

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**May 24, 2011
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
Almond, Lyle (ph)	Makah Tribe
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Bigley, Richard	Dept. of Natural Resources
Ehinger, Bill	Department of Ecology
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, SRSAG Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept. of Natural Resources, AMPA
Hooks, Doug	WFPA, Director of Forest Env Program
*Jackson, Terry	Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, CMER Co-Chair
Johnson, Candace	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser, LWAG Co-Chair
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
Miller, Ken	Washington Family Forestry Association
Minkova, Teodora	Dept. of Natural Resources
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
*Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

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

Agenda

There were no changes made to the agenda.

Business Session

➤ CMER Science Topics – *Update*

Terry Jackson reviewed the CMER science topics listed in the CMER task list. CMER will need to identify science topics for September to the end of the year.

➤ CMER Protocols & Standards Manual – *Update*

Jim Hotvedt identified that NWIFC had an intern for six months that worked with Nancy Sturhan on updates to the CMER PSM. Ash has expressed interest in volunteering to continue this work. This is an FYI to let CMER know that they are working together on this project for CMER. Chris Mendoza provided a brief history of why the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual was created – to ensure that a fair and consistent process was developed and followed by a diverse group of stakeholders.

Discussion Points:

Next steps for this project were discussed. Ash will go through and compile the revised versions, with red line strike out, and provide a draft to CMER. The suggestion was to go through the manual one chapter at a time, work through the revisions, and bring them to CMER every few months for discussion and input throughout the year. The areas where CMER input is vital will be flagged.

A TAG will be organized to assist with the writing and editing of the PSM. The Policy and CMER co-chairs have worked on the parking lot issues from the AMP Board Manual trainings and have developed and distinguished between Policy tasks and CMER tasks. This list will be forwarded to the TAG. The TAG can work through these parking lot issues and then CMER can prioritize the issues to be worked on and inserted into the PSM.

➤ CMER Co-Chair - *Recommendation to Policy*

Jim Hotvedt provided the overview where CMER developed two recommendations for the co-chair position that will replace Terry Jackson as of July 2011. Mark Hicks and Todd Baldwin were nominated at the April 26th CMER meeting. Todd Baldwin communicated to Jim that he would withdraw if Mark Hicks was willing to be co-chair. Mark Hicks has agreed to be CMER co-chair. This recommendation will go to Policy for approval on June 2nd.

Chris Mendoza reminded CMER members to start planning ahead for next year as he will step down from the other co-chair position.

CMER members reached consensus and congratulated Mark Hicks.

➤ Coordinator's Corner - CMER Meeting Notes March 22, 2011 – ***CMER approved March meeting notes with noted changes made at the meeting.***

➤ SAGE -Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project – *Status Update*

Todd Baldwin provided an update on the status of looking for a replacement contractor for this project. So far, Todd has been unable to get a replacement. At their last meeting, SAGE discussed and agreed to bring in CMER staff to complete the project. SAGE needs to work with CMER staff to organize how to finish this project. The 2nd phase of the project will provide analyses tying current conditions (from Phase 1) to various types of harvest opportunities.

Jim Hotvedt pointed out to CMER that the benefits of having Steve McConnell do this work was due to his background in silviculture and his knowledge of the forest vegetation simulator (FVS). Ash has the silviculture background, and it will be a good opportunity for him to learn FVS.

Science Session

Doug Ryan and Pete Bisson from the Pacific Northwest USFS Lab presented on the Riparian Adaptive Management Symposium and shared the PNW GTR 830 publication. They were part of a two-day symposium where a wide range of scientists (policy focused) gathered to review the riparian policy and management practices in western Washington. The main focus was on western Washington due to the differences of riparian policies on each side of the state. The presenters shared that one of their main findings presented at the symposium was that the science has changed over time. A main question was whether or not policy and management were consistent with the science. One of the major recommendations that emerged from this symposium is to conduct a thorough review of current science, policies and practices.

The case study used at the symposium was the work from Forest Ecosystem Management & Assessment Team (FEMAT). FEMAT studied 1993 Forest Service lands in Oregon and looked at ecological rationale for determining buffer width. FEMAT was interested in knowing quality of the riparian forests and their effect on streams as functions of buffer width and several riparian functions (shade, wood recruitment...). FEMAT focused on habitat requirements for anadromous fish and that these requirements were good for other riparian functions. The science from FEMAT provides the primary basis for the NW Forest Plan of 1993 and current riparian policy and management on US Forest Service lands of the PNW and California. Current science points to the dynamic nature of stream systems and the fact that the best conditions for fish are a patchy mosaic of age classes and species composition. The newer science also points to mid-successional stands as the peak for optimum conditions for fish habitat, not old growth stand conditions.

CMER/SAG Items:

➤ **UPSAG - Scoping of criteria interpretation of landform identification – *Status Update***

Leslie Lingley shared that UPSAG is beginning the conversation that will lead to scoping for the landform identification. UPSAG will take field trips over the summer to look at rule- identified landforms (RIL) and other landforms that may not be included as RIL. UPSAG will look at buffered areas and areas that were not buffered. The field trips will help UPSAG scope how to further develop the project. UPSAG will then need to present their scoping document to CMER and Policy before proceeding with the development of a study design and implementation of a study.

Discussion points- The conversation focused on the fact that UPSAG is charged with looking at characteristics that lead to landforms other than rule- identified landforms, and determining whether the current criteria for defining RILs is appropriate to ensure protection of steep unstable slopes. Policy has provided direction to UPSAG to look for a definable set of characteristics, starting with results from the post mortem data.

Accuracy and bias remains a priority, but the first charge for UPSAG is to further investigate characteristics that lead to unstable landforms by further mining the post mortem data.

➤ **LWAG - Type N Experimental Amphibian Genetics – *CMER approved the six questions document to accompany the final report and to send the two documents to Policy.***

Teresa Miskovic reported that the final report has been reviewed by three ISPR reviewers. A response matrix was prepared that included all of the ISPR review comments and WSU's proposed revisions based on those comments. LWAG and CMER approved the response matrix and approved WSU revising the report to incorporate the comments. The ISPR comments have been incorporated into the report and LWAG and the CMER reviewers have reviewed and approved those revisions. LWAG developed the six questions document and is requesting CMER approval to send this with the final report for Policy review.

Terry Jackson motioned to approve sending the six questions with the final report to Policy.

Chris Mendoza seconded the motion.

CMER members agreed to send the six questions document, along with the final report, to Policy.

➤ RMZ Re-Sample Final Report – *CMER Approved Funds for Re-Analysis*

AJ Kroll reported that this request is to fund analysis of the avian portion of the RMZ Re-Sample Project. The project will re-analyze data collected in 2003-2004 (10-11 years after the original harvest treatments occurred) as well as data drawn from the initial study. The re-analysis will provide information about individual (occupancy and abundance) and community (species richness) responses to different buffer treatments over a longer time frame than available in Pacific Northwest studies. In particular, this analysis has two advantages over previous efforts: 1) it examines buffer width as a continuous covariate across a broad range of values and 2) it will identify whether buffer width, selected other habitat covariates, or an interaction between buffer width and another habitat covariate influence bird species occupancy, abundance, and richness. The results of the analysis will provide substantive information to policy on avian responses to different buffer sizes and configurations. A total of \$47,000 is needed to complete this project. Half the funds (\$23,500) are being requested from the CMER project development fund and industry will contribute the remaining half of the funding.

Discussion points: The question was asked if there was enough data to make this a quality product. The design has sampling plots within the three treatments and in the upland areas in each basin. Pearson will analyze the full aspect of the design that reflects upland and riparian buffers across all the treatments. This analysis will cover 18 basins in western Washington.

The question was asked about how much exists in the project development fund. CMER, Policy and the FPB approved the CMER budget with \$50,000 in the project development fund.

The question was asked whether or not Policy also needs to approve this request, if it is coming from project development funds? The reply was that because the RMZ Resample Report has already been completed and this request is for additional analysis, the request needs to be approved by Policy.

The concern of using nearly half of the project development fund for this re-analysis was expressed. This fund was set up for projects that had overrun costs for unforeseen circumstances. In the past, the fund was allocated \$100,000 and rarely had competition from projects for available funds. CMER needs to consider what project costs may be anticipated for the next fiscal year, which the \$50,000 will cover.

The question was asked about the contract and approval process for this work. This would be an interagency agreement with DFW which requires an internal approval process at DNR.

The CMER co-chairs and the AMPA mentioned that this possible request was presented to Policy and they expressed skepticism. Policy was concerned about the amount of funding already spent on this project and the quality of the product that was delivered. They emphasized that LWAG will need to provide a presentation for Policy and to really show them how this will provide information for adaptive management and the current rules. AJ Kroll and Marc Hayes will provide a presentation to Policy and show them the merits of this re-analysis on June 2nd.

Nancy Sturhan motioned to approve this project.

Dick Miller seconded the motion.

CMER members reached consensus.

➤ **RSAG - Eastside Extensive Type F Report ISPR Matrix – *CMER Approved ISPR Matrix***
Teresa Miskovic shared that the report went to ISPR and the comments have been incorporated into the matrix. Department of Ecology has responded to the comments, and RSAG has reviewed and approved the matrix. RSAG requests CMER approval of the ISPR matrix

Terry Jackson motioned to make the changes in the report.

Mark Hicks seconded the motion

CMER members reached consensus and approved the ISPR matrix.

➤ **SAGE Type N Characterization Project: Forest Hydrology – *Status Update***

Teresa Miskovic reported that, in Amy's absence, she is overseeing the RFQQ of this project. She is working with Patti Shramek, contract specialist, on the RFQQ timeline and preparations. Teresa reports that it is highly unlikely that this project will be ready in time for field season this year. The realistic time frame for the contract is October. SAGE will set this up for next year.

Discussion points:

It was clarified that this will be a project for FY13 instead of FY12.

It was clarified that the RFQQ is not linked to the approval of the Type N Characterization Project: Forest Hydrology charter.

CMER members discussed the importance of this project and the connection it has to CWA. The fact that site selection seems to be delaying the implementation of this project was raised as a concern. There are other projects riding on the outcomes of this project and the delay pushes the other projects out another year.

The discussion of site selection focused on the issue of sample representation. The question of a random sample is popping up due to the SAMPLE model and the actual site selection to date. At an earlier meeting, CMER agreed to the recommendation from SAGE about the elimination of small landowners from the sample based on the small portion of the actual sample size (<3%) they contributed. CMER emphasized the importance of sampling all sites within one year (same snow year) and that SAGE should have all the sites validated and resources obtained before launching the full study. The contract should not be completed until all sites are obtained.

CMER agreed to have Mark Hicks, Chris Mendoza and Jim Hotvedt meet with SAGE and Greg Stewart to discuss the current status, representativeness of the sites, and possible alternatives for implementing the study more efficiently.

➤ **SRSAG - Type N Experimental Buffer Study in Incompetent Lithologies in Western Washington (Soft Rock Study) – *Status Update on QAPP***

Mark Hicks reported that he received comments from all of the CMER reviewers. These were folded into the QAPP and EPA is has approved it. The project is progressing well and landowners are providing positive feedback for sites.

➤ **WETSAG - Wetlands Office FPA Survey – *Discussion of FPA Office Survey document***

Ash Roorbach reported that CMER wanted an overview of the wetlands office FPA survey. Data were collected and summarized by WETSAG in preparation for the August 2010 field trip. One recommendation that emerged from the field trip was to expand this and make it statewide. WETSAG took the results of this expanded survey and created a stand-alone document.

WETSAG is presenting this as an exploratory document. Though this document does not require CMER approval, CMER may provide comments and submit them to Ash Roorbach within two weeks; comments due by June 7th.

- CMER Report to Policy – *Discussion on Items to take to Policy*
 - RMZ re-sample funds for re-analysis –Kroll & Hayes will provide a presentation to Policy at the June 2nd meeting
 - CMER co-chair recommendation
 - Final Amphibian Genetics Report and associated six questions document
 - Eastside Type N Characterization Forest Hydrology Charter

- CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments from May 24, 2011 CMER Meeting:
 - June 28th meeting CMER will review and discuss the AMP Training Parking Lot issues, CMER Task List, and PSM update
 - Potential future CMER science topic – Olympic Experimental System Forest -
 - Chris & Mark will schedule time for discussion with Greg Stewart & SAGE about the Type N Characterization Project: Forest Hydrology project, while the PM continues with the RFQQ process.
 - Comments due June 7th to Ash Roorbach on the Wetlands Office FPA Survey

Meeting Adjourned.