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*Indicates Decision
Science Session:

Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project (FWEP)
Nate Hough-Snee gave a presentation of the FWEP Study Design and answered questions. Patti Shramek will send out the presentation to the CMER listserve.

♦ UPSAG Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy
Mike Maudlin gave a presentation on the Deep-Seated Landside Research Strategy and answered questions. Shramek will send out the presentation to the CMER listserve.

Decisions:

LWAG

♦ *Hard Rock Phase-2 Extensive Report Format – approval
Aimee McIntyre gave the background and explanation for the request and answered questions. She assured that the final report would be ready for review October 1, 2018. Sections of the report will be submitted to CMER leading up to that date.

Howard Haemmerle reminded committee members that CMER asked the PIs at the December 2017 meeting to come back to CMER this month with a recommended report format for approval.

Doug Martin asked if the report will address the effectiveness of the rule at the watershed scale. McIntyre responded that the study was not designed that way. She asked if Martin’s questions related to his feelings that the assessment did not go far enough. Dave Schuett-Hames commented that the performance targets in Schedule L-1 are not well defined. Martin replied that maybe there needs to be discussion in the report on what is known now that wasn’t known when the original study was designed. Chris Mendoza replied that there are some defined performance targets (i.e. water quality). He added that he feels that this report should be addendum to the original report, and if LWAG wants to do a standalone document, they need to go to Policy for approval. McIntyre remarked that she thinks there may be different ideas of what addendum means in this case. Her recall is that Policy was concerned that the original report would be held up while waiting for the extended data to be included, so LWAG suggested an addendum. Her concern is that the new data, which she feels is more important, would get lost in the large 17-chapter report. Hans Berge replied that he thinks there is a hybrid that would include everyone’s concerns and shared some of his suggestions/recommendations. Mark Hicks remarked that he agrees with Aimee, and that they shouldn’t spend extra time rewriting. He added that since methods changed, the Phase II report will need to go to ISPR. Berge said he could share his suggestions to the whole group right now, or just with the PIs. Bill Ehinger replied Berge should share his suggestions with PIs only at this point.
Berge agreed, as they are in the best position to know how/if his suggestions will work. Hayes agreed and asked for specifics. McIntyre replied that from her perspective what Berge is suggesting is not that much different from what she envisions. Mendoza replied that he feels that this is doable, but wants to make sure it is not so different from the original report that it can provide for an un-necessarily long review period. Hicks would like to approve the general concept of the format and let the PIs move on, instead of waiting another month for a new format. Berge replied that he does not see any harm in waiting another month, and he would like to see a complete report, and not chapters.

**Next Steps:** Berge will send his suggestions to the PIs and they will modify the proposal for approval next month. This delay will not delay the PIs work on the report.

**ISAG**

*Request to use funding allocated for eDNA literature synthesis for Phase 1 of an eDNA project* - request for review of re-allocation of funds into a specific proposed project

Mendoza reviewed the first part of the request; approval to reallocate the funds earmarked for a literature synthesis to evaluate the effectiveness of using eDNA as a tool in identifying the upper extent of fish in small headwater streams in Washington. Hicks remarked that he didn’t think that CMER has the authority to move budget from one project to another without Policy weighing in on it.

Debbie Kay moved to approve, Marc Hayes seconded, Hicks neutral and would like to make sure it goes to Policy, Doug Hooks confirmed that he would take it to Policy. – Approved

**Next steps:** Hooks will take to Policy at February meeting.

Jenny Knoth gave the background for the second request; CMER review of a proof of method proposal to evaluate the use of eDNA as a tool in identifying the upper extent of fish in the watersheds of Washington State.

**Next steps:** Shramek will send proposal out, Hicks, Dieu, and Baldwin reviewers. Comments due Friday, February 23 to Howard Haemmerle.

**SAGE**

*Request for review of Findings Report for the Fire Salvage Literature Review and Synthesis* – assign reviewers
Angela Johnson reviewed the request and asked for reviewers. Mendoza remarked that there is no need to assign reviewers for findings reports. Mendoza, Martin, Bell will review. Comments due February 16.

**Unstable Slopes Criteria TWIG**

*Approval of revisions to study designs for Compare/Contrast Landslide Hazard Zonation Mass Wasting Map Units with RIL and Object-based Landform Mapping with High-Resolution Topography, and request to send document to ISPR – approval*

Julie Dieu reported that the study design has been reviewed and is now ready for approval to send to ISPR. Mendoza remarked that one sentence was inconsistent. Dieu replied that comments would be addressed before sending to ISPR.

Knoth moved to send to ISPR, Hicks seconded – **Approved**

**Westside Type F Prescription Monitoring Pilot Project**

*Request for CMER approval of ISPR approved study design and review of Findings Report – approval of ISPR approved study design and request for review of findings report*

Hooks reviewed the request. Schuett-Hames remarked that the ISPR approved study design was sent to CMER, but when he looked at the revised LEAN process, he realized that they also were required to submit six questions. The TWIG is now working on those, along with the budget and recommendations for implementation, to come to CMER for approval in February. Mendoza confirmed the LEAN revisions, but he felt CMER could at least approve the study design. Berge suggested the CMER Policy request would be a better avenue than the six questions. Hicks remarked that a presentation to Policy that hits all the points would work, too. Hooks suggested that he could bring recommendations to Policy at their next meeting. Berge suggested that a CMER sub-committee, or the PSM group, draft what the document should look like. Ash Roorbach suggested just going with the four questions for now, in the interest of getting the current document to Policy.

Martin moved to approve the study design, Bell seconded - **Approved**

**Next steps:** TWIG will work on the findings report and reduce to four questions, along with a budget, and will take to Policy at their March meeting. Hooks will extend the TWIG’s offer to give Policy a presentation.

**Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project TWIG**

*Request to review Study Design – assign reviewers*

Johnson requested reviewers for the study design. Dieu, Martin, Kay, Mendoza, and Hicks will review the study design.
Next Steps: Shramek will send out the study design on Friday, January 26. Comments due to Angela Johnson February 26, 2018.

Discussion:

♦ **2018 CMER Science Conference Presentations**—recommendations and prioritization
  Next steps: SAGs send name of presentation and person giving it for review at next meeting. Send to Shramek by February 15.

♦ **2019-2021 Biennium Master Project Schedule**
  Hooks reported that Policy will be prioritizing projects during their two day meeting February 28 and March 1. PIs and PMs should be available to answer questions. One page recommendations to be completed by February CMER mailing date.

♦ **Implementation of TWIG projects**
  The current revised Lean process was reviewed. Berge remarked that the Lean process ends once the TWIG has completed the study design. Hooks, Mendoza, Murray, and Roorbach remarked that they felt that it should follow project team process approved in Chapter 7 PSM. Discussion was about how to move a project from the TWIG process to implementation. Dieu remarked that participants in the TWIG assumed they were in it from start to finish. Berge and Haemmerle replied that they could move into the implementation phase. Kay remarked that if WetSAG had been involved they would have caught that the FWEP TWIG had used the State Lands HCP instead of the Forest Practices HCP. Roorbach reviewed guidance in Chapter 7 – SAGs and CMER work with AMPA, PMs and PIs to identify team make-up and qualifications required for team members. Berge said that another option is for the TWIG to stay together and change name to Project Team.

Next Steps: Hooks will schedule a conference call with the AMPA, RSAG, ISAG, Type F TWIG members, and PMs to work out recommendations.

Updates:

**Report from Policy**—January 14, 2018 meeting
Hans Berge reported on the January 14, 2018 Timber Fish & Wildlife Policy meetings. The meeting minutes can be found on the Department of Natural Resources web page at [http://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board/tfw-policy-committee](http://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board/tfw-policy-committee).
CMER

♦ 2018 Meeting Dates and Locations
Shramek reported that the March and July CMER meetings will be held at the Hal Holmes Center in Ellensburg and the May and September meetings will be held at the Northern Quest in Spokane.

♦ CMER Staff Update
Dave Schuett-Hames introduced Emily Davis, the new Riparian Scientist on the NWIFC CMER Science staff. He also reported that Netra Regmi has taken a research position at University of Oklahoma and the CMER Geologist position is now open. He is in the process of reviewing applications for the Wetlands Scientists position.

♦ Ongoing and Upcoming Reviews
  - **UPSAG:** Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy - comments due to Angela Johnson by February 12, 2018.
  - **SAGE:** Findings Report for Fire Salvage Literature Synthesis – comments due to Angela Johnson by February 15, 2018.
  - **FWEP TWIG:** Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project study design – comments due to Angela Johnson by March 2, 2018.
  - **ISAG:** Review of eDNA project proposal – comments due to Howard Haemmerle by February 23, 2018.
  - **Type F TWIG:** “prospective” findings report will be sent out to CMER in February once completed by Dave Schuett-Hames – comments due to Howard Haemmerle (timeline TBD)
  - **RSAG:** BCIF draft report – will be coming to CMER for review in the next couple months after RSAG review.

♦ 2017 CMER Accomplishments
Updates to the CMER Accomplishments Document due to Patti Shramek by February 15, 2018. The document will be on the February agenda for approval.

♦ Protocol and Standards Manual Chapter 8
Roorbach reported that the PSM committee is still working on Chapter 8 – document review and that they are half way through the chapter.

♦ Riparian Literature Synthesis
Berge reported that this is a Board priority, but the contractor didn’t work out as planned. It will probably go to RSAG as a project to have them scope it and move it forward.

**SAG and TWIG Updates** – *answer questions on written updates*
RSAG and SAGE will collaborate on the Riparian Characteristic Shade Study.
Public Comment Period
None

Recap of Assignments/Decisions approved
♦ Berge will send his report format suggestions to the Type N Hard Rock PIs and they will modify the proposal for approval at the February CMER meeting.
♦ Request to use funding allocated for eDNA literature synthesis for Phase 1 of an eDNA project approved. Hooks agreed to check with Policy for the need for their approval.
♦ Comments on the proof of method proposal to evaluate the use of eDNA as a tool in identifying the upper extent of fish in the watersheds of Washington State due to Howard Haemmerle February 23, 2018.
♦ Study designs for Compare/Contrast Landslide Hazard Zonation Mass Wasting Map Units with RIL and Object-based Landform Mapping with High-Resolution Topography, approved to send to ISPR.
♦ ISPR approved West Side Type F Prescription Monitoring Pilot Project study design approved.
♦ Type F TWIG will work on the findings report and reduce to four questions, along with a budget, and will take to Policy at their March meeting. Hooks will extend the TWIG’s offer to give Policy a presentation.
♦ Shramek will send out the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project Study Design on Friday, January 26, 2018. Comments are due to Angela Johnson February 26, 2018.
♦ Updates to the CMER Accomplishments document due to Patti Shramek by February 15, 2018.
♦ Hooks will schedule a conference call with the AMPA, RSAG, ISAG, Type F TWIG members, and PMs to work out recommendations for implementation of TWIG projects.
♦ Shramek will send out comment and assignment due dates by end of week.
♦ Shramek will send out PDFs of the PowerPoint presentations given today.

Adjourn