

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
May 24, 2016
DNR Southeast Region Office/Ellensburg**

Attendees	Representing
Andrade, Charlene (ph)	Department of Natural Resources
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe – CMER Co-Chair
§Bell, Harry (ph)	Green Crow
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Bigeagle, Jerry (ph)	Spokane Tribe of Indians
Garlesky, Jennifer	Upper Columbia United Tribes – CMER Staff
§Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	WFPA – CMER Co-Chair
Johnstone, Jackie (ph)	Spokane Tribe of Indians
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny (ph)	Green Crow
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protections Association
§Mendoza, Chris (ph)	Conservation Caucus
Murray, Joe	Merrill Ring
Roorbach, Ash (ph)	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuetz-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Stewart, Greg	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Teply, Mark	Cramer Fish Sciences
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser
Woodsmith, Rick (ph)	Private Consultant

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

*Indicates Decision

Decisions:

TWIG

◆ ***ENREP – Approval of study design**

Howard Haemmerle gave a brief overview of the history of the projects and Todd Baldwin opened up the subject for discussion. Greg Stewart reported that comments were received from four people. Several red comments were received from various reviewers. He said that the comments haven't been addressed yet, as they were waiting for this meeting to discuss them. Baldwin remarked that the request is premature since the

comments haven't been intergraded. Stewart replied that the some comments will not be able to be resolved as they are policy issue.

Baldwin moved to approve study design and to send to ISPR, Mark Hicks seconded. –
Non-Approval

Jason Walter asked Stewart why the comments couldn't be addressed. Stewart said that a couple of the comments (performance targets and treatments) couldn't be resolved as they are policy issues. Further discussion revolved around these two issues. Stewart suggested that another meeting be held with the commenters and TWIG members as there are too many red comments to discuss at this meeting. He suggested that the Committee discuss the treatment issue at this meeting since Mark Teply, is at this meeting. Haemmerle reminded CMER that the project is broken into two components, wet and dry and the study design under review is for the Np (wet) portion of the project and that many of Doug Martin's comments might be more applicable to the dry part of the study. Stewart remarked that the TWIG is feeling frustrated as they keep addressing comments over multiple months and they seem to be working with a moving target. He also stated that they have had multiple meetings with the reviewers and believed that they had addressed the issues, and then new comments come up. Chris Mendoza remarked that once the initial review and comment period is completed submittal of new and different comments cannot be submitted per CMER process. Doug Hooks replied that new comments are acceptable if new content is added to the document.

Baldwin requested that only new comments that were provided after the November meeting are the ones being addressed at this meeting. Harry Bell replied he doesn't agree with that, but he is comfortable with the TWIG addressing his comments, except the treatment issue. Hicks said he is willing to meet with the TWIG and address all the comments.

ACTION: The TWIG will meet with commenters to work through the comments. Everyone who provided comments will attend meeting and if they are not there than they accept what the TWIG does. The TWIG will provide a comment matrix. Haemmerle will set up meeting ASAP.

Mendoza remarked that he felt the TWIG did a good job in the Best Available Science (BAS) document and that the treatment issue is a policy issue.

Site selection discussion:

Baldwin remarked that Policy gave the TWIG guidance to use BAS on a strategized harvest treatment strategy. Questions were raised that the TWIG misquoted some of Teply's research and with Teply at the meeting the project would benefit from him clarifying those points. Baldwin remarked that he has concern over the TWIG's use of the Idaho rule and the focus on it. The TWIG responded that they identified treatments to be evaluated based on their review of the Idaho Rule, Oregon research, and the Type N Hard Rock Study in the BAS. They prescribed treatments based on that BAS, several other treatments have been proposed, and there seems to be no agreement on what actual

treatment should be studied. Martin said he has not proposed a 30 foot buffer in any written comment and has not proposed any alternate treatment. He stated that the TWIG appropriately pointed out that they need some type of shade gradient and that in his opinion the treatments they have proposed have a very slim difference in shade gradient. He feels that some treatment needs to be tested that will have a larger shade gradient that is not so highly loaded (85-90% shade). Teply remarked that he didn't see anything misrepresented in regards to the Idaho rule in the study design. The reason for the 60 part of the 60/30 in the Idaho rule was because the small landowners wanted some thinning allowed in the prescription. He added however, that a component that may be missing in both alternatives is work on average shade and temperature changes, recognizing that there may be variability in shade reduction when applying these in the field. Teply answered questions regarding his research and the Idaho rule.

Martin asked Stewart what was the desired shade range they wanted. Stewart replied 0-20% of actual prescriptions, how much extra light energy hits the stream that changes the temperature, and shade change that is directly attributed to the harvest. He said that could be tested with just one treatment.

Hicks remarked that CMER is here not to make advances in science, but to test the rules and make recommendations to Policy. Mendoza agreed and stated that CMER has the extreme ends of where shade temperatures with other studies and that the side boards have already been set. Bell disagreed and stated that he will push the ball up hill to Policy if need be. Does a different buffer still allow us to do what needs to be done? Stewart replied that one of Bell's red comments was that they didn't consider economics and that is a policy issue, not a science issue. Martin said he disagrees with Hicks and Mendoza and that the treatments they are proposing doesn't get to what needs to be done.

Baldwin asked if there were any more questions for Teply. Martin asked how difficult or available would it be to use the Idaho model. Teply replied fairly easy. Stewart pointed out that Hicks does have a suggested shade study that was added to the work plan that would address these issues. Bell asked if Teply had any comment related to the discussion about whether or not to use a smaller buffer. Teply replied that from his work and the work of others it is apparent that a smaller buffer would result in a decrease of shade and a resultant increase in stream temperature.

ACTION: the project will move into dispute resolution – see TWIG Update below.

CMER

- ◆ ***Meeting Minutes Approval** – *Approval of November & December 2015 and January, February, and April 2016 meeting minutes.*

Baldwin and Marc Hayes moved to approve the November and December 2015 and January, February, and April 2016 minutes. Hicks abstained for the January, February and April 2016 minutes – **Approved**

Updates:

Report from Forest Practices Board – May 11 meeting

Doug Hooks gave a report on the May 11, 2016 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>.

Report from Policy – May 4 & 5 meeting – In Spokane, first day was field trip.

Hans Berge gave a report on the May 4 and 5, 2016 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

◆ **Ranking of projects for 17/19 Biennium – update**

Hooks reported that he used the Work Plan ranking of programs to rank the new projects and reviewed the ranking document that was sent to Policy. Hicks said that he appreciates the quick work that Hooks did, but in the future would he like to have more face to face discussions. Hayes seconded what Hicks said and that it would be nice to have a simpler, easier to use process. Schuett-Hames expressed the desire for CMER to figure out how to do a big picture overview of the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP). Mendoza reported that the process is in the Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM), but he appreciates what Hooks did in a short time frame. He said he would be willing to work with Schuett-Hames to brain storm ideas on the HCP overview.

◆ **Protocols and Standards Manual – review timeline for comments**

Haemmerle reported that he has received comments from a number of people, but also heard that because of the scope of the changes additional time was requested to review the document comments. Hicks responded that he spent time over the weekend and that if deadlines are going to be extended that it is announced as early as possible. Baldwin remarked that he was the one that requested the additional time as there were so many changes that he was having a hard time following them. Haemmerle stated that comments were received from five people and that they can work on incorporating those while they are waiting for Baldwin's comments. Hicks agreed that it was a very dense read and that he thinks it's important for Baldwin to provide comments given his tenure with the program. Mendoza advocated that Todd submit comments if he has the time. Berge suggested that if Baldwin doesn't have the time to do thorough review that he at least does a high level review and point out things that jump out at him. Roorbach remarked that Chapter 8 isn't new language, it was just copied out of Chapter 7.

ACTION: Baldwin will turn in comments by June 3, 2016.

◆ **ENREP TWIG – dispute resolution update**

Baldwin reported that Ecology delivered a dispute resolution document to Berge at the last CMER meeting. Berge and the Co-Chairs have met since then to decide the best way to handle it. He and the Co-Chairs and AMPA are not in total agreement on what the process should look like, so they are asking CMER their opinions. Should the CMER

process, or Board Manual process be followed? Berge remarked that he feels this is in Stage 1 of dispute resolution, not Stage 2. Hicks said that this follows the CMER process and as far as he's concerned this is still in dispute. Berge asked what process the group wants to follow, Board Manual (2003) or the CMER PSM (2012)? Hicks, Baldwin, Mendoza, and Hayes feel that the CMER process should be followed. Mendoza remarked that the only significant change to the PSM was that CMER adopt a two stage dispute process. Roorbach stated that he thinks the informal conversation will be more successful if people involved realize they are in the formal dispute process. Berge asked if any members objected to using the CMER process and no objections were made.

ACTION: Berge will schedule an informal meeting between the disputing parties to discuss the issues.

Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Basalt Lithologies (Hard Rock)

◆ **ISPR Update**

Charlene Andrade gave an Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR) update and reported that the project is in the final stages of the original study and that the goal is to be through approval by next June. The individual chapters need to be finished by the end of the summer so the synthesis chapter can be completed. All the chapters, except large woody debris and amphibians, are most of the way through the initial ISPR review. The introductory chapters have already been through final approval and now that the rest of the chapters are complete. Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) is revising them and they will go through technical editing before coming back to CMER for final review.

◆ **Rubble Rousing Update**

Berge reported that after consulting with Aimee McIntyre he made the decision to move forward with the rubble rousing since there wasn't enough time to go through the ISPR process in time for WDFW to hire crews for collection this summer. Hayes remarked that there was also a technical reason for keeping it because it had already been done that way before.

Type N Effectiveness in Incompetent Lithologies Project (Soft Rock) – update

Haemmerle reported that everything is on schedule. Hooks asked what the next thing is that will be coming to CMER. Haemmerle replied nothing soon.

SAGE

◆ **SAGE Co-chair – update**

Baldwin reported there is no update and that there will be nominations at the next SAGE meeting for a new Co-Chair. Berge encouraged people to turn in nominations.

WetSAG

◆ **WMZ Effectiveness Study – update**

Kay reported that they are about to start the background for their charter.

TWIGs – Discussion of Lean & timelines for deliverables

- ◆ **BMP Roads Effectiveness Project**
Study design – late this year at the earliest.
- ◆ **Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project**
Study design should come to CMER in July.
- ◆ **Unstable Slopes Criteria**
BAS alternatives document will come to CMER in fall at the earliest.
- ◆ **Type F Riparian Prescriptions**
Study design should come to CMER in late summer.

Hooks remarked that the process doesn't seem to be moving very fast and that maybe CMER needs to assess make recommendations to the Board that it the pros and cons of the process and make recommendations to the Board whether or not it (or portions of it) should be continued. Haemmerle remarked that he is starting a Lean training class next month and he suggests that he use this as his case study to see if the process can be moved along. Schuett-Hames reported that they are having issues with outside participant commitment. Hans suggested setting an hour aside on a future agenda to discuss this. Mendoza said that what Amy Kurtenbach was working on before she left is good, but the process has changed quite a bit since it started and has evolved to look more like a SAG process. Hicks noted that we have not really stuck with our Lean process so cannot judge the processes effectiveness yet.

Public Comment Period

No public comment

Hayes asked Berge for an update on the Buffer Shade Study ISPR process. Berge reported that it is back in the Associate Editors hands and he expects to get it back in the next month.

Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- ◆ ENREP TWIG will meet with commenters to work on resolving commenter comments. Howard Haemmerle will work on setting up a meeting as soon as possible.
- ◆ November and December 2015, and January, February, and April 2016 meeting minutes approved.
- ◆ Hans Berge will schedule informal meeting between the ENREP disputing parties to discuss the issues. He will set this up as soon as possible.
- ◆ Todd Baldwin will turn in comments on the PSM by June 3, 2016.

Adjourned