

Cooperative Monitoring Group (CMG) End-of-Year Review Meeting Report November 17-18, 2015

Location: BLM, Battle Mountain District Office

Participants: CMG members (see attached Appendix 1: CMG Attendee List)

Distributed 12/4/2015

Tuesday 11/17/2015

8:00 - Introductions/Expectations – Diane Groves

Each person introduced themselves, discussed their relationship with the Argenta Allotment, and explained their expectations for the meeting and how they felt about being their participation.

8:30 - Background and meeting overview – Mike Lunn

Mike referred the group to the goals, established by the Settlement Agreement and displayed on the flip charts, and explained that this meeting would focus on the progress made to date in moving to achieve the following goals.

Section 2. Goals

The Parties' goals under the Settlement Agreement are to:

- a) Protect important riparian-wetland sites;
- b) Pilot an adaptive grazing management project to improve or continue to improve resource condition on the allotment largely through the use of riding and supplement placement to effectively distribute livestock across the landscape;
- c) Implement and identify through the trial period improved grazing management that can achieve or continue to achieve meeting resources objectives and provide lessons for use on this allotment;
- d) Achieve overall allotment success (as defined below);
- e) Collect important implementation and effectiveness monitoring data throughout the trial period to inform development of a long-term management strategy (including range improvements needs as appropriate) for the allotment (i.e., for the permit renewal process);
- f) To the greatest extent feasible and consistent with range health, maintain Permittee operations, consistent with Rangeland Health Standards and applicable Land Use Plan Objectives (i.e. "resource objectives");
- g) Foster a more collaborative and cooperative working relationship between the Parties; and
- h) Provide valuable knowledge and experience on adaptive grazing management.

Next, Mike explained that the agenda had been developed with the intention of including needed discussion elements, but there easily could be additional topics for discussion and/or a different

order that would better meet the needs of the CMG. Following discussion, it was agreed that the way the CMG functioned as a group and the Dispute Resolution process were two topics that needed to be discussed first, as they would impede the CMG work if not confronted and resolved early. It was agreed without dissension that we begin with those topics.

Dispute Resolutions

Discussions were held about the status of the disputes on AG-23, AG-09, and the incomplete dispute authored by BLM staff Adam Cochran regarding lack of riparian monitoring sites in Mill Creek, Rock Creek, and Ratfink Canyon. Jon Sherve, Field Office Manager (FOM), has received the first two disputes but made no decisions to date. Adam has not updated his dispute following communication with Steve Smith, NRST team leader, who deemed the original submission incomplete and offered suggestions for what was needed. Adam still plans to complete this form so the process can move forward.

Clearly resolution has not been timely; FOM agreed to timely completion, but wanted assurance that all the steps, including attempts at early resolution had been sought. Jon suggested that on these two initial disputes, AG-23 and 09, he would finalize his acceptance/rejection of NRST recommendation within two weeks. Later, a 10-working day period was accepted as a standard and reasonable time frame for moving disputes forward with the provision that an extension could be requested if conflicts in work schedules prevented one from meeting the 10-day period for responses.

The discussion then focused on WWP, and whether they were committed to following the dispute resolution process to which other CMG members are committed. The ongoing appeal by WWP of Round 1 water projects was the focus. Mike explained that in reviewing the timing of the original proposal for those water protection proposals, and the actions of WWP, they did comply at least with the spirit, if not the actual process of the Dispute Resolution Process. WWP (specifically Ken Cole) expressed objections in the field, and sent a letter to a number of people objecting to the enclosure fences, but this letter was not distributed throughout the CMG. Mike explained that the letter would be distributed to all CMG members immediately, and it was later that same day.

Those riparian protection projects were first recommended by NRST and BLM in the first field review in March and reinforced throughout a series of meetings and ultimately in the Settlement Agreement. It has been and is the strong contention of the NRST that without fencing, protection is not possible so long as the allotment is grazed. The first stated goal of the Settlement Agreement is to “Protect important riparian-wetland sites.” Because of the timing of the CCC letter by BLM on the initial round of riparian protection, WWP had to follow the formal timelines of the BLM protest/appeals process. While WWP agreed with the need for protecting the identified riparian spring/wetlands, they believed it should be done without fences. Further, the timelines of the formal BLM process that began with issue of the CCC letter resulted in WWP having to be current with those rather than any other process.

Following this discussion, each person responded in turn to questions about “How do you feel about the situation with dispute resolution, and how the CMG is working together?”

Answers were not recorded, but there were open and honest comments and opinions offered by members of the group. Following this, Mike offered a written proposal seeking to resolve the question of participation, and people expressed suggestions and opinions about the wording.

After group discussion and WWP conferring with their attorney, the following resolution was accepted without objection from anyone:

Dispute Resolution Process - All CMG members will follow the dispute resolution process described in the Settlement Agreement section 13.1 up until the point a formal process by the BLM is initiated, such as a request for comments or other action such as issuance of a CCC letter.

Question and Answer Session

As the people were talking in turn during the previous session, a number of questions came up. Mike and Diane had the group record their questions on 3x5 cards, and then answered them as best as possible before lunch. Those questions/answers follow:

“Why, if a group or entity refused to sign the agreement, are they involved in the CMG?” *WWP chose to not sign the agreement, but are named in Section 3.4 as a member of CMG.*

“Should a party be removed from the CMG for not working in good faith?” *There is no current mechanism in the Settlement Agreement for removing any party.*

“How can the CMG work effectively, if there is not a partnership by all parties to work forward in good faith? WWP is not part of the settlement agreement by choice. They have no skin in the game.” (Eddy Ann Filippini) *If people don't want to work in partnership, it makes it harder to achieve the goals of the Settlement. The parties (signatory to the Settlement Agreement) pledged to participate in good faith in the cooperative process (section 4 of Settlement Agreement).*

“How can the CMG function in light of opposing objectives and goals?” *See above.*

“Is CMG monitoring only or management and monitoring? If it is monitoring only then that is all that should be covered by the CMG.” *See Section 5.3; primarily monitoring, but also evaluation of the “results of activities” undertaken during the 3 year period. Additionally, section 13.1 requires disputes to be brought to the CMG in an effort to find resolution.*

“Is it true that BLM ‘can’t enter the allotment’ without the CMG?” *This question came up in the summer, and Jon Sherve explained that it is not true. The permittees are largely responsible for mid-season monitoring, but Jon explained that BLM is frequently on the allotment and makes observations.*

“Mule Canyon – explain why it wasn’t monitored? Did the site fit the stratification standards? Was it excluded because of the blowout?” *The Ratfink area of Mule Canyon Use Area had a high-intensity thunderstorm this past summer that washed out much of the existing riparian area including the DMA. Inadequate vegetation (especially a lack of key forage plants) remained to*

monitor short-term indicators. During the field review earlier in the summer, it was noted that photo monitoring will provide needed information for well into the future.

“What is the situation in the upland in regard to the allotment boundary fence?” Pete Tomera continues to work with Barrick to get the fence constructed, appears likely the fence will be on private land, and there will be new boundaries described for Carico Lake and Argenta allotments along with rebalancing AUMs as a result of the changes.

“Where does the approval stand in regard to the riparian fences?” See next agenda section

Statements by Pete Tomera (in response to statement that there are too many AUMs):

- The permittees must be profitable.
- The Argenta unit has taken a 50% cut in AUMs in 63, 64 and 65.
- We have changed our season of use from 12 to 8 months.
- We have reduced the number of permittees.
- We have taken nonuse on all sheep AUMs in the allotment.
- We have built fence for better range management.
- We are using only 60 per cent of our cattle AUMs.

Range Improvements

Boundary Fence – Pete Tomera has been in contact with Sam Castor and Bob Brock about fence location and construction. He hoped to visit with them by telephone during the meeting to get an update. Unfortunately he was unable to connect with them but will continue to follow up. It appears likely that all the fence might be constructed on private lands which would greatly expedite construction. That also could lead to some trade in AUMs between Argenta and Carico Lake allotments along with boundary alterations that could benefit both allotments.

Round 1 Riparian Enclosures – Round 1 proposals included Mill Creek Spring, N. Fork Mill Creek Spring, Fire Creek wetland, The Park – Round Spring, Slaven and Rat Fink. These projects were approved first in late June, with a final decision following protests on 9/2. Three groups appealed the decision and requested a stay. On 11/17, the judge denied the stay filed by WWP. The stay request by the other two groups, who jointly filed, remains unanswered. If the stay is denied, then construction could begin; however, the risk would be that if the appellants are upheld on summary judgment or through a hearing process, the fences might be required to be removed.

Round 2 Lotic enclosures – Three projects are included in one environmental assessment; Fire Creek, North Fork Mill Creek and Ferris Creek. An IDT has been assigned, and the sage grouse HAF has been completed and provided to the State Office for review as required. SO will coordinate with FWS and NDOW in this review. The EA kick-off meeting has been held, and an aggressive time line for completion developed. Battle Mountain is sponsoring an EA training course, which includes the development of a draft EA for Round 2 projects as the focus of the training. It is possible this may result in an initial draft by mid-December. The EA draft is scheduled to be available for comments in mid-January, completion by mid-February, and CCP letter by end of February. By mid-March, the process should be complete, ahead of the 8-month timeframe noted in the Settlement Agreement.

Stockmanship Management – The consultants and permittees described the movement of cattle within each of the Use Areas, and noted that a written report will be provided by each to the CMG in addition to the brief summary during the meeting. The amount of efforts and costs were also discussed. Water hauling in particular was a large expense item and very hard on their trucks. Hiring and keeping riders was a difficult aspect as well, and most of the ones they had were hard pressed to stick with the stockmanship riding techniques, and frustrated by the long hours and hard country. Use of the low-moisture supplements was seen as a positive way to attract and keep cattle in areas where they had not grazed in previous years.

Mid-Season monitoring – On behalf of IRC, Jamie Dafoe distributed upland utilization summaries, some done in July and others in late August/early September. Only AG-08 in Slaven Use Area had met upland triggers by early September, though these data will need to include confidence intervals.

The CMG also discussed data portrayal and agreed that utilization levels should be portrayed by individual species so as to determine the potential effects on individual species, and by the average of all key species at each KMA, and finally by each use area. Confidence intervals should be included with all averages too.

Riparian Monitoring, End-of-season – Sue Priest discussed results of end-of-season monitoring and distributed an excellent monitoring report, complete with field photography taken during monitoring, and including several photo pairs showing change in condition over time at the DMAs. Residual stubble height triggers were exceeded at 7 of 10 DMAs. Fire Creek (6.5”), Indian Creek and Corral Creek were the exceptions that showed stubble height of 4” or more when confidence intervals were considered (Corral Creek was 3.6” and Indian Creek was 3.7” +/- 0.75”). Most other DMAs were closer to 2” residual stubble height (see Appendix 2 for additional details).

Woody browse levels were high (62% to 77%) on 6 DMAs (Harry Canyon, Corral Creek, Indian Creek, Ferris Creek, Crippen Creek, and Trout Creek; see Appendix 2). However, the sample size was very small at the Trout Creek DMA (1 sample) and at the Corral Creek DMA (5 samples). No conclusions should be drawn from the woody browse data for these two DMA because the sample size is too small for statistical purposes. In addition, these two DMAs are dominated by herbaceous vegetation and stability is controlled by herbaceous vegetation, negating the need for woody browse measurements. No woody browse measurements were made on the 4 other DMAs (Fire Creek, The Park, Slaven, and N. Fork Mill Creek), because these sites had no key woody species and were entirely controlled by herbaceous vegetation.

Several DMAs lacked an adequate representation of hydric plants, therefore mesic plants (e.g. Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*) or Sandberg bluegrass (*Poa secunda*) or weakly-rooted plants such as redtop (or creeping bentgrass, *Agrostis stolonifera*) and annual rabbitsfootgrass (*Polypogon Monspeliensis*) were used to calculate residual stubble height.

Several members of the CMG also discussed some problems with measuring twig-length measurements at the end of the growing season. Some notable problems were discussed and

demonstrated in the field, and the issue was resolved by dropping the twig-length measurements and continuing the “incidence of use” or woody browse approach that is part of the MIM protocol.

Also, it was discussed during the end-of-season meeting that simply collecting annual utilization measurements, such as residual stubble height, woody browse, and bank alteration, provided little usable information for management purposes. Strong agreement was expressed in favor of measuring long-term indicators at each DMA during 2016 near peak plant production and before much livestock use.

The complete report by Sue is available by request; copies were distributed at the meeting. See Appendix 2 for an abbreviated summary of riparian, end-of-season, short-term indicator monitoring results.

Upland Utilization, End of Season – Adam Cochran showed a PowerPoint presentation of the upland monitoring data that were collected using the height/weight (H/W) method. The presentation was incomplete because H/W curves for several key species had not yet been obtained to complete the calculation of utilization levels. Furthermore, none of the data had confidence intervals. Consequently, it was not possible to draw conclusions regarding utilization levels; yet the information was presented with the statement that this was information that would be presented to the public in January.

The CMG worked out a plan to obtain missing H/W curves to complete the analysis. The CMG agreed that all utilization levels calculated from non-Forest Service derived H/W curves will be clearly marked as provisional, subject to additional testing and analysis.

Also, the presentation included a map that purported to show a major portion of the allotment had been overgrazed. Entire use areas were shaded bold red to indicate overuse. While the Settlement Agreement requires use areas to meet specific utilization targets (e.g. 4” riparian stubble height, 40% utilization on upland grasses in most use areas), the monitoring sites (DMAs in riparian areas and KMAs in upland sites) are not representative of use throughout the entire use area whether riparian or upland. Less than 1% of the 140,000 acres of public land on Argenta are riparian areas, and most of these riparian areas are narrow, short reaches. DMAs are deliberately located in the most sensitive complexes, consistent with the MIM protocol. However, other complexes that are not targeted for monitoring may be in complacent, comparatively insensitive reaches that may have good resource conditions.

In the absence of proper stratification, extrapolation of conditions from a single DMA or KMA to an entire use area is inappropriate and unwarranted. Annual utilization measurements are the basis for determining the success/failure of each use area as defined in the Settlement Agreement; but they are not representative of grazing impacts over an entire use area.

Finally, unlike the riparian data, which were presented in a formal report with background information to describe the setting of each DMA (e.g. valley type, stream type, gradient, duration of streamflow, dominant plant communities, etc.), the upland data were presented with no background information or context. Upland data should be presented with adequate description

of the monitoring sites to provide context for interpreting the data. Furthermore, interpretation of data, including extrapolation and inference, must be made within the limits of the data.

The map and summary displayed by Adam created strong feelings among members of the CMG at the end of the day, and several people expressed concerns that this was inappropriate and needed to be revisited the following morning.

The CMG agreed that the annual-use data are to be portrayed as representative of the monitoring site where they were collected, not of the entire use area.

Tuesday, 11/18

Proposal to resolve issues raised in upland monitoring presentation – Mike presented an 8-step approach to resolve the issues from the previous evening, it was written on a flip chart, and the CMG went through it paragraph by paragraph to reach agreement. At the conclusion of the process, there were no objections to the following proposal:

Resolution proposal -- display of upland monitoring information.

1. The existing upland monitoring information displayed by Adam is inappropriate for public review. It lacks definitive utilization measures on important forage species due to a lack of H/W curves for certain species. Further, there is no consensus on selection of key species and seasonal-based utilization procedures.
2. Raw data from October monitoring should be reviewed by key CMG members who request it. BLM should make this immediately available.
3. Where H/W curves are currently lacking in BLM (e.g., intermediate wheatgrass, Siberian wildrye), other existing curves by species believed applicable should be shared by CMG; these should include curves from other BLM units in northern NV, FS, cooperator-developed curves, or others for consideration by CMG/NRST. The purpose is to utilize a selected set of curves to apply against existing collected data. Supporting documentation should be provided. Provide curves to Mark NLT Monday, 12/1/2015.
4. Mark will use CMG input to develop draft recommendation on how to proceed. E-mail recommendation to CMG by 12/8.
5. CMG members will have 10 working days following submission to comment on concerns/suggested resolution. Comments due to Mark on 12/22.
6. NRST will make recommendations to BLM on how to proceed; if needed, dispute resolution will follow. Mark will have recommendation to CMG NLT 12/30. *All time lines are intended to be maximum times in order to finalize upland utilization documentation by BLM by January 7 in order to have review by CMG members after calculations using new curves while allowing presentations for 1/12 public meeting to be ready.
7. No presentation will purport to show a total unit failure because of riparian or upland exceedance. Presentations will show DMA/upland locations as points that are meeting or missing Settlement Agreement standards.
8. In terms of success/failure, this is a baseline year. Utilization monitoring will inform 2016 management, and plans will clearly address measures to improve success in 2016.

There is no penalty in year one for failing to meet use area standards (SA 6.10). Changes in management may be made to timing, duration and/or intensity of grazing.

Request to Add FWS to CMG

During the previous several weeks, Mike Lunn and Laura Van Riper had discussed with FWS a request to add them to the CMG. Section 5.2 of the Settlement Agreement provides a mechanism to add technical specialists to CMG based on a consensus of CMG members. A conference call was held with NV FWS State Office leadership (Ted Koch and Lee Ann Carranza) so they could explain what they wanted to the entire CMG. After discussion, and questions being asked by CMG members, Ted explained that at this time at least, they don't want to be true members, but to have the opportunity to maintain close working relationships with both the BLM and CMG. This would include the opportunity to receive meeting notices, notes, and to participate in meetings where topics are being covered that are of interest to FWS. In particular, FWS wants to be closely involved with the permit renewal process on Argenta, as it is the first in Nevada to be prepared by the BLM SO Permit Renewal Team and has sage-grouse habitat. No objection was offered by anyone, so that is how we will proceed. Mark will update the CMG mailing list to include Lee Ann, who will serve as the primary contact for FWS.

Mark also noted that he plans to develop a core CMG mailing list for routine business in order to avoid providing more information than some people currently on the list may want to review. This is primarily when proposals such as the monitoring approach are going back and forth among the CMG for review.

Argenta Overview from NRST – Mark Gonzalez

Mark discussed his thoughts on how the group has proceeded during the year, progress that has been made, and the continuing need to be proactive and innovative in addressing issues as they continue to arise. Mark distributed a figure summarizing the integrated riparian management process (IRMP) and explained the importance of following an integrated process to expedite management and facilitate progress on the Argenta allotment. The IRMP is a 7-step approach, summarized below (see also Appendix 3):

1. Assess riparian area function using the PFC method. This is also an approach needed for uplands and can be done with the Interpreting Indicators of Rangeland Health protocol. A prerequisite to assessments is completion of a stratification process, which is also used in subsequent monitoring efforts.
2. Identify riparian (and upland) resource values and complete additional assessments.
3. Prioritize reaches and upland habitats for management, restoration, or monitoring actions.
4. Identify issues and establish goals and objectives by areas. *(It was noted several times during the meeting that we “Started in the middle instead of the beginning”. We early on developed systems of livestock handling and rotation, along with monitoring and protection of key water production/storage areas before assessment information was collected or analyzed and management objectives could be articulated.*
5. Design and implement management and restoration activities.

6. Monitor and analyze the effectiveness of actions and update resource condition ratings. *We have no management objectives and landscape goals at this time for Argenta; stubble height and utilization limits are not objectives.*
7. Implement adaptive actions. *This will be done in the 2016 Stockmanship Plan.*

After a review of the IRMP, Mark discussed in generalities some ideas that might foster improved relationships, ranching operations, and resource conditions. These included:

- The status quo is not working for the BLM, the permittees, or for resource conditions; therefore the status quo must change.
- Start at the beginning, which relates to following the IRMP. Although this may appear to be back-tracking and to slow the process down, in reality the failure to start at the beginning is the reason progress has been slow and success has been elusive. A rush to get to the end only creates problems and delays progress. Need to slow down to go fast and to ultimately make the right kind of progress.
- Need to change emphasis in management practices based on short-term monitoring to those based on long-term monitoring of resource conditions and sound management objectives.
- Riparian condition is the Achilles heel or soft underbelly of the Argenta allotment. If riparian issues are addressed properly, the biggest problems can be fixed and other problems will likely improve too.
- Need a change in grazing practices.
 - Stockmanship and use of supplements need adjustments or fine tuning (learn from 2015; apply in 2016).
 - Fencing and other range improvements necessary: hyper-concentrate improvements on the highest value riparian areas.
 - Change in standard grazing management (time, timing, frequency, and intensity)
- Sage-grouse are additional challenge and opportunity
 - Sage-grouse will require additional monitoring and plan direction
 - Potential opportunities for money and coordination among internal and external partners
- Change is inevitable; embrace the change and control the change.
 - As understanding of resource conditions in Argenta improves, permittees should think about practices they can change that can improve conditions. It is probably better for permittees to determine what they can change and how to change than to try to adjust to changes imposed upon them by other parties.
- Optimization versus maximization.
 - A reduction in numbers may not equate to a reduction in profitability.
 - Considerations should be given to practices that optimize an operation, not just to maximization of gross proceeds.

After Mark concluded his discussion and to have balance among all participants and the NRST, each person was provided the opportunity to speak in turn answering as they chose the following 3 questions. Answers were not recorded.

- How do you feel about what you heard in Mark's presentation?
- What did you learn that can help us be successful?

What does NRST/BLM need to know or change to help us be successful?

Calendaring future events

Week of January 11 - Mike Lunn discussed the upcoming public meeting scheduled for this week. A suggestion was offered that there be two meetings, one in the afternoon and another in the evening on January 12. After group feedback, it was agreed that a single meeting in the evening should provide adequate opportunity for interested parties to hear the reports. That meeting will focus on progress made by the CMG, BLM and NRST on achieving the eight goals of the Settlement Agreement. NRST will report on overall progress, BLM will report on monitoring outcomes, and permittees/consultants will talk about their experiences with the greatly changed management requirements and plans. NRST attendees will include only Mark Gonzalez and Mike Lunn.

The BLM staff of the Mt. Lewis Field Office are in charge of securing and paying for the meeting room for the public meeting.

February 8 week – This week has been held by NRST for working with the permittees and others on finalizing the Stockmanship Plan for 2016. At this time, unclear whether or not a meeting will be needed. Steve Leonard and Steve Cote have been working on the plan and believe they currently have adequate information. If needed, Steve and Steve will come down to meet with permittees.

Meeting Closure – Mike Lunn asked everyone in turn to talk about how they felt about the meeting we just concluded and to provide advice for moving ahead. People generally expressed satisfaction with the progress made during the meeting.

Appendix 1: CMG Attendance list

Pete Tomera	Permittee
Lynn Tomera	Permittee
Dan Tomera	Permittee
Paul Tomera	Permittee
Eddyann Filippini	Permittee
Shawn Mariluch	Permittee
Angie Mariluch	Permittee
Jamie Dafoe	Consultant, IRC
Jack Alexander	Consultant, Synergy
Martin Paris	Consultant, Synergy
John Carpenter	CMG, signatory to S.A.
Ken Cole	WWP
Kathryn Dyer	BLM State Office
Adam Cochran	BLM Battle Mountain
Jon Sherve	BLM MLFO
Dustin Fowler	BLM MLFO
Sue Priest	GBI riparian specialist
Mark Gonzalez	NRST Riparian/Wetland Ecologist (Soils)
Steve Leonard	Ecologist/Livestock Management
Steve Cote	Livestock Management
Mike Lunn	Conflict Resolution specialist
Diane Groves	Conflict Resolution specialist
Wayne Elmore	Riparian Ecologist
Steve Foree	NDOW

Appendix 2: Summary, End-of-season Riparian Short-term Monitoring Results

2015 Argenta Allotment--Annual Use Indicators

DMA	Stubble Height			Woody Browse			Bank Alteration		
	Average Height (in)	95% Conf. Int.	Sample Size	95% %	Conf. Int.	Sample Size	95% C.I.	Sample Size	
Harry Canyon#	2.5	0.67	99	76.7	8	18	31†	8	80
Fire Creek	6.5	0.95	145	----	----	----	42	9	83
The Park	1.9	0.63	129	----	----	----	42	9	85
Corral Creek	3.6	0.75	76	76.7 ^{NA}	16	5	26	7	80
Indian Creek	3.7	0.75	60	62.0	11	24	15*†	6	79
Ferris Creek	1.6	0.61	72	75.6	8	18	41	9	74
Crippen Creek	1.8	0.63	102	69.0	7	29	8*†	5	80
Slaven Creek	1.6	0.61	126	----	----	----	32†	8	81
Trout Creek	2.1	0.64	135	70.0 ^{NA}	5	1	23*	7	82
N. Fork Mill Creek	2.3	0.66	130	----	----	----	15†	6	83
Mill Creek	(No suitable DMA established in 2015)								
Rock Creek	(No suitable DMA established in 2015)								

* Bank alteration is comparatively low due to abundant rock within the DMA

† Bank alteration measurement affected by high water flow from recent rains

High water may have changed position of greenline and point where short-term indicators were measured

^{NA} Insufficient sample size; unable to draw any conclusions (Note: this is a typical occurrence when a measurement is made on a woody plant in a reach that is dominated by and where stability is controlled by herbaceous vegetation.)

Appendix 3. Summary of the Integrated Riparian Management Process

