Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

May 26, 2015

DNR Southeast Region Office/Ellensburg

Attendees Representing

	· F
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe – CMER Co-Chair
Berge, Hans	Department of Natural Resources - AMPA
chesney, charles (ph)	Private Citizen
§Dieu, Julie (ph)	Rayonier
Ehinger, Bill	Washington Department of Ecology
Fasiano, Caprice	Quinault Nation
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
Hayes, Marc (ph)	Department of Fish & Wildlife
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-Chair
Hooks, Doug	WFPA
Jaspers, Kodi Jo (ph)	Colville Confederated Tribes
Lund, Eric (ph)	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protections Association
§Mendoza, Chris (ph)	Conservation Caucus
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
Schuett-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Stewart, Greg	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
§Sturhan, Nancy (ph)	NWIFC

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

Science Session:

Review first step of LEAN Process

Mark Hicks went over his suggested changes to the TWIG/LEAN process. Discussion revolved around how to handle the critical questions and problem statement, the sequence, and how they relate to Policy. Comments on his recommendations should be sent to him by June 4 for further discussion at a future meeting.

Decisions:

ENREP

♦ *Request to hire a two year project position for site selection.

Greg Stewart proposed that NWIFC hire a project position to help with site selection for the study. It would be helpful to have a cooperator provide office space on the eastside to house this person. (UCUT or Ecology would be good candidates as they are TWIG

^{*}Indicates Decision

members). Hicks and Todd Baldwin will check to see if they can find available space at Ecology (Spokane), UCUT, or Colville (Wenatchee). Doug Martin questioned the cost and efficiency in hiring someone because of down time and waiting for response from landowners, as well as qualifications of possible person. He feels a consultant who has the qualifications to deal with landowners would be more efficient and DNR wouldn't be paying for down time. Hans Berge suggested that the TWIG make the decision on how to do the study design of their work and how it will be done in their timeline. He would like them to take in to consideration hiring a contractor in their decision. Stewart said on behalf of the TWIG that they are willing to take direction on who to hire and how.

Decision: The TWIG will make the call on how best to handle the workload issues for this project. Stewart will be in contact with cooperators about work space and Martin for possible contactors and the TWIG make their decision from there. If they are within budget and staying within the approved direction of the project, they have the flexibility to draw on resources to get what they need done. If they (or any TWIG) need extra budget, or want to take the project in a different direction, they need to go through CMER for approval.

Updates:

Report from Forest Practices Board – May 12 meeting

Hans Berge gave a report on the May 12 Forest Practices Board meeting. Minutes for the meeting can be found on the Department of Natural Resources web page at http://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board.

He also announced that Aaron Everett is moving to the DNR Policy Director position and Stephen Bernath is going to be the Deputy Supervisor for Forest Practices and the Forest Practices Board Chair.

Report from Policy – *May 7 meeting*

Mark Hicks gave a report on the May 7 Policy meeting. Minutes for the meeting 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

• Request for nominations for replacement Co-Chair for Mark Hicks

Berge reported that Nancy Sturhan put together a chart of past co-chairs and he put it in a memo asking Policy to help work on getting a new Co-chair. He didn't receive much response. He said that the State has provided numerous Co-chairs and he would like to get another caucus to help out. He asked for suggestions.

LWAG

◆ Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Hard Rock – update
Eric Lund reported that at the beginning of May a grouping of chapters were put together and they have been transmitted to ISPR. They were sent with the standard questions.

The introduction chapters will go with each grouping. The next grouping of chapters will go in mid-July.

♦ Buffer Integrity/Shade Effectiveness Study – update

Marc Hayes reported that he restructured appendix 2 and sent to it to Jim McCracken. He is waiting for McCracken to get it back to him. Once he gets it back he will go through the entire document to reflect the changes that have been made. McCracken should return it soon and Hayes hopes to have it ready for the next CMER meeting.

RSAG

♦ Extensive Monitoring Remote Sensing Proposal – *update*

The project and schedule should be completed by UW by the end of June.

◆ Type F Extensive – Westside – *update*

Haemmerle reported that final report should be ready by end of June and received confirmation that the document would not be going through ISPR. Baldwin asked how the combined reports will go to Policy. Will the findings report and six questions be sent with report to Policy? Haemmerle responded yes and that he will let Bill Ehinger know this needs to be done.

UPSAG

♦ Glacial Deep-Seated Landslide Project – *update*

Sturhan reported that UPSAG is working on the RFQQ to be put out to bid.

SAGE

♦ EWRAP – *update*

Haemmerle reported that Ash Roorbach has been working on various chapters and giving them to Greg Stewart and Dave Schuett-Hames to provide comment on format and structure of the document. They are working on a description on the ways the data can be broken up for analysis. Baldwin asked where the responses to the SAGE comments are at. Haemmerle said that they are working on the data set in order to answer the questions. Discussion revolved around where the report and review are in the process. The issues will be taken back to SAGE.

♦ Eastern Washington Forest Hydrology Study – *ISPR update*

Berge reported that the ISPR review is completed and responses to the comments were put in a matrix. The Associated Editor at ISPR will work with Dan Miller on the comments. When completed it will go to SAGE, then CMER, for review and approval. Berge also reviewed the new ISPR process.

SRSAG

◆ Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Soft Rock – update
Haemmerle reported that the project is back on schedule. Bill Ehinger and Stephan
Bernath worked with Hancock to bring their unit back into harvest.

WetSAG

♦ Work Plan – update

Haemmerle reported that WetSAG worked on updating the Work Plan at their last meeting. WetSAG also had discussions about forest chemicals and their effects on wetlands.

TWIG

♦ BMP Roads Effectiveness Project TWIG – update

Julie Dieu reported that the TWIG is working on alternatives at this time. They have a teleconference this Friday. Haemmerle reported that this is the one TWIG that doesn't have a CMER member and that Julie is taking on the leadership role.

♦ Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project TWIG – update

Haemmerle reported that the TWIG met last week for two days. The first day was field trip to forested wetlands last Tuesday, and Wednesday the group met to start to work on their charter. Their next meeting two months out as everyone is busy at this time.

♦ Unstable Slope Criteria TWIG – update

Stewart reported that the TWIG rewrote their problem statement and the revised document is scheduled to go back to Policy at their next meeting.

♦ Type F Riparian Prescription – update

Haemmerle reported that the alternative design document is on hold until an outside review can be obtained, and once the comments are received they will decide the next steps. Berge reported that he is still working out the details on what the outside review will address.

♦ **ENREP** - update

Stewart reported that the project description was sent out with the CMER mailing and that input was provided on harvest sizes being done on eastside. The TWIG decided that they can go for a bigger basin size. They also realized there is still confusion about what the treatments are and a table was added to the document that was sent out. They should have a draft study design ready for review at the June CMER meeting.

CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- Comments on Hicks' suggested TWIG process revisions due to Mark by June 4.
- ➤ ENREP TWIG will look at project position/contractor options and decide which the best route for them to take is.
- ➤ Baldwin will talk to UCUT regarding space for ENREP project person.
- ➤ Baldwin will get contact information for Bud Kovalchick and send to Leah Beckett.

Adjourned