

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
July 27, 2010
DNR/DOC Compound - Tumwater**

Meeting Notes

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept of Natural Resources /CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept of Natural Resources /Adaptive Management Program Administrator
*Jackson, Terry	Washington Dept of Fish & Wildlife, CMER Co-Chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept of Natural Resources /Project Manager
*Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept of Natural Resources /Scientist
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
*McConnell, Steve (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Dept of Natural Resources /Project Manager
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, North West Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, North West Indian Fisheries Commission
*Sturhan, Nancy	North West Indian Fisheries Commission

* Indicates official CMER members and alternates; ph indicates attended via phone & v indicates attended by video conferencing.

Agenda

Co-chair Mendoza requested to add CMER Co-Chair positions as a topic for discussion.

Science Session

Jamie Glasgow (Wild Fish Conservancy) & Adam Mouton (NOAA –NW Fisheries Science Center & UW) presented on water typing and validating the DNR Hydrolayer with LiDAR.

Business Session

CMER Meeting Notes of April 27, 2010 were **approved** with edits suggested by Teresa Miskovic.

➤ **CMER Co-chair position**

CMER Co-chair Mendoza stated that if all stakeholders/ participants are expected to take a 20% cut in Forests and Fish Support Account (FFSA), the Conservation Caucus (CC) has made it clear that he will no longer serve as CMER co-chair for the next 2 years, but would continue to serve as an active CMER member and as SRSAG Co-chair. FFSA participants received the letter two weeks ago from the DNR. Mendoza further stated that the CC agreed to take the 20% reduction under the condition that other stakeholders agreed to do the same. Mendoza stated that

it was unclear at this point what the outcome would be, but wanted to give notice to CMER just in case.

AMPA Hotvedt clarified the context for the letter to FFSA participants. Since the principals have not filled in the gap of funding for the Adaptive Management Program, DNR is going into the 2011-2013 biennium looking for a strategy in funding. One step in the funding strategy is to look at voluntary reductions so that the cuts will not be as deep.

The need for rotating the CMER co-chair positions will be shared with Policy.

➤ Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) – Type N BCIF

Project Manager Teresa Miskovic reported that the Westside Type N BCIF final report is in the final stage of the RSAG review. RSAG proposes moving the document into the concurrent CMER review process while RSAG is in its final stages of review. CMER approved the concurrent review of Westside Type N BCIF draft final report.

CMER approved the request for CMER Reviewers:

The CMER reviewers are Chris Mendoza, Nancy Sturhan & AJ Kroll and they have received the final report. CMER Reviewer comments are due by August 11th.

➤ Upslope Processes Scientific Advisory Group (UPSAG) – Post Mortem - *Update*

Project Manager Amy Kurtenbach reported that UPSAG has received comments from eight reviewers. The comments are substantial. Greg Stewart is reviewing the comments and expects that it will take three months to incorporate the comments into the final report. Alice Shelly the on-call statistician is reviewing the statistical sections.

Points of Discussion:

Leslie Lingley asked if a decision has been made on the comment matrix.

Project Manager Kurtenbach stated that the Protocols and Standards Manual (PSM) does not identify that a comment matrix is required for CMER reviews, but is for ISPR. Project Manager Kurtenbach pointed out that because of the number of comments, developing a comment matrix would be a lot of work and takes a lot of time; UPSAG's primary focus should be to get the report finalized. UPSAG is considering putting the comments into main themes with a cover memo that goes out with the new draft report so that reviewers can see how their comments were addressed.

➤ Soft Rock Scientific Advisory Group (SRSAG) – *Update*

Co-chair Mendoza reported that SRSAG is working on the scoping document and will have it available at the next CMER meeting. If the SAG cannot reach consensus, a non-consensus report will be developed and moved up to the Policy level. SRSAG is primarily modifying the study design used for the Hard Rock Study, and expanding on the stream temperature component, and omitting the fish and amphibian components.

➤ Wetlands Scientific Advisory Group (WETSAG) – Wetlands Mitigation Study - *Revised Study Design Presentation*

Ash Roorbach reviewed the methods and design of the wetlands mitigation study.

Primary Questions:

How are roads affecting wetland function?

How are roads affecting areas & structures?
What kinds or types of wetlands?
What size wetlands?
What kind of road interactions?

Scoping design:

Characterization – Roads & Wetlands Interactions study (RWI)
Function/Effectiveness
Plan to use an HGM classification system.

WETSAG proposes to conduct the Characterization study first.

Study Design Options:

Paired treatment sites –there is too much variability between wetlands.
Before / After - Long time frame
Retrospective - There is no baseline data for comparison
The design that has been adopted is the Retrospective approach.

Points of Discussion:

Study design:

Ash Roorbach emphasized that this is not an effectiveness study; this is a characterization study: and the rating is based on the Department of Ecology's rating system. The approach is to conduct a pilot study in the DNR Olympic Region. The design suggests the use of LIDAR for site selection. The Policy action to date is to budget \$150 in FY11 & \$157 in FY12.

AMPA Hotvedt asked about the performance targets with hydrology and if there was a reason that it wasn't included?

Ash Roorbach replied that at this phase of the study, wetlands are being characterized. Functions, such as hydrology, are not being addressed at this phase.

Data collection, number of sites, analysis & ISPR:

Leslie Lingley stated that she recalled that at the May CMER meeting, the response from CMER was to develop methods, refine them and then go through ISPR. Once ISPR was completed then WETSAG would launch a pilot study. WETSAG needs to have the methods vetted by ISPR. Based on the ISPR feedback, the study may not need 60 sites to determine wetland function.

Wetlands Specialist:-

Ash Roorbach suggested that CMER hire a wetlands specialist to look at the design, the stratification, and all of the components.

Timeline:

Project Manager Miskovic stated that the estimated timeline for the characterization phase is to have the methods development worked out between September 2010 – October 2011 and another year for the pilot stage.

AMP Hotvedt stated that Policy thinks this will take two years. They will be concerned about cost and time.

Co-chair Jackson pointed that this is why CMER needs to bring this to Policy; need to show the timeline so they see when to expect results.

Action Step: Co-chair Mendoza suggested CMER give WETSAG provisional approval based on CMER revisions made to the approach and strategy and agreed upon timeline today.

CMER agreed to this provisional approval.

➤ *CMER – Task List & Science Topics - Review Updated Table*

Co-chair Jackson stated that CMER needed to start on the annual revisions to the Work Plan. It is best to start sooner than later on the assignments for the revisions. SAGs need start working on refining/revising the Program Strategies (how the projects work together to answer the Program Critical Questions. They also need to work on the Links to Adaptive Management and the project descriptions and status.

➤ *CMER Science Conference – Update*

CMER Coordinator Hitchens announced that the CMER science conference is scheduled for Wednesday, March 30, 2011. The DSHS - OB2 Auditorium has been reserved. The science conference guidelines and timeline will be updated and shared with CMER next month. Once CMER has approved the timelines, these will be reflected in the CMER task list.

➤ *Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Grants – Update*

AMPA Hotvedt announced that EPA has not made their announcement yet for awards. The EPA has delayed the announcement another month.

➤ *CMER Lessons Learned -Update*

Nancy Sturhan provided the first draft on lessons learned from past CMER projects. This is an opportunity for CMER to provide input on this draft. The intent is to use this as a way to learn from past experiences. Please send comments to Nancy Sturhan, CMER co-chairs and AMPA Hotvedt **by next CMER meeting – August 24th**. An updated version will be provided for CMER.

➤ *CMER Information Management System Project - Update*

Co-chair Jackson asked CMER to review the draft Table of Contents to be used for all projects in the CMER Information Management System and to review the list of CMER Projects to be entered into the system for FY 2011. CMER members need to send comments to Nancy Sturhan, NWIFC, nsturhan@nwifc.org **by August 10th**.

SAGs need to gather project materials to be entered into the system for the selected projects and send them to SSHIAP. This step needs to be completed prior to developing a contract so that the SSHIAP manager can provide an accurate proposal for 2011 work.

➤ *CWA Assurances - Update*

Mark Hicks reported that he will try to start sending out a quarterly report on Clean Water Act milestone work done to-date. CMER should see what was provided at the last FPB meeting in May as this will give an in-depth overview of the milestones. Some changes in the dates were made at the FPB meeting. The biggest concern is the long-term funding for the Adaptive Management Program; meeting CWA assurances is a high priority for Policy and the Board.

➤ *Policy Update – July 1, 2010 Meeting:*

RMAP: Policy gave provisional approval of the recommendation presented at Policy – to extend the RMAP 2016 deadline.

Dispute Resolution: The main issue is how to deal with non CMER generated science, the Weyerhaeuser Study request brought this to the forefront. Policy is in the formal process of Dispute Resolution. The formal process officially started July 1st and Policy has six months to reach a resolution.

Small Forest Landowners (SFLOs) gave a presentation on SFLO issues to Policy: WFFA is working with Policy to try to solve those issues.

CMER Co-chairs invited Policy members to the CMER science sessions.

TIC: Trying to clear up what the expectations are with this effort.

➤ CMER Report to Policy – *Items* to take to the Policy meeting on August 5, 2010:

- ❖ Wetlands Mitigation Study design – presentation
- ❖ Potential CMER Co-chair change

Meeting Adjourned.