

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
July 23, 2013, 2013
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-Chair
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Hotvedt, Jim	Department of Natural Resources, AMPA
*Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish and Wildlife
*Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
*Lingley, Leslie	Department of Natural Resources
Kurtenbach, Amy	Department of Natural Resources
*Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
Danehy, Bob	National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI)
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
Mostovetsy, Anna (ph)	Skagit River System Cooperative
*McCrea, Chad (GoTo)	Spokane Tribe of Indians
Chesney, Charles	Department of Natural Resources

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

Agenda – No changes were made to the agenda.

CMER Monthly Science Session:

- ◆ Forest Road Best Management Practices (BMPs) and Water Quality – Bob Danehy with the National Council for Air and Stream Improvement (NCASI), Corvallis, OR gave a PowerPoint presentation on project development suggestions.

Discussion: Questions were asked about the various models presented and how they would work for the CMER study.

Mark Hicks commented that CMER would like to partner with NCASI but would need assurances of a dedicated scientist who can take time to go through all of CMER's process steps. Bob Danehy replied that he can't imagine not partnering on road issues and he could take the suggestion to NCASI's task group to see what they think. Doug Martin added that one way NACSI can partner is to contribute someone to a TWIG. Chris Mendoza added that if CMER is going to partner with someone it should be done with someone who shares CMER's goals and research and monitoring objectives outlined in our Work Plan, and what's required by the Washington FP HCP. He would like to see a

draft of the related ongoing research that's been done by NCASI, whether it has been peer reviewed or not.

Doug Martin inquired about the time frame for the project. Jim Hotvedt replied that it was approved for this year by the Board and is a high priority. Amy Kurtenbach has been assigned as the Project Manager. Jim went on to say that a TWIG would be good but some up front work needs to be accomplished first. Chris Mendoza agreed that sorting out how NCASI work relates to CMER's goals will make the TWIG process easier.

Nancy Sturhan asked if a sub-group should be formed to develop a strategy for the TWIG. Amy Kurtenbach replied that she is ready to move forward on this project and would like CMER's blessing to proceed. The CMER committee gave her the okay to move forward.

Doug Martin said he will keep CMER informed of the NACSI task group's discussions pertaining to partnering with CMER on this project. Jim Hotvedt mentioned that there is money in budget to help pay for participation.

Chris Mendoza asked Bob Danehy if he could send copies of the presentation from the Watershed Research Cooperative Paired Watershed Conference that was held in Oregon in April. Bob said would send the link.

- ◆ ***Reitter et al paper** – *discussion about whether or not to have Maryanne Reiter present at a future science session*

Discussion: Should CMER have Maryanne Reiter present at a future science session?

Mark Hicks commented that he thinks the paper is well written and doesn't see the need to take up Maryanne's time. He expressed concern about taking up someone's time just to have a presentation slot filled. He added that if it connected with something going on in CMER at the time it would be different. Chris Mendoza added that the Type N Effectiveness Hard Rock Study chapters are coming up for review and presentations as well, and that should take priority at CMER monthly science session .

Mark Hicks moved that CMER doesn't have Maryanne Reiter present at this time. Chris Mendoza seconded the motion. **Approved**

- ◆ **Possible Future Science Sessions:**

Jim Hotvedt reported that Linda Storm from EPA is interested in coming sometime after October and that George McFadden from BLM is willing to give a presentation on remote sensing for inventory. Jim will work with them to set up what meeting would work best for them to present. Chris Mendoza added that Policy has recently given CMER/ RSAG direction to start the extensive monitoring alternatives discussion and that George McFadden's remote sensing presentation would dovetail well with this.

Business Session: (*Decisions)

***Coordinator's Corner**

- ◆ Approval of May and June Meeting Notes - **May approved and June approved with slight changes to SAGE co-chair section.**

CMER

- ◆ ***Use of non-CMER science document – Approved**

Discussion: Jim Hotvedt reported that he made the suggested changes from Dick Miller. Jim told Dick that the concerns he has about what should be included in the technical recommendations (page 9) will be addressed later in the CMER PSM. Dick feels that Policy should weigh in on how far technical recommendations should go.

Curt Veldehuisen suggested adding sub-committee member names and asked for input. Chris Mendoza agreed that since the initial request from Policy was to have CMER complete this assignment with help from the AMPA, and since several folks had worked on different versions, that all CMER sub-committee members and the AMPA should be listed as authors.

Jim Hotvedt recommended approval of the document with edits. There was no opposition, the recommendation was approved.

- ◆ Water Typing – rules vs. location of treatment site discussion (Lingley request)
Leslie Lingley expressed concern that 33% of the of the sites evaluated in a couple of the reports that she sent out to Jim Hotvedt, Mark Hicks and Todd Baldwin were in non- type waters. She questioned why Type N streams would be included in a Type F study or vice versa.

Discussion:

Mark Hicks commented that the sites were field verified and were chosen for what the studies were looking for. There should be a physiological reason for rejecting a site, not just if it has fish or not. It has been hard finding enough sites for some of the studies and CMER has had to go to the Board for approval to use certain sites. Leslie commented that she didn't think the Board should have approved it and that if there weren't enough sites than maybe the study shouldn't have been done.

Jim Hotvedt stated that he feels this concern is mixing apples with oranges; the needs of research and finding study sites. Mark Hayes explained that the criteria had to be relaxed in some cases to get enough sites and that it was addressed in the study write-up. Chris Mendoza added that it's often difficult for CMER to find enough sample sites because landowners are not required to cooperate so many don't allow CMER access to their lands. This substantially reduces CMER's sampling site selection pool, which is why such exceptions must be made.

Jim said that site selection needs to be on a case by case basis in relation to the goal of the study and needs to be addressed at the beginning of the study. Mark Mobbs agreed that it

needs to be on a site specific basis. If the study is looking at a physical process, and not specifically if the stream is fish bearing or not, then type doesn't matter.

***RSAG –**

- ◆ Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring –Temperature – Westside – *decision on whether to recommend to Policy omission of ISPR review* – **Non Approval**

Discussion:

Chris Mendoza commented that the three documents are only “status” with no “trends” and that a previous decision was made not to have all of them go through ISPR review since the first one (Type F Eastside) has already been peer reviewed and they all use the same methods, analysis, and sampling scheme.

Doug Martin stated that he had no problem skipping ISPR and that he felt the review of first report was very thorough and Westside report would most likely get the same comments. He added that if the writers are rigorous in following the ISPR comments from first document and incorporating them into other three then ISPR review isn't needed. Other members expressed concern about approving omitting ISPR review since Dick Miller, who sent in written opposition, wasn't present at the meeting.

Decision – Non-approval, will try to work this out through the RSAG process and re-visit again when that is completed.

Updates:

Report from Policy – July 11th Meeting

- ◆ Bill Ehinger delivered Eastside Type F Extensive Temperature Monitoring to Policy. Policy is interested in alternative methods. Policy would like CMER, through RSAG, to start looking at alternative methods on the Trends portion of the study and give a presentation at their October or November meeting.
- ◆ Policy is working on a Mass Wasting Charter.
- ◆ Board Manual Adaptive Management Section 22 has been approved, CMER can now use stage 2 in the dispute resolution process.

AMPA – Update on CMER project manager assignments

Jim Hotvedt went over the project manager assignments and will send the table out to the committee members.

Project Management Assignments:

CMER – PSM Chapter 7 – *update on comments on outline*

Nancy Sturhan requested to put this on agenda for the next meeting. She will send out a tickler to remind people to send in their comments.

LWAG/RSAG - Westside Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment in Hard Rock Lithologies Study -

- ◆ Status of next chapters for review

Amy Kurtenbach reported that chapter 5 is ready for review but six isn't at this point. She is uncomfortable separating them but is willing to send five onto reviewers if they are ready, but won't make a formal SAG request until both chapters are complete. Six should be ready next month. The reviewers requested that she send out chapter five. Amy praised Dave Schuett-Hames, Marc Hayes and Aimee McIntyre for working hard to make the deadlines.

Action: Amy will send chapter 5 out for review.

- ◆ Request for volunteers for SAG/CMER reviewers for chapters 5-17

Amy Kurtenbach made another request for reviewers for chapters 5-17.

LWAG –

- ◆ Buffer Integrity - Shade Effectiveness –

Amy Kurtenbach reported that Julie Tyson will start working on ISPR comments soon. Jim McCracken has started working on response to ISPR reviewer comments.

- ◆ RMZ Re-Sample –

Amy Kurtenbach reported that a draft document provided to LWAG at their last meeting. It still needs a little work but she is optimistic that there will be a complete document ready for LWAG review in the next couple of months.

RSAG –

- ◆ Extensive Westside Type N & F Temp –

Howard Haemmerle reported that the combined report is out for review. The established comment period was through July 19th and comments were received from three reviewers. It is unlikely that Bill Ehinger will have time to address the comments until November 2013.

- ◆ Hardwood Conversion Study/Status update of first draft RSAG review document –

Howard Haemmerle reported that the draft report was sent to RSAG and forwarded to RSAG members from Joe Murray. Ash Roorbach and Dick Miller are the co-authors are in dispute about making specific rule recommendations. Joe relayed that this is a first draft and they are just soliciting preliminary comments. The due date for comments is September 1st. Mark Mobbs said that CMER has been against putting rule change recommendations in documents so it will be interesting to see where it goes. Jim Hotvedt commented that this is just an informal review for authors to get input from CMER and RSAG about how to proceed.

SAGE –

- ◆ Eastside Type N Hydrology –

Amy Kurtenbach reported that the authors are working on putting together the first draft of report and that it should be turned in by the end of the month.

- ◆ EWRAP –

Amy Kurtenbach reported that CMER staff proposed breaking up the report into sections. The first two sections have been drafted and were sent out in May for comment. August 1st is the deadline for providing comments. Ash is working on section 3 but hasn't started on section 4. The tentative timeline set in March had sections completed by June.

WetSAG

- ◆ Forested Wetlands Synthesis –
Amy Kurtenbach reported that WetSAG met with the Paul Adamus July 10th & 11th and went out in the field. Paul had only a couple of comments to address and should be able to get them done pretty quickly. WETSAG approved the draft for CMER review and it is anticipated for the end of September.

The next step is to amend contract to include Paul in the ISPR process. The original contract included a component about developing a hypothesis about a strategy document. Paul will be the lead writer on the strategy. The amendment should be completed by end of August.

- ◆ Wetlands Strategy –
Amy Kurtenbach reported that Paul Adamus will be the lead writer on the strategy and that his contract will be amended to include this.

Nancy Sturhan asked about the CMER Wetlands staff position. Jim Hotvedt replied that the position description sat on his desk for a while. He did get it drafted and sent it to WETSAG last month for their review and comment. It should come to CMER at the next meeting for their review and input.

TWIG

- ◆ Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness –
Amy Kurtenbach reported that the TWIG is meeting on July 30th and they are doing well. She added that Richard Woodsmith has provided draft of scoping document. She said that progress will be slowed down a little because of the field season and vacations.
- ◆ Roads Prescriptions/Scale Effectives Monitoring – Started today
- ◆ Westside Type F Riparian Effectiveness Monitoring –
Chris Mendoza reported that schedules are keeping work from being done on this. Initial writing phase hasn't been started and nothing is going to happen until the fall. He said that since the Type F strategy in the CMER work plan was extensively revised by he and others in RSAG, once the TWIG is selected it this well help expedite their process by not having to complete this step.

CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- ◆ Jim Hotvedt will speak with George McFadden about doing a presentation sometime in early fall.
- ◆ Jim Hotvedt will send the project manager assignments table to committee.
- ◆ Amy Kurtenbach will send chapter 5 of the Hard Rock study out to reviewers.
- ◆ Chris Mendoza will deliver request from Policy to submit alternatives for Eastside Type F Extensive Temperature Monitoring to RSAG.

- ◆ Patti Shramek will send out Bob Danehy's PowerPoint presentation to the CMER listserv.