# **Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee** (CMER)

# September 28, 2010 DNR/DOC Compound - Tumwater Meeting Notes

**Attendees Representing** 

Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration -
Fisheries
Washington Forestry Protection Association
Department of Ecology
Dept. of Natural Resources /CMER Coordinator
Dept. of Natural Resources
/Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, CMER Co-Chair
Dept. of Natural Resources /Project Manager
Weyerhaeuser
Environmental Protection Agency
Dept. of Natural Resources /Scientist
Washington Forestry Protection Association
Upper Columbia United Tribes
Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Dept. of Natural Resources /Project Manager
Washington Family Forestry Association
Washington Family Forestry Association
Quinault Tribe
CMER Staff, North West Indian Fisheries Commission
CMER Staff, North West Indian Fisheries Commission
CMER Staff, North West Indian Fisheries Commission
North West Indian Fisheries Commission

<sup>\*</sup> Indicates official CMER members and alternates; ph indicates attended via phone & v indicates attended by video conferencing.

### **Science Session**

Dr. Jeremy Groom from Oregon State University presented on Rip Stream: Quantifying Stream Temperature Response to Oregon Timber Harvest Practices.

### **Business Session**

## Future CMER Meetings

Dawn Hitchens reviewed the dates for the next CMER meetings. November and December CMER meetings will be held earlier in the respective months. The location for the November meeting will be at the NRB in room 175 A&B.

#### > CMER Science Conference

Dawn Hitchens reviewed the timeline for tasks associated with preparing for the CMER Science Conference. The date for the annual science conference is Wednesday, March 30, 2011. The OB-2 Auditorium has been reserved. SAGs are encouraged to start identifying topics for CMER's consideration and approval at the October CMER meeting.

### Points of Discussion:

The issue of CMER and non-CMER science presentations was raised. Both CMER co-chairs stated that the focus of the annual science conference is to showcase CMER funded studies. If there are slots available CMER may want to add non-CMER funded projects. The primary focus is CMER studies. In past conferences, all presentations have been related to the Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program.

Doug Martin announced that the American Forestry Society will host a conference and that one day will be devoted to Forest and Fish related studies. He suggested that CMER could present several studies at the forum and would need to send an email to Bob Danehy this week to get included. CMER has a lot to offer.

### ➤ Announcement pertaining to CMER meetings

Terry Jackson announced that CMER meetings will end with a recap of assignments to help track work to be accomplished by specific members before the next CMER meetings. CMER has done this in the past, but has been inconsistent in documenting and maintaining a task list.

# ➤ CMER WORKPLAN – Discussion

Terry Jackson stated that SAGs need to start making revisions and improvements to their components of the Work Plan, especially pertaining to the (1) Links to Adaptive Management, (2) Program Strategies, and (3) Project updates. The tables for each rule group strategy and program strategy were reviewed and updated last year. These tables show the list of programs that answer the critical questions for each rule group, and the list of projects that answer the critical questions for each program. SAGs need to review the program strategies and make improvements where they can demonstrate how the projects work together to answer the critical questions for that program. As identified on the CMER task list, CMER will devote its February meeting to the annual work plan. SAGs need to make sure there is a co-chair or project manager attending the February CMER meeting to highlight the SAG's significant revisions to the Work Plan.

## ➤ CMER Lessons Learned - Update

Terry Jackson stated that comments have been received from one of the project managers and these have been incorporated into the lessons learned document that Nancy Sturhan drafted. This updated version is open for further comments and suggestions. The main purpose of this document is to identify where problems have occurred in the past pertaining to projects so that we can learn from those experiences and make improvements in the future.

# > RSAG - Effectiveness of the Current TFW Shade Methodology for Measuring Attenuation of Solar Radiation to the Stream (a.k.a. Solar Study Report) - CMER Approved sending the Solar Study Report to ISPR

Amy Kurtenbach (Project Manager for the study) stated that Greg Stewart is helping the consultant with the statistical analysis section. The three CMER reviewers for the Draft Report were Leslie Lingley, Todd Baldwin and Steve McConnell. Their comments have been addressed and sent to the report authors.

Chris Mendoza asked for clarification about the ISPR step. He thought the use of ISPR would be a combined review of both the MB&G and the Terrapin reports.

Kurtenbach and Jackson replied that this is the final report for MB&G and is being sent to ISPR separately. The relevant data from the Shade and Solar report will be incorporated into the

Shade/Temperature component of the study after ISPR. The final combined report will then be sent to ISPR. RSAG is asking for CMER approval of the CMER comments incorporated into the MB&G report and to send this to ISPR.

Chris Mendoza motioned to approve this as a draft CMER report and to send it to ISPR. Terry Jackson seconded the motion and CMER members approved.

# > SAGE - Type N Characterization project: Forest Hydrology - *Update*

Project Manager Kurtenbach reported that at the last SAGE meeting, SAGE discussed the findings from the 2010 field season. SAGE members have been validating field sites this past summer/fall and the success rate has been low so far. SAGE will produce a formal memo for CMER detailing the results of their site screening process and identify challenges and potential solutions. SAGE will give another update at the next CMER meeting (October).

### Points of Discussion:

Chris Mendoza stated that SAGE will need to provide more details. Specifically, what SAGE plans to do with the remaining sites yet to be field validated? SAGE was hoping to validate 150 sites, but currently has only 50 sites. What are the implications of reducing the sample size on the current study design and meeting Clean Water Act assurances milestones? SAGE will be prepared to answer such questions at the next CMER meeting.

Todd Baldwin (SAGE Co-chair) stated that the study will not end up with as many validated sites as originally predicted. SAGE initially screened the first 150 sites and then screened the remaining 250 sites. SAGE did not predict that the hydro layer would be that far off for a sub basin study. Chris Mendoza stated that CMER informed SAGE during their study development phase that the DNR hydro-layer had already been tested by ISAG (In-stream Scientific Advisory Group) which found it to be highly inaccurate in eastern WA. The fact remains that we need something to more accurately predict the location of Type N sub basins in eastern WA.

### > SRSAG - Soft Rock Scoping Document - CMER Approved the Scoping Document

Chris Mendoza (SRSAG Co-Chair) stated that CMER was presented with the first version of the scoping document last November. This was not approved by CMER. SRSAG has revised the document based on comments received by CMER and requests CMER approval of this version of the scoping document.

### Points of Discussion:

Mark Hicks reported that DOE received the EPA grant for \$670,000. This will cover the project work for up to four years (pre-harvest data collection). CMER will need to be prepared to fund the remainder of the study. EPA will provide information on deliverables thru WEBNAR. SRSAG will need to submit a QA/QC plan to EPA by next March. CMER needs to be efficient with their process timelines on this study in order to meet EPA Grant timelines. This study is a high priority for Clean Water Act assurances.

Bill Ehinger reported that DOE & DNR need to have a meeting to look at the EPA requirements and see how to mesh it with CMER requirements.

Terry Jackson requested CMER approval of the soft rock scoping document. There were no objections and CMER members approved.

➤ UPSAG - Road Sub Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring - CMER Approved the ISPR-Reviewed Final Report Julie Dieu (UPSAG Co-Chair) stated that there has been an astonishing short turn around with the contractor (Watershed Professionals) in responding to the ISPR comments and making the proposed changes to the document. UPSAG requests CMER approval for the final report.

Chris Mendoza stated that it was helpful when UPSAG and the contractor gave a presentation to CMER on how they incorporated CMER comments into the report. This may be a model for CMER to follow with other projects.

CMER members reached consensus and approved the Road Sub Basin-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring final report.

### CMER Report Standards & Format Discussion:

It was brought up that CMER final reports have a different format and are possibly not following the CMER standard pertaining to the title page, disclaimer and proper reference citation. Jim Hotvedt, AMPA, will look into this further and report back to CMER.

AJ Kroll asked if there is an authorship standard in CMER.

Chris Mendoza stated that CMER has not documented a standard for authorship, but that identifying report authors has never been a problem in past reports. CMER will discuss authorship at the next meeting.

Dick Miller & AJ Kroll will pull together information from other professional journals and bring back information to the next CMER meeting.

> Testing the Accuracy & Bias of Unstable Landform Identification - *Update* Chris Mendoza stated that there is an issue at UPSAG with the interpretation of the critical question for this study, and that Policy guidance is needed before finalizing the study design.

UPSAG members Julie Dieu, Greg Stewart and Curt Veldhuisen will have a PowerPoint presentation completed and a memo outlining and detailing the interpretation issue for Policy by this Thursday and will present to Policy at their October meeting.

Jim Hotvedt stated that this is important to clarify now since a decision package for additional funding to the legislature may be submitted. CMER needs to have the Accuracy & Bias study design completed so CMER has something to show them.

### ➤ Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Monitoring - *Update*

Julie Dieu (UPSAG Co-Chair) reported that UPSAG is revising the report. This revised draft report will be shared with CMER reviewers after the next CMER meeting. At that time UPSAG can talk about the changes, edits and responses to the comments.

Julie Dieu reiterated that, according to the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual, UPSAG is not required to complete a comment matrix for CMER reviewers. However, because of the number of CMER comments, UPSAG will be using a modified approach to the matrix; they will develop a memo highlighting all of the substantial changes made to the report and, will be grouping similar CMER comments together rather than addressing them individually.

### ➤ Wetlands Mitigation Study - *Update*

Steve Todd (WETSAG Co-Chair) reported that WETSAG received Policy approval on the methods charter at the September 2 Policy meeting. There were a few revisions recommended

by Policy and WETSAG is currently making them. The RFQQ to hire a wetlands specialist is currently going through OFM. There will be a field trip tomorrow with Tom Hruby and 15 others. The primary purpose of this field trip is to get Tom Hruby's input on field methods, roads and wetland functions. WETSAG will share the results of this field trip at the next CMER meeting.

### ➤ Clean Water Act Assurances – *Update*

Mark Hicks reported that we are doing our best to meet the timelines established in Ecology's CWA assurances memo. The Soft Rock study and Accuracy & Bias study are the two highest CWA priorities for CMER. CMER talked about the flagging process for meeting the CWA milestones last month.

# Recap CMER /SAG Assignments:

SAG co-chairs are responsible for delivering assignments to their SAG from CMER meetings.

SAGs need to come up with their list of science topics for the CMER Science Conference; SAG co-chairs need to be prepared to have these topics ready for CMER approval at the October CMER meeting.

SAGs need to start updating their components of the CMER work plan (Program strategies, Links to Adaptive Management, and Project Status).

CMER information management systems – SAGs need to compile the documents specified in the Table of Contents for the projects that they manage (on the list of new projects), and send those documents to Nancy Sturhan.

SAGE will provide an update on their last field season for site validation and the implications for the model regarding the Forest Hydrology project.

RSAG needs to provide the questions to submit to ISPR for the Shade and Solar Study.

- Policy *Update* September 2, 2010 Meeting:
  - Policy discussed their work list & work load priorities.
  - Policy had an update on Watershed Analysis.
  - Policy had the AG provide a public records training and stressed the difference about what notes you keep and how they can become part of the public record. It may be good to have a similar presentation for CMER.
  - Policy approved the Wetlands Charter.
  - SAGE memo on site selection pertaining to Small Forest Landowners was shared with Policy.
- > CMER Report to Policy Items to be taken to Policy meeting on October 7, 2010:
  - Soft Rock scoping document for approval.
  - UPSAG presentation on interpretation of the critical questions related to Accuracy & Bias.
  - SAGE Co-chair will be discussed.