

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)
November 27, 2018
DNR/DOC Industrial Park, Tumwater WA**

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Davis, Emily	Northwest Indian Fish Commission – CMER Staff
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Gleason, Abigail	Department of Natural Resources
§Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish & Wildlife
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
Heimburg, John	Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association – CMER Co-Chair
Hough-Snee, Nate (ph)	Meadow Run Environmental
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Green Crow - CMER Co-Chair
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Stephens, Rob (ph)	Spokane Tribe of Indians
Stewart, Greg (ph)	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff

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

*Indicates Decision

Science Session

LiDAR Acquisition – Abigail Gleason Department of Natural Resources Washington Geologic Society (WGS) gave a presentation on the WGS LiDAR acquisition and answered questions.

Decisions:

CMER

- ◆ ***October 2018 Meeting Minutes - approval**

Patti Shramek and Chris Mendoza reviewed the minutes as revised by Mendoza.

Mendoza motion to approve the minutes a revised, Julie Dieu seconded - **Approved**

- ◆ ***2019 CMER Work Plan** – *approval of LWAG, RSAG, and WetSAG portions of Work Plan*

LWAG – Shramek and Marc Hayes reviewed the LWAG updates to the Work Plan and answered questions.

Jenny Knoth moved to approve the LWAG Work Plan edits, Mark Hicks seconded – **Approved**

RSAG – Shramek and Joe Murray reviewed the edits to the RSAG Work Plan.

Hicks moved to approve the RSAG Work Plan edits, Knoth and Hayes seconded – **Approved**

WetSAG – Shramek, Debbie Kay, and Knoth reviewed the changes to the WetSAG Work Plan.

Mendoza moved to approve the WetSAG Work Plan edits, Hayes seconded – **Approved**

- ◆ **CMER 2018 Accomplishments Document** – *request for review*
Shramek asked for edits to the 2018 CMER Accomplishments document to be submitted by December 7, 2018, for distribution and approval at the December meeting. She also reminded everyone to bring treats to the December meeting to celebrate the 2018 accomplishments.

Updates:

Report from the Board – *November 13 & 14, 2018 meeting*

Hans Berge gave an update on the November Board field trip and meeting and answered questions regarding the AMP improvements facilitation.

- ◆ Potential Habitat Break (PHB) assignment to ISAG – Berge reported that he recommended to the Board that they move the project to CMER and ISAG for implementation following the ISPR review. Stakeholders had made comments on the document from ISPR and Berge noted that those comments were friendly amendments that improved the study design. Ultimately, the Board directed Berge to work with CMER to review the study design, although no formal approval is required. The study design is currently being reviewed by ISAG (stakeholders that have been involved over the last year in previous versions) and then will go to CMER. The ISPR-approved PHB study design will be shared with CMER at the December meeting, with comments solicited by the January meeting. This added review pushes out the timing of implementation. Berge will send out an invitation to “box’ to review the ISPR comments that had been made. The Board also directed CMER/ISAG to work with Berge on the

implementation plan and staffing within FY19 for site selection. Hicks stated that he would like clear expectations of what CMER is expected to do with the report when it comes to them since this happened outside the normal CMER process and it has already been approved by ISPR. Berge answered questions about the PHB process up to this point.

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 – November 5, 2018 meetings

Berge gave an update on the November Policy meeting. He answered questions about the 17-19 biennium budget positive variance. There was discussion around how to come up with projects that can be completed before June 30, 2019. 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>.

Roads Project

◆ Updated Charter

Howard Haemmerle reported that Justin Long, DNR civil engineer, has been added to the project team. He added that they are still working on getting the package ready for the public works solicitation. He also reviewed the other updates to the Charter. He stated that the goal is to get the public works process done in order to implement the full study in FY 2020. Haemmerle and Julie Dieu answered questions about the Charter.

CMER and SAG updates – answer questions on written updates

Hicks remarked that he had some edits for the updates. Update will be submitted to Haemmerle by Wednesday, November 28, in order for him to make the changes for Doug Hooks by Thursday, November 29.

Discussion:

◆ **Riparian Characteristics and Shade Study – clarify Policy's request**

Hicks reported on the specifics of Policy's request for the study. Policy had asked that a study design be developed within a budget of \$50,000 by June 30, 2019. They further asked that the study design include elements of sequencing only the eastside, only the westside, sequencing westside first followed by eastside, and the inclusion and removal of model calibration/improvement component. Concern was expressed that variable buffer widths (25' vs. 30') make the study more challenging and Murray requested that CMER co-chairs ask Policy if it is okay to simply use a specific buffer width of one or the other. Doug Martin suggested that the design team should have the latitude to determine the buffer width. Hicks replied that he had to leave the Policy meeting early, but he would have suggested that if he would have had the chance.

CMER assigned this study to RSAG. RSAG will work on the RFQQ and charter at their December meeting.

Next Steps: Hooks will ask Policy for clarification on buffer width for the study design (25 feet or 30 feet).

◆ **Policy extensive monitoring assignment to RSAG**

Policy asked CMER and RSAG to start a conversation on extensive monitoring and bring back recommendation to Policy. There was no specification on when they wanted the recommendation. Berge remarked that this is something that needs to start, but doesn't think there is time to identify next steps in time to include it in the 2019-2021 budget. RSAG, through CMER, needs to make a proposal on how to proceed with extensive monitoring. Discussion revolved around how to approach this. RSAG will attempt to come up with a schedule for when a plan can come back to CMER at the December 2018 meeting.

◆ **How to decide when or if projects go to extended monitoring**

The Board asked for Policy and CMER to come up with a process for determining when extended monitoring is needed. A report will be delivered by the AMPA to the Board at their February 2019 meeting on progress.

Hayes asked how extended monitoring is defined. Berge responded, data collection beyond what was in the original study design.

Harry Bell remarked that when doing a study that may have effects years down the road, perhaps it needs to be recognized, and a placeholder added in case it is determined later on that extended monitoring is needed and there is budget available to do it.

Murray remarked that maybe extended monitoring should build into studies that CMER is doing now, and look back on past studies, to see if they were valuable.

Hayes remarked that the choice to do extended shouldn't be dependent of budget and done just because there is budget to do it. If there is need to do it to get the information we need, then it should be done. Hicks remarked that if it looks like there may be a need for extended monitoring then it should be part of the study plan.

Martin remarked that when contemplating extended monitoring the question needs to be asked "what's the consequence if we don't have the information we would get by doing extended monitoring?"

The following criteria were drafted for determining whether or not to conduct extensive monitoring:

1. Defined time to evaluate if project is getting us what we need.
2. Did something come up during the study that we didn't anticipate, and do we need to investigate further?
3. Is the study answering Policies questions and what is the risk if we don't do extended monitoring?
4. What are opportunities lost?

Next Steps: Extended monitoring questions will be written up by Knoth and will be finalized at the December CMER meeting.

◆ **Project operations and contracting – what does it look like when it's working?**

Hooks remarked that there seems to be a communication issue more than anything. Example: The budget for the Forested Wetlands Effectives Project contract was expended and there was a delay in getting an amendment done to increase the budget. Roorbach recommended quarterly project reports that include budget. Discussion revolved around how communications can be improved to avoid issues like this in the future. The general consensus is that communication between and SAGS and PM's is vital.

Public Comment Period

Charles Chesney thanked Ash Roorbach for his work on PSM and asked Shramek to mark him down as attending meeting. Asked what the M stands for in CMER and if what are the seven monitoring types are. He emphasized there is "value of data and data of value", and is interested in finding the Dec 2011 SAGE meeting presentation.

Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- ◆ Patti Shramek will send out the PDF of Abigail Gleason's LiDAR presentation.
- ◆ October 2018 revised meeting minutes approved.
- ◆ LWAG, RSAG, and WetSAG portions of the CMER Work Plan approved.
- ◆ Hans Berge will make PHB comments available on Box.
- ◆ Riparian Characteristics and Shade Study assigned to RSAG. Joe Murray will work with Teresa Miskovic on Charter, Mark Hicks will work with Miskovic on the RFQQ. RSAG will try to submit the draft Charter to CMER at December meeting.
- ◆ Doug Hooks will ask Policy for clarification on buffer width for the Riparian Characteristics and Shade Study Design (25 feet or 30 feet).
- ◆ RSAG will attempt to come up with a schedule for when a plan regarding extensive monitoring can come back to CMER.
- ◆ Extended monitoring questions will be written up by Jenny Knoth and will be finalized at the December CMER meeting.
- ◆ SAGs will submit edits on the 2018 CMER Accomplishments document to Patti Shramek by December 7, 2018.

Adjourned @ 3:57 pm.