

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**January 22, 2013
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Dube', Kathy	Watershed GeoDynamics
Gauthier, Mark (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Hayes, Marc	Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Heide, Pete	WFPA
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Hooks, Doug (ph)	WFPA
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept. of Natural Resources, AMPA
*Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
Terwilleger, Karen	WFPA

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

Agenda – No changes were made to the agenda.

Road Erosion/Sediment Model – Kathy Dube' presented on the work she has been involved in determining how well three models predict road erosion and run off. She walked through the NCASI funded project where various models were compared across the US, the road model comparison objectives and identified the benefits and limitations of each for forested lands.

Doug Martin suggested to CMER members there was a potential for CMER to partner with NCASI (Bob Danahey) with best management practices and targets for water runoff with the Environmental Protection Agency.

Business Session:

CMER Meeting Notes: August, September & October 2012

The three months of meeting notes were approved by CMER members with one change to the August notes and an added footnote to the September meeting notes.

CMER FY14 Work Plan & Budget – Review Updates

- ♦ CMER members reviewed the WETSAG changes.
M Hicks motioned to approve the changes.
Julie Dieu seconded the motion.
The WETSAG changes to the work plan were approved by CMER members.

- ♦ CMER members reviewed the RSAG changes.
Chris Mendoza motioned to approve the changes.

Dick Miller seconded the motion.
The RSAG changes were approved by CMER members.

FY14 CMER Budget Discussion

Jim Hotvedt summarized the following additions made to the CMER budget based on the comparison to the Settlement Agreement and recent CMER meeting discussions:

#11 Type N Experimental Extended & Demographics
#29 Van Dyke's
#34 Mass Wasting Landscape
#39 Roads Sub-Basin – develop a TWIG and coordinate the potential for partnership with NACSI

Post-Mortem Report Six Questions/Findings Report – CMER members provided suggestions

Chris Mendoza and Mark Hicks worked with the Post Mortem authors in answering the standard six questions that typically accompanies a CMER report for the Policy review. The minority opinion reporters will have time to respond to the six questions. Chris Mendoza requested to have these responses sent to him for inclusion before the next Policy meeting. The CMER co-chairs would like to have the finalized answers from the Post Mortem authors so the minority (AJ Kroll, Leslie Lingley and Doug Martin) can include their answers to the six questions, if different, in a timely manner.

Discussion Points

Dick Miller provided comments regarding question #4: **Response of Authors (supported by majority of CMER reviewers):** Whether current buffer and road requirements are adequate to meet FFR resource objectives remains unresolved. He asked the “so what question”; what should the reader think about doing after reading this?

Julie Dieu responded the section in harvest rules may answer that better.

Dick Miller cited the section on effectiveness for hill slope landslides was very good.

He suggested citing an example to entice the reader to go to section 7.2 on page 2.

Julie Dieu responded the authors were purposely brief, as it was not clear who will be responsible for editing the document. She offered to insert a parenthesis after section 7.2 (for example – influences of stand age.)

Dick Miller asked about the wording in Effectiveness for road-related landslides; page 3.

Julie Dieu agreed to replace comments on factors that may have contributed to the lack of statistically significant differences and instead comment on the most important factor, which appears to be the limited number of spatially clumped landslides.

Dick Miller stated he could not see the comparison as cited in *Critical Question 2* and asked if this was on a square mile basis.

Julie Dieu responded they made the comparison in the document; at the simplest level with all 88 blocks of data. She will add *Based on simple count without area normalization*, to this section.

Dick Miller stated there were some grammatical tangles in *Critical Question 3*.

Julie Dieu agreed there were some grammatical problems in this section and was willing to revise; *sampling design focused on site scale prescriptions*; and *at the harvest unit* rather than individual prescriptions.

Dick Miller shared there was confusion with page 4 and the following statement: *Of the stream crossing failures, plugged pipes contributed to 68% and fill edge collapse without plugging comprised another 11%*.

Marc Hayes suggested *of the failures at stream crossings*

Dick Miller requested clarification on page 4 in section A. Influence on Landslide Effects Across a Range of Storm Magnitudes: Data collection was limited to managed forest lands in southwest Washington with a landslide density of at least four landslides per square mile.

Julie Dieu responded the study is based on the 2007 storm & she will correct the density information.

Dick Miller stated the less variable statement does not make sense in the last sentence of A. on page 4; should it be less powerful?

Julie Dieu answered she did not know what this sentence was supposed to mean; she suggested - *where precipitation intensity is less variable*. This is the re-written sentence: It is possible that the patterns observed in this event are different from patterns we would have observed in multi-storm studies where the precipitation intensity would be less variable.

She added she will check with Greg Stewart to clarify the meaning of this sentence.

Dick Miller requested clarification under B on page 4: Further, this pattern was not limited to areas of most extreme precipitation rates.

Julie Dieu suggested *areas of highest precipitation rates*.

Dick Miller asked about the study's focus: was it on gradient or based on forest practices rules? The following statement needed to be clarified- This study was not designed to evaluate if these non-RIL failures were concentrated within certain slope gradients or landform types and, thus, is insufficient to suggest any modifications to the RIL criteria.

Julie Dieu responded that the authors further clarified this on page 5 as follows: (Note: As discussed below in C. Validation of Current RIL and of Hillslope Gradient as a Criterion (Question 7), the study results support the continued use of the current RIL definitions and of gradient as a criterion.)

She added we cannot characterize RIL.

Dick Miller asked why the authors restricted the question to CMER studies only on page 5.

Chris Mendoza and Julie Dieu answered this is meant to be CMER specific.

Dick Miller stated the information provided in the last sentence of the first paragraph to answer question #6 (Further, the targets are conceptual, rather than quantitative, which makes them more appropriate for

broad guidance than as metrics for evaluation.); left him hanging and he asked about a target for the natural background.

Mark Hicks added that it may be referring to narrative targets.

Julie Dieu agreed the use of *conceptual* is not correct and will use narrative. She added she was not able to provide a target, as the natural background does replenish, fish do return.

She added she will try to re-write the answers for clarity. She will make the suggested changes and send them out to Marc Hayes, Doug Martin, Dick Miller, Jim Hotvedt, Chris Mendoza, and Mark Hicks for re-review. She will do this by tomorrow afternoon.

CMER – Protocols & Standards: This agenda item was delayed to next month.

TWIG

♦ **Eastside Type N Experimental Study Initial Writing Team (IWT)**

Marc Gauthier reported this is the first step in implementing a TWIG pilot. The document mailed out for CMER identifies this is the stage for CMER to approve selecting the TWIG members.

Mark Hicks provided an overview of this process for CMER members; CMER has seven days to give input on this preliminary draft of the IWT. CMER members should provide formal responses; comments need to be sent to Marc Gauthier and Greg Stewart.

CMER – Items to take to February 7, 2013 Policy Meeting

- Status of the Six Questions -Post Mortem Study
- TWIG updates

CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments

- Chris Mendoza will work with Julie Dieu and Leslie Lingley on the UPSAG updates to the FY14 CMER work plan.
- Co-chairs need to coordinate with Julie Dieu, Greg Stewart, and Nancy Sturhan in developing a TWIG for the Roads Sub-Basin and investigate the potential for a partnership with NCASI.
- Julie Dieu will send the Post-Mortem Study Six Questions revisions out by tomorrow afternoon – January 23rd. CMER members need to have responses back to Julie by January 25th.
- CMER members need to provide comments on the **Eastside Type N Experimental Study IWT**. CMER Co-chairs will email out a message for comments to be sent in by January 29th to Greg Stewart and Marc Gauthier.

Meeting Adjourned.