

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
September 24, 2013, 2013
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
Chesney, Charles (ph)	Department of Natural Resources
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Gauthier, Marc (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Hotvedt, Jim	Department of Natural Resources, AMPA
Kurtenbach, Amy	Department of Natural Resources
*Lingley, Leslie	Department of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
McIntyre, Aimee	Department of Fish & Wildlife
*Mendoza, Chris (ph)	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Farm Forestry Association
*Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Schuett-Hames, Dave	North West Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Stewart, Greg	North West Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
*Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Woodsmith, Rick (ph)	Washington Farm Forestry Association

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

Agenda – No Changes

Science Session

Update of future science sessions:

October

Mark Hick gave an overview of what will be presented in the Remote Sensing science session at the October meeting. George McFadden from BLM has taken lead to schedule the speakers.

Mark asked if there were any specific areas members would like them to focus on. Doug Martin suggested the presentations answer these four questions:

1. What are data needs?
2. What can you get out of it?
3. What's the limitations?
4. What's the cost?

Dick Miller asked if there will be time after the presentations for CMER to discuss how they could use the information. Mark replied that most of the meeting will be dedicated to this topic.

Chris Mendoza remarked that Policy has requested a report of alternative methods to extensive monitoring and the benefits, limitations and associated costs of each compared to what CMER is currently doing. Policy wants to keep this issue at the 10,000 ft. level and not have CMER get bogged down by details on alternatives. Mark Hicks added that Policy requested this for their November meeting, but he told them it was unlikely that CMER would be able to make that timeline. He suggested having RSAG write a report/recommendation that could possibly go to Policy in December.

The rest of the discussion revolved around what level of detail Policy is interested in and what should be included in the report/recommendations.

November

Jim Hotvedt reported that Linda Storm from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is scheduled to come in November to provide a presentation on how EPA views wetland functions. He asked if everyone is okay with this, or if there's something else coming up that should be done instead. Doug Martin commented that it would make more sense to dovetail it with the Wetlands Strategy presentation. Amy Kurtenbach replied that she would like to have Adamus give a presentation on the Wetlands Synthesis in November so it would be better to have Linda come in December.

CMER Task List:

Jim Hotvedt suggested adding the following to the task list:

1. Get a group together to develop what a research strategy looks like.
Mark Hicks said he was reluctant to form a sub-group to develop what a strategy looks like. Chris Mendoza suggested having the SAGs form a small group to get this done. Dick Miller suggested that there must be some books on how to develop a research strategy. Jim replied that he has done some searching on the internet and hasn't found any.

Mark Hicks asked for a vote to add guidance on how to develop a strategy as a formal task on the task list. The members voted no.

Jim Hotvedt commented that he wanted to make clear that by not doing this WetSAG will be given the flexibility to develop their own process for developing a strategy.

Dick Miller said that he would look through his documents to see if he could find something to use as guidance.

Amy Kurtenbach requested that if anyone has examples of strategies to please forward them to her and she will share them with WetSAG.

2. Direction on technical recommendations for studies.
*The members voted no on adding this to the task list.

Dick Miller expressed concerns about question 7, and content of discussion, in the Guidance for Developing a Findings Report (Appendix of the Use of Non-CMER Science in the Forest Practices Adaptive Management document.) He will send them to Nancy Sturhan to incorporate into section 7 of the PSM.

3. Public Disclosure – need clearer guidance on how to respond.
Jim Hotvedt will work with DNR’s Project Managers and Public Discloser Office to put together a report and bring it to CMER for discussion. This will be added to the task list with Jim as PM.

CMER Science Conference

Discussion revolved around whether or not results from the current studies will be ready for the conference in March; and possibly postponing the conference until the fall.

Marc Hayes commented that the Westside Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies Study Report may not be ready by then, especially since some of the chapters most likely won’t be through Independent Scientific Review (ISPR) by then. Jim Hotvedt replied that CMER needs to decide when a report is sufficiently complete to go to the conference. Maybe they don’t necessarily need to have gone through ISPR to be ready for a presentation at the conference. Marc Hayes said that he would be more comfortable with postponing the conference until the fall because he felt that it was important for some of the highly technical chapters to go through ISPR before they were presented.

Chris Mendoza noted that Policy would need to be consulted to see if it is okay to postpone the conference until the fall.

Mark Hicks moved that CMER Science Conference be rescheduled for November with projects for the conference submitted by July. He will inform Policy of the change. Marc Hayes seconded the motion. **Motion passed.**

***Decisions:**

Coordinator’s Corner

- ◆ *Approval of July CMER Meeting Minutes – **Approved**
- ◆ Review of Remaining 2013 Meeting Dates
Patti Shramek reminded everyone that the November and December meetings will be held on the third Tuesday of the month because of the holidays.

Updates:

SAGE

- ◆ Eastside Type N Hydrology Study Update – Amy Kurtenbach reported that the first full draft of the report is still in the process of the SAGE review. An incomplete draft sent

out and SAGE provided comment on incomplete draft. A copy of the full report should be available in the next few weeks and the Contractor will be attending the November SAGE meeting. She also reported that CMER staff is in the process of analyzing the data.

TWIG

- ◆ ***TWIG Process – BAS and Alternatives*** – Jim Hotvedt reviewed the TWIG flow chart to show where the BAS and alternatives are at in the process.
- ◆ ***Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness*** – Greg Stewart reported that they are at step 4 in the process and plan to bring a document to CMER at the next meeting. He also gave a presentation on how they are using data from Eastside Forest Hydrology Study to develop the TWIG document.
- ◆ ***Roads Prescriptions/Scale Effectives Monitoring – IWT TWIG Selection***
Jim Hotvedt gave update on the Initial Writing Team. Julie Dieu and Doug Martin drafted a memo with a list of initial qualifications. Jim will send out an email by the end of the week requesting additional qualifications and submittal of names of people to participate. Potential IWT members need to have the qualifications listed in the memo. Doug and Julie will review the list of candidates with Jim and come to the October meeting with recommendations.

RSAG

- ◆ ***Westside Type N Buffer Effectiveness in Soft Rock Lithologies***
Howard Haemmerle reported that the project is schedule but they are still doing field work. Next steps in the project are data management and keeping up on water quality samples. Bill Ehinger said the project is going well. He reported that the EPA grant funds will be running out at the end of this fiscal year so CMER will have to discuss budget for the remainder of the project.
- ◆ ***Extensive Westside Type N & F Temp***
Howard Haemmerle reported that Bill Ehinger feels he can start addressing the comments in November. There is still uncertainty about whether or not the report will go through ISPR.
- ◆ ***Hardwood Conversion Study/Status update of first draft RSAG review document***
Howard Haemmerle reported that a preliminary draft was sent out to RSAG and the review period has ended. The comments have been placed into a matrix and a big component is substantive and revolves around technical content. The appendix to the report is case studies and they have not ever received CMER approval. RSAG will discuss at their next meeting if the case studies should be pre-approved or approved with the report.
- ◆ ***Solar/Shade Effectiveness (Cupp) – ISPR Update***
Amy Kurtenbach reported that ISPR comments are being addressed.

CMER

CMER Office of Financial Management (OFM) Deliverables

Jim Hotvedt remarked that AMP and CMER have deliverables that need to be reported to the OFM in order to get approval for budget requests from the Governor. He submitted six for the next biennium:

- Solar/Shade
- Buffer/Shade
- Tailed Frog
- Westside Type N Extensive
- Forest Hydrology
- Wetlands Synthesis

Others that could may be possible to complete:

- Hardwood Conversion
- Extensive Eastside Type N & F
- Type N Hard Rock

Report from Policy – September 5th Meeting

Mark Hicks gave a summary of the September Policy meeting:

- Policy doesn't want a single meeting for work plan and budget, and instead wants to get the work plan a month earlier than the budget in the future. Jim has been asked to provide quarterly progress status reports and twice yearly budget reports.
- Policy still has a facilitator and are getting mediator for the Type F Charter.
- Gave guidance about perianal and uppermost point of flow.
- Accepted non-CMER science report.

LWAG

◆ *Westside Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies Study SAG Request for Review of Chapters 5, 6, 8 and 9*

Amy Kurtenbach presented SAG request for review of chapters 5, 6, 8 and 9. She encouraged members to review chapter, even if they hadn't signed up as a reviewer. She commented that chapters 5&6 are complementary and will be going through review at same time and it is the same with chapters 8&9. October 31, 2013 was set as the deadline to submit review comments.

Amy reminded reviewers to color code their comments as it is very helpful for the authors to know what comments are the most critical to look at first. Comments are to be sent to Aimee McIntyre and Amy Kurtenbach.

Amy McIntyre gave an update on Chapters 1-4. She has not had time to address the comments but has looked through them and there are very few. Most of the comments

relate to terminology, etc. Most of the history of the study is in the first four chapters. Even though the comments haven't been addressed she feels that the chapters can still be referred to as intro to the four chapters up for review now.

Bill Ehinger gave an overview of chapters 8 &9.

Dave Schuett-Hames gave an overview of chapter 5.

◆ **Buffer Integrity/Shade Effectiveness**

Amy Kurtenbach reported that Julie Tyson is working on addressing the ISPR comments.

WetSAG

◆ **Forested Wetlands Synthesis**

Amy Kurtenbach reported that WetSAG is completing the review of the report. She is hoping to have Paul Adamus give a presentation at the November meeting.

◆ **Wetlands Research & Monitoring Strategy**

Amy Kurtenbach reported that she is working on an amendment to include the Wetlands Strategy in Adamus' contract.

Dick Miller asked Jim Hotvedt about the status of getting wetland scientist staff. Jim replied that the solicitation will go out in October.

CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- ◆ Amy Kurtenbach will check with Linda Storm to see if December or January works with her to present at CMER.
- ◆ Patti Shramek will add the 2014 meeting dates to the bottom of the October agenda.
- ◆ Patti Shramek will remove the formatting on the date in the Coordinated CMER Review for the Type N Study – Hard Rock Project document to reflect date the document was approved by CMER.
- ◆ Jim Hotvedt will send out the request for names and qualifications for the Roads TWIG by end of week.
- ◆ CMER Members will provide comments on the TWIG document within seven days
- ◆ The deadline for comments on chapters 5, 6, 8, and 9 of the Westside Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies Study is October 31st. Comments are to be sent to Aimee McIntyre and Amy Kurtenbach.