

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
September 27, 2016
DNR Southeast Region Office/Ellensburg**

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe – CMER Co-Chair
Beckett, Leah	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
§Bell, Harry	Green Crow
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
chesney, Charles (ph)	Member of the public
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hicks, Mark (ph)	Department of Ecology
Garlesky, Jennifer	Upper Columbia United Tribes – CMER Staff
§Hayes, Marc (ph)	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Hooks, Doug (ph)	WFPA – CMER Co-Chair
Johnson, Angela	Department of Natural Resources
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny (ph)	Green Crow
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protections Association
§Mendoza, Chris (ph)	Conservation Caucus
Murray, Joe	Merrill Ring
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Stewart, Greg	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser

§Indicates official CMER members and alternates; ph indicates attended via phone.

*Indicates Decision

Agenda changes:

Lean Update postponed to future date.

ISAG update moved after Policy and Board updates.

Introduction of new AMP Staff – Hans Berge introduced Angela Johnson and Heather Gibbs, the new AMP project managers.

Science Session:

Forested Wetland Effectiveness Project (FWEP) TWIG – *Best available science presentation*

Leah Beckett gave a presentation on the Best Available Science document and answered questions. Doug Martin and Berge commented that they would like to see a hybrid alternative.

Howard Haemmerle asked if the TWIG will need to add that before asking for approval of the document. Hans replied yes.

Decisions:

UPSAG

- ◆ **Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Literature Synthesis** – *approval of findings report and six questions.*

Haemmerle presented the UPSAG request for approval of the findings report and six questions. Baldwin motioned to approve, Marc Hayes seconded. – **Approved**

Harry Bell asked if literature reviews go to ISPR. Berge replied that if it was necessary, yes. This literature review will not go to ISPR.

SAGE

- ◆ **Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project** – *approval of final report*

Haemmerle presented the SAGE request for approval of the final report. Baldwin motioned to approve, Dave Schuett-Hames seconded, Mark Hicks abstained. - **Approved**

Martin remarked that purpose/objective A was not addressed in the document then pulled by SAGE later. Haemmerle explained that they were removed because SAGE had identified that the areas were not required and should not have been put in the contract.

Next step: SAGE will work on findings report and six questions. Haemmerle will work with SAGE Co-Chairs to have a discussion at the next SAGE meeting.

Hicks remarked that he would like to see the ISPR review of the original Study Design (EWRAP) as part of the findings report.

CMER

- ◆ **Meeting Minutes Approval** – *July 2016 meeting minutes*

Patti Shramek asked if anyone had revisions they would like to be made to the minutes and incorporated the revisions. Chris Mendoza provided revisions. Baldwin moved to approve the minutes as revised, Hicks seconded. - **Approved**

Updates:

Report from Forest Practices Board – *August 10 meeting*

Berge gave a report on the August 10, 2016 Forest Practices Board meeting. Minutes for the meeting can be found on the Department of Natural Resources web page at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board>.

Report from Policy – *August 4 and September 8 & 21 meetings*

Hans Berge gave a report on the August 4 and September 8 & 21, 2016 Policy meetings. Minutes for the meeting can be found on the Department of Natural Resources web page at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board/tfw-policy-committee>.

CMER

◆ **ENREP TWIG** (*study design*) – *dispute resolution update*

Berge gave an update on the meetings held to resolve the dispute. Disputing parties were able to come to agreement on key issues. Result: prescriptions for study design changed to give more shade values. The study design needs to go through another reiteration and come back to CMER for approval to go to ISPR. The revisions to the study design that were made through the dispute process eliminated the need for the additional questions from Bell and Martin. Schuett-Hames asked about the TWIGS role moving forward. Berge replied that the TWIG will make the changes to the study design and bring it back to CMER. Hicks remarked that the TWIG needs to have clear communication of what was agreed to in the dispute resolution so they know exactly what they need to respond to. Berge and Haemmerle agreed that clear written direction needs to be given to the TWIG.

Nest Steps: Hicks will work on writing up the agreement and direction of the ENREP dispute, and distribute it to the dispute participants for review, by the beginning of the week of October 3. When the dispute participants are in agreement it will be distributed to Berge and the CMER Co-Chairs to review, then distribute to the TWIG. A revised Study Design may be ready for distribution in the next CMER mailing if the TWIG receives their direction in a timely manner.

◆ **2017 CMER Science Conference** – *Discussion of topics and dates*

Shramek asked if CMER felt there were enough projects to present for a science conference and if they would like to hold one in 2017. The SAGS will put together a list of possible topics for the conference for discussion at the October CMER meeting. If the decision is made to have a conference it will be held in late spring 2017, possibly May.

◆ **CMER Work Plan** – *update*

Shramek and Haemmerle discussed the process for revisions to the Work Plan for 2017.

◆ **FY 16 Mid-Year Projects** – *update*

Haemmerle gave an update on the following FY 16 mid-year project:

- Wetland mapping project Phase I is almost finished, waiting for sub-contractor to do his part. He inquired about funding to continue the project and reported that the University of Washington has concerns with utility of this process. Martin said that from WetSAG's perspective it's a go. Haemmerle will work with WetSAG to work out the details.

◆ **October 25 Forest Chemicals Science Session** – *update*

Jenny Knoth reported that everything is on track and that the agenda will be revised slightly.

◆ **Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM) Chapter 7** – *update*

Roorbach reported that the revised draft should go out for review the first week of October and they are hoping to have it on the October agenda for approval.

ISAG

◆ Update on First Meeting

Jason Walter reported that interested participants met on September 23 to assign co-chairs and set meeting dates. He and Caprice Fasano were appointed co-chairs and Marc Gauthier will work with Fasano for full tribal representation. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 1. The 2017 meetings will be held the third Tuesday of month. Aside from administrative logistics they brainstormed topics they may work on, most of which are related to the current water typing Policy issues.

Next steps: Prioritize brainstorm ideas. Berge remarked that Policy added budget for 2017 for ISAG and that budget refinement is happening now. ISAG needs to provide details to Policy, or let them know that they won't be using the budget. Haemmerle remarked that they are still looking for participants from the Eastside Tribes.

Mendoza requested to be added to the ISAG email list. He also requested a list of budget projects from Policy. Berge replied that the budget item just says ISAG.

LWAG

◆ Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Basalt Lithologies (Hard Rock – update on chapters

Haemmerle gave an update on the status of the 18 chapters:

- **Chapters 1-4** – *Introduction*; with the technical editor.
- **Chapter 5** – *Stand Structure and Tree Mortality Rates in Riparian Buffers*; back from ISPR 2. It is going back for third round as ISPR wasn't satisfied with responses.
- **Chapter 6** – *Wood Recruitment and Loading*; back from ISPR1 and comments are being addressed. Should be ready to go back to ISPR in mid-October.
- **Chapter 7** – *Stream Temperature and Cover*; Ecology has finished responding to ISPR comments and will be ready to go back to ISPR in a week.
- **Chapters 8-10** – *Discharge, Nutrient Export, Sediment Process*; going through ISPR2 review now.
- **Chapter 11** – *Stream Channel Characteristics*; back from ISPR2, Ecology is working on response to comments.
- **Chapter 12** – *Litterfall Input and Detritus Export*; back from ISPR 2 and should be ready for CMER approval at the October meeting.
- **Chapter 13** – *Biofilm and Periphyton*; ready to go to Policy.
- **Chapter 14** – *Macroinvertebrate Export*; still at ISPR 2.
- **Chapter 15** – *Stream-Associated Amphibians*; back from ISPR 1 and WDFW is working on response to comments.
- **Chapter 16** – *Downstream Fish*; due next month – response to ISPR 1 comments.
- **Chapter 17**, *Tropic Pathways*; back from ISPR 2, ISPR2 didn't except, they didn't feel some of their comments were addressed. It has gone back to Bob Bilby.
- **Chapter 18** – *Synthesis*; comments due September 27. Will go back to the PI for response when the CMER comments are received.

Mendoza inquired about the table that tracks when chapters will come back to CMER for review. Haemmerle replied that he will update it and send to CMER.

Action: Haemmerle will upload the Hard Rock chapter status document in Box.

◆ **Process of review of individual chapters**

Hooks presented the process for the Hard Rock chapters review for Policy that was agreed upon by the AMPA, CMER Co-Chairs:

Policy agrees that no action will be taken on any individual chapter until the synthesis chapter has been delivered.

There will be a findings report with the answers to the standard six questions delivered to policy based upon the synthesis chapter.

- 1) CMER will approve ISPR reviewed chapters as they become available, but will not produce a findings report or answers to the six questions at this time.
- 2) A presentation on each ISPR reviewed and CMER approved chapter will be presented to Policy as they become available.
- 3) Following the presentation of each chapter, Policy will make a decision on whether they would like to receive a findings report and answers to the six questions for that chapter.
- 4) If Policy requests a findings report and answers to the six questions for a particular chapter, then CMER will provide it through its normal consensus process. In order to ensure that progress is made on other chapters, this will be done by a subgroup of CMER (PI, authors, and SAG members are the ones working primarily working through the ISPR reviews and will not likely be able to deliver the reports and answers in a timely fashion or without creating delay of ISPR reviewed chapters). *
- 5) CMER will provide Policy with an ISPR reviewed and approved Synthesis chapter. A finding report and answers to the six questions will be provided to Policy on the synthesis chapter.

*A Policy request for the findings report and answers to the six questions for any given chapter does not trigger any actionable timelines for policy recommendations on that chapter.

TWIGS

◆ **BMP Roads Effectiveness Project** (*study plan*)

Haemmerle reported that the TWIG is meeting regularly to discuss the Study Design. They are at a point where they feel they need to meet with a statistician. They would like to have the Study Design to CMER in December.

◆ **Unstable Slopes Criteria** (*BAS*)

Greg Stewart reported that they are continuing to meet and work on the Best Available Science document. They hope to have a document to CMER in October.

◆ **Type F Riparian Prescriptions** (*study plan*)

Haemmerle reported that the TWIG is meeting every two weeks. They are meeting with a statistician, and once they finish with statistician they should have a document ready for CMER review.

Additional topics:

Martin asked for a site selection update for ENREP. Stewart reported that they are not finding water at lower elevation sites. Jennifer Garlesky doesn't have access to sites so she is surveying on public land where she can see private land and documenting possible sites on GPS. Martin asked if they had considered using GIS, orhto, and Dan Millers model to document potential sites. Stewart replied that the challenge with those is that you can't determine stand age. They won't be able to determine that until they talk to landowners and get their approval to survey their land.

Public Comment Period

charles chesney had the following comments:

- ◆ Asked Martin about value of substance of the Forest Hydrology Study. Reply: Not agenda item and chesney can discuss with Martin outside of meeting.
- ◆ Asked what content exists in Chapter 7 of the CMER PSM regarding duty and standard of care? Reply: Not part of Chapter 7 PSM.
- ◆ Meeting minutes: chesney suggested better quality and timeliness in future. Reply: Noted

Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- ◆ Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides Literature Synthesis – **Approved**
- ◆ Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project - **Approved**
- ◆ Todd Baldwin and Howard Haemmerle will look for ISPR review of the original EWRAP Study Design for Mark Hicks.
- ◆ July minutes approved with revisions.
- ◆ Hicks will work on writing up the agreement and direction of the ENREP dispute agreement and distribute it to the dispute participants by the beginning of the week of October 3. When participants are in agreement it will then be distribute to Hans Berge and the Co-Chairs to review, then distributed to the TWIG. Depending on the timing of the direction, a revised Study Design may be ready to be distributed in the next CMER mailing.
- ◆ SAGS will put together a list of possible topics for a science conference for discussion at the October meeting. If CMER decides to have a science conference it will be held in late spring, possibly May.
- ◆ Haemmerle will work with WetSAG on the Wetland Mapping details.
- ◆ A revised draft of PSM Chapter 7 will go out for review in the next week and will be on the October CMER agenda for approval.
- ◆ The CMER Work Plan will be loaded on Box as soon as it is received from the editor and Haemmerle will work on a SAG review schedule.
- ◆ Haemmerle will upload the Hard Rock Chapter Status document in Box.

Adjourned