

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)**  
**December 12, 2017**  
**DNR/ Natural Resource Building/ Room 172**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
§Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe – CMER Co-Chair
§Bell, Harry (ph)	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Gauthier, Marc (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish & Wildlife
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association – CMER Co-Chair
Johnson, Angela	Department of Natural Resources
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Green Crow
McCrea, Chad (ph)	Spokane Tribe
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Nation
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Regmi, Netra	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commissions – CMER Staff
Schuetz-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Stednick, John (ph)	Private citizen
Stephens, Rob (ph)	Spokane Tribe
Stewart, Greg	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
Swanson, Scott (ph)	Washington State Association of Counties
Walters, Jason (ph)	Weyerhaeuser

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

\*Indicates Decision

**Decisions:**

**CMER**

◆ **\*October 2017 CMER meeting minutes**

Heather Gibbs reported that the date of September 22, 2017 on the minutes was incorrect and it should be October 24, 2017. Patti Shramek had made the correction. She asked if there were any other edits. Chris Mendoza had a couple of edits.

Mendoza motioned to approve the October 2017 CMER meeting minutes as edited. Mark Hicks seconded the motion - **Approved**

**\*2018 CMER Science Conference** – *decision on date*

Hans Berge remarked that he thought the auditorium is already reserved for May around the Board meeting. He will check with Shramek on this. Marc Hayes was concerned that May might be a little late compared to when these have been held in past years. It could be a problem for those gearing up for fieldwork having to stop and get presentations ready for the science conference. Berge suggested picking a date, and then reaching out to the SAGs to get commitments and availability from those who can do it. Then the SAGs can work to get these presentations ready and this should avoid micromanagement from the principal investigators (PIs). CMER needs to present results, not just planning documents. Possible project presentations could include:

- BCIF,
- BTO add-on,
- Hard Rock, Harwood Conversion,
- Riparian Extensive pilot project, and
- Wetland Mapping Tool

Mendoza thought CMER had agreed to have results and then back fill with study designs if there is not a full schedule and suggested forming a sub-committee to work on it. Berge suggested that the priorities would be results, completed studies, then completed study designs and plans. He does not think that there will be a problem filling the slots. Hicks thinks Shramek needs to confirm what the date is and then get her to compile a list of presenters to see if a full schedule available. Berge clarified there is not usually a committee to facilitate a science conference. He requested the SAGs identify projects, who would present them, and then Shramek will compile and distribute for the January CMER meeting. The prioritization will take place at the CMER January meeting. Dave Schuett-Hames asked for clarification on what “finalized” work means. Doug Hooks suggested noting where the project is when presenting it as an option at the CMER January meeting.

**Next Steps:** Berge will check with Shramek to confirm that May 8 is reserved at the Office Building 2 auditorium. SAGS will submit presentation suggestions to Shramek for prioritization at the January CMER meeting.

## ISAG

### **\*Request to use funding allocated for eDNA literature synthesis for development of an eDNA pilot project – approval**

Marc Gauthier formally requested the change that ISAG unanimously approved by vote at their last meeting. This request will need to go to Policy as well. Berge recommended that a more flushed out idea of what the funds will be used for is needed for Policy. Hicks remarked that he would not approve the money shift unless it is clearer on what it will be used for in such a tight budget year. It was discussed among the group that more information is needed from ISAG to support this at the CMER level. The Board does not need to approve the shift given that Policy has a 10% deference in the budget to approve changes on their own. Mendoza recommended that it might be best to delay the request until February, when the ISAG strategy is complete. Hicks said he would like to see more solid numbers for requests moving forward. Hooks noted that there is money allocated in the out years for this project, so any updates need to include updating these numbers. Todd Baldwin did not feel the direction to ISAG had been clear on how to move this forward for approval. Jenny Knoth and Gauthier confirmed they had enough information to change the request and then bring it back to CMER. ISAG will clarify the schedule and budget for the pilot study, and bring it back to CMER in January.

**Next Steps:** ISAG will clarify the schedule and budget for the pilot study, and submit it to CMER in January for a decision.

## RSAG

### ◆ **\* BTO Add-On Report – approval**

Joe Murray presented the request and asked for approval to send to ISPR. Howard Haemmerle mentioned there were three CMER reviewers (Baldwin, Harry Bell, Knoth) and they were satisfied with Schuett-Hames' edits to their comments.

Hicks motioned to send the BTO Add-on report to ISPR, Knoth seconded – **Approved**

### **Additions to the Agenda:**

## RSAG

### ◆ **Harwood Conversion Report.**

CMER meeting minutes from 2014 were checked and the decision to send the report to ISPR was captured, so no minority/majority reports are needed.

## LWAG

### ◆ **Type N Hard Rock summary chapter and the findings report(s)**

Haemmerle noted that Chapter 17 is the summary chapter and is an overall findings report. Policy has asked for individual findings reports for chapters 5, 6, 7, and 15. LWAG noted the four additional findings report are going to be copies from the findings in Chapter 17. Hayes asked if CMER would like to see the four additional findings reports or just Chapter 17 for approval. LWAG has approved Chapters 7 and 17 findings reports and they are ready to send to CMER for final approval. Mendoza remarked that he thinks Policy's request for four additional chapters' findings reports when they have not seen the summary chapter is backwards. Chapter 17 would have to be reviewed and approved by CMER before it is approved to be cut and pasted into other findings reports. Hayes replied that the cut and paste option was only used because of these additional reports being requested. He thinks the requests were made because there was not enough time at Policy to address the questions from Policy members.

Discussion revolved around the Policy presentations and the reasoning for their request for individual chapters' findings reports. Berge pointed out that the findings reports are approved by CMER before going to Policy. That is why the presentations were short at Policy, but the Policy co-chairs allowed for cards with questions they had for LWAG, which is unusual. There should be just the one findings report, but Policy started asking for individuals before they saw the overall findings report. He told Policy that when they see the overall findings report they might not need these additional reports. CMER should focus their energy on the overall findings report. The findings report needs to be submitted to CMER with enough time to review before getting it ready to send to Policy. He asked CMER members to reach out to their caucus members after they see the overall findings report to make sure they understand that it is the overall findings report.

Haemmerle noted that as the project manager it is his intent to get Chapter 17 to CMER this week. He asked CMER to start the review period as soon as they get the document, so by the next CMER meeting there is clarification on addressing CMER comments. He requested a quick review so Shramek has time to get it out in the January CMER mailing.

### ◆ **Type N Hard Rock Extended Report**

Hicks asked how the report is going to look. He suggested an addendum report in connection with the original report. He pointed out it would not need to go to ISPR if the original methods were followed. Hayes remarked that it is not clear what an addendum would be. He mentioned there are different analysis in the extended because there were changes to pre and post sampling that cannot be treated the same. In addition, some of the results contained in the first post analysis will be changed in the second post analysis. An

addendum would not work for this reason. Mendoza recalled that Policy approved the extended studies year to year, but only if they did not hold up the original report.

Discussion revolved around what whether or not an addendum would work, if it should be a standalone report, and if it should go to ISPR. He thinks that a short addendum could be possible, and that it was decided not to send it to ISPR. The thought was that if there are changes made from the original report then it should go to ISPR. Hicks asked if LWAG could bring ideas on how the extended report would look back to CMER and present them at the January meeting. Hayes agreed to this.

**Next Steps:** PI's will put together a report template and present it to CMER at the January 2018 meeting.

### **Updates:**

#### **Report from the Board – November 7 & 8, 2017 meeting**

Hans Berge reported on the November 7 & 8, 2017 Forest Practices Board meeting. The meeting minutes can be found on the Department of Natural Resources web page at

<https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board>.

Berge mentioned that forest health and fire resilience were topics that CMER (especially SAGE) should be considering.

#### **Report from Policy – November 2 and December 7, 2017 meetings**

Hans Berge reported on the November 2 and December 7, 2017 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>.

### **CMER**

#### ◆ 2018 Meeting Dates and Locations

The dates of the 2018 meetings are located on the bottom of the agenda. Berge recommended having more meetings on the eastside of the state, including some in Spokane. Hooks expressed concern with participation on the eastside. Baldwin has stepped down as CMER co-chair and will now be the chair of SAGE. Hicks concerned due to the costs, and would like to make sure there is participation from eastside participants and there are eastside issues on the agenda. Berge remarked that this is a statewide program and Spokane meetings would help to support SAGE. Shramek will send out some proposed eastside dates and locations.

#### ◆ Jenny Knoth will be replacing Todd Baldwin as a CMER Co-Chair in January 2018.

- ◆ 2017 CMER Accomplishments- Shramek is working on a draft. Knoth suggested that SAGs could include this when making a list for the potential CMER science conference presentations to send to Shramek.

### **SAG and TWIG Updates** – *answer questions on written updates*

- ◆ UPSAG- January meeting will have a presentation on deep-seated landslide strategy. The document may be distributed for review to CMER in January 2018. CMER reviewers are Mark Hicks, Jenny Knoth, and Marc Hayes.
- ◆ SAGE- plan to approve findings report for fire salvage literature synthesis at December SAGE meeting.
- ◆ RSAG- Hardwood Conversion going to ISPR, BTO add-on going to ISPR.
- ◆ ISAG- will bring eDNA request back to CMER January 2018.
- ◆ LWAG- Buffer shade is going to ISPR and Van Dykes is back from ISPR.
- ◆ FWEP- will be looking for study design reviewers at the next CMER meeting.
- ◆ Roads- Study design could be coming to CMER for review in January or February.

**Public Comment-** No public comments

### **Recap of Assignments/Decisions approved**

- ◆ October 2017 meeting minutes approved with revisions.
- ◆ Berge will check with Shramek to confirm that May 8 is reserved at the Office Building 2 auditorium is reserved for the 2018 CMER Science Conference.
- ◆ SAGS will submit presentation suggestions to Shramek for prioritization at the January CMER meeting.
- ◆ ISAG will clarify the schedule and budget for the eDNA pilot study, and submit it to CMER in January for a decision.
- ◆ Bull Trout Overlay Add-on report approved to send to ISPR.
- ◆ PI's will put together a template for the Type N Hard Rock Extended Report and present it to CMER at the January 2018 meeting.

**Adjourned**