

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)**  
**June 26, 2018**  
**DNR/DOC Industrial Park, Tumwater WA**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
chesney, charles (ph)	Private Citizen
Davis, Emily	Northwest Indian Fish Commission – CMER Staff
Ehinger, Bill	Department of Ecology
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association – CMER Co-Chair
Hough-Snee, Nate	Meadow Run Environmental
Johnson, Angela	Department of Natural Resources
Kiffney, Peter	National Oceanic Atmospheric Agency
§Knoth, Jenny (ph)	Green Crow - CMER Co-Chair
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
McIntyre, Aimee	Department of Fish & Wildlife
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Roorbach, Ash (ph)	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Stephens, Robert (GoTo)	Spokane Tribe of Indians
Stewart, Greg	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
Swanson, Scott (ph)	Washington State Association of Counties
Turner, Ted	Weyerhaeuser
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser

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

\*Indicates Decision

**Science Session:**

- ◆ **Climate change and forest fires in the Pacific Northwest: Consequences for streams and riparian habitats** Peter Kiffney, National Oceanic Atmospheric Agency, gave a presentation and answered questions. Patti Shramek will send out a PDF of his presentation.

## **Decisions:**

### **CMER**

#### ◆ **\*April 2018 Meeting Minutes**

Chris Mendoza moved to approve the minutes as edited, Mark Hicks seconded –  
**Approved**

### **FWEP TWIG**

#### ◆ **\*Forested Wetlands Effectives Project Chronosequence Study Plan – approval to go to ISPR**

Angela Johnson reported that Mark Hicks had some comments that will need some more time to address, so the TWIG is not asking for approval at this meeting. Nate Hough-Snee reviewed the reasons for some of the changes in the Study Design, and explained why they are only asking for approval of the Chronosequence. Discussion was around the critical questions and why they were changed from the original draft. The findings from the Chronosequence will inform the development of the BACI design, where the original questions from the CMER work plan will be addressed.

**Next steps:** A table laying out the comparisons of the questions will be distributed and the study design will be sent out for approval in July.

### **LWAG**

#### ◆ **\*Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study on Hard Rock Substrates – approval of chapters 5, 6, 7, and 15 Findings Reports**

Aimee McIntyre pointed out that Policy asked for these additional findings reports, in addition of the overall findings report, and explained how they addressed the questions and comments. She indicated that they are hoping to get CMER approval at this meeting for all the documents to go to Policy. Howard Haemmerle added that the full report and overall findings report were already approved by CMER. He is hoping there will not be a long conversation since these contain all the information in the overall findings report. Mendoza agreed, and hopes this does not happen in the future. He remarked that instead of letting Policy members ask questions of the authors when they were presented at the meeting, to save time the Co-Chair asked them to write them on post-it notes to give to the authors. This created a lot of work. Hans Berge replied that he agreed with Mendoza, but there was a full agenda for that meeting and there was not a lot of time to answer questions. Doug Martin remarked that he has issues that CMER did not get to review and provide comments on the memo to Policy. This does not follow process and why was this done? McIntyre replied that the authors agree that it was extra work and the questions did not fit into the findings report, which is why they addressed them in the memo format. Harry Bell remarked that the PI's asked for more clarification from Policy. Berge

remarked that these memos are the equivalent of the conversation CMER had with Peter Kiffney earlier; the authors just were not able to receive questions and answer questions and ask for clarification in real time. Bell suggested that a disclaimer be added to the memo that it did not go through the standard CMER process and CMER was not allowed to review and comment. Mendoza replied that this is a go between with the PI's and Policy and CMER does not need to weigh in. He added that CMER's responsibility is to approve the findings reports, not the memo. Scott Swanson remarked that he appreciated the fact that they were trying to answer the questions as best they could and did not expect it to be approved by CMER.

Haemmerle requested approval of the findings reports for Chapters 5, 6, 7, and 15.

Hicks moved to approve reports, Mendoza seconded - **Approved**

The memos are not a part of approval.

◆ **\*Van Dyke's Salamander Literature Review** – *approval*

Haemmerle asked for approval to send the literature review to Policy. The findings report, if requested, will come at a later date. Doug Hooks asked if CMER would like a findings report. Murray remarked that since there is nothing in the budget for this project at this time a findings report is a good idea if it gets picked up in the future. Everyone else agreed.

Bell moved to approve the lit review and initiate the findings report, Hicks seconded - **Approved**

◆ **Buffer Integrity-Shade Effectiveness Study**

Berge reported that the report has gone back to ISPR.

**RSAG**

◆ **\*Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Experimental Research Study – Draft Scoping Document** – *approval to send to Policy*

Murray reported that Hicks has responded to the comments and all commenters were satisfied with the response. RSAG would like approval to send Policy.

McIntyre (on Hayes' behalf) moved to approve to send to Policy, Bell seconded - **Approved**

Berge asked if there would be a cover memo that goes with this since there is no findings report for this. Haemmerle remarked that the CMER to Policy request document will be sent with it. Hicks will fill out the request form to be given to Policy with the document.

◆ **\*BCIF** - *approval to go to ISPR*

Mendoza remarked that he spoke with Dave Schuett-Hames and agreed that his red remarks could be addressed in the findings report. Murray mentioned that doing a synthesis between Hard Rock, Soft Rock, and BICF would be good if Policy asked for it. Hicks remarked that Dave will clarify the findings from the study and other studies.

Hicks moved to send the study to ISPR, Martin seconded - **Approved**

◆ **\*Westside Type F Implementation Team Members** - *approval of acceptance of recommendations*

Murray reported that RSAG discussed and approved who the team members should be. The team members are committed to the time required for participation on the project. Mendoza remarked that he was not able to participate on the team because of the time commitment requirement. He went on to say that it's important that team members need to commit to the time required for the project. Hicks remarked that some members are just technical advisors and not actually implementing the project. The team member's commitment level will be identified in the Project Charter and Project Management Plan.

Hooks asked for motion. Bell moved to accept the team member recommendations, McIntyre seconded - **Approved**

**Discussion:**

◆ **Scheduling a field trip to coincide with the September CMER meeting in Spokane**

Hicks recommended possible field trip sites; ENREP, fire salvage, and RMZs that have had fire go through them. Rob Stephens suggested sites where there was salvage activities after the fires inside the RMZ. Hooks remarked that he is happy to coordinate with landowners on eastside to locate field trip sites. Berge suggested Type N/F sites and assigning a couple people to take the lead. Stephens replied that he would be happy to help and will talk to Todd Baldwin about helping him.

**Next Steps:** Stephens will do research and report back to CMER at the July meeting with options for CMER to pick from.

◆ **19-21 Biennium CMER Work Plan**

Hooks commented that it's time to start planning on working on updates to the Work Plan. He thinks it will be an easy lift since summary sheets were developed for the Board. Heather Gibbs will work with the SAGs to get this on their schedules.

**Updates:**

◆ **Report for the Board – May 9, 2018 meeting**

Hooks gave an update on the Board meeting and decisions. The main focus of the meeting was water typing. Berge gave an update on the progress of the Potential Habitat Break project. Hooks reported that the AMP Improvements facilitation is wrapping up and the summary of the interviews and recommendations will be shared with the sub-committee on July 6, 2018.

Forest Practices Board meeting minutes are located on the Department of Natural Resources web page at

<https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board>.

◆ **Report from Policy – May 3 and June 7, 2018 meetings**

Berge reported that last two meetings were primarily focused on budget.

Timber Fish & Wildlife Policy meeting minutes are located on the Department of Natural Resources web page at <http://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board/tfw-policy-committee>.

◆ **SAG and TWIG Updates – answer questions on written updates**

Hooks gave a brief review of the written updates that were part of the meeting mailing.

**Public Comment Period**

charles chesney had suggestions for sites for the September field trip.

**Recap of Assignments/Decisions**

- ◆ Patti Shramek will send out the PowerPoint presentation given by Peter Kiffney.
- ◆ April 2018 CMER meeting minutes approved.
- ◆ Forested Wetlands Effectives Project Chronosequence Study Plan - A table laying out the comparisons of the questions will be sent out and the study design will be on the July agenda for approval.
- ◆ Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study on Hard Rock Substrates –*chapters 5, 6, 7, and 15 Findings Reports approved to go to Policy.*
- ◆ Van Dyke's Salamander Literature Review approved to go to Policy. A findings report will be written to go along with it.

- ◆ Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Experimental Research Study – Draft Scoping Document approved to go to Policy. Mark Hicks will draft the CMER to Policy request document to go with it.
- ◆ BCIF approved to go to ISPR.
- ◆ RSAG Westside Type F Implementation team member’s recommendation approved.
- ◆ Rob Stephens will do some research for sites for the field trip for the September meeting in Spokane and bring the options to CMER for a decision at the July meeting.
- ◆ Heather Gibbs will work with the SAGs to get the review and editing of the CMER Work Plan on their schedules.

**Adjourn at 1:55.**