

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
April 28, 2015
DNR/DOC Compound/Tumwater, WA**

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe – CMER Co-Chair
§Bell, Harry	Green Crow
Beckett, Leah	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
Berge, Hans	Department of Natural Resources - AMPA
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-Chair
Hooks, Doug	WFPA
Jaspers, Kodi Jo (ph)	Colville Confederated Tribes
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Indian Nation
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	NWIFC
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser

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

*Indicates Decision

Science Session:

Discuss potential ways to improve our ISPR process – Hans Berge reported on where we are at with ISPR:

- Dan Vogt, managing editor, selects an associate editor (subject area expert from the Pacific Northwest), who chooses reviewers (typically 3).
- Associate editor collates comments and makes a ruling on the suitability of the manuscript for publication. Vogt sends the decision to AMPA, AMPA or the PM sends the reviews to the primary author. The primary author goes through the comments and determines how to address them (generally a matrix, but doesn't need to be). The plan to address the comments (e.g., matrix) is sent from the author to AMPA and then to ISPR (Vogt). In instances where the comments are clear, the author can simply revise the manuscript and describe how comments are addressed and send it back to ISPR (via AMPA). This decision is best discussed with the PM to maximize efficiency of the process. Once ISPR has agreed with the revisions and 'accepted' the manuscript, it is sent back to CMER for final review and approval. All documents (drafts, revisions,

matrices, reviews, etc.) will be available for CMER members via a dropbox set up by the PM.

Discussion revolved around what isn't working in the current process and how it can be improved moving forward. Harry Bell commented that CMER should make sure the study designs are good and that they go through ISPR so the study design isn't challenged when the actual study goes through ISPR.

Decisions:

TWIG

- ◆ ***Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Effectiveness TWIG** – *approval of draft study design alternative and recommendation report*

Dave Schuett-Hames gave a summary of the comment process and reported that review of the document raised some concerns. The TWIG is withdrawing the request for approval while additional work is done on addressing reviewer concerns. Howard Haemmerle requested that any CMER members that may have additional comments please come forward so that the TWIG can address all of them while working on the current concerns.

Discussion revolved around the TWIG/Lean process and how CMER's role in it is working in this case.

Updates:

Report from Policy – *April 9 and 10 meeting*

Todd Baldwin and Hans Berge gave a report on the April 9 and 10 Policy meeting and field tour. 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 requested recommendations or volunteers for a new CMER Co-chair. Discussion revolved around process and requirements for Co-chairs. Hicks commented that he has spoken to a few people about volunteering. Nancy Sturhan commented that a request needs to go to Policy as it requires buy-in from supervisors.

LWAG

- ◆ **Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study** – **Hard Rock** – *update*

Haemmerle reported that most of the chapters are being prepped for ISPR. Aimee McIntyre is working on this and will send them to Berge when they are ready. They will be going in blocks, with the first block going sometime next month, and the next a month later. Berge gave an overview of how this will be handled in the ISPR process. There are a few chapters left that have gone through CMER review and they are working on addressing the comments now.

◆ **Amphibian Buffer Shade Study** – *update*

Berge reported that comments are being worked on and Marc Hayes is working with Jim McCracken on this. McCracken is slow to respond.

RSAG

◆ **Extensive Monitoring Remote Sensing Proposal** – *update*

Haemmerle reported that Dr. Monica Moskal and her representative, Andrew Cook, attended the last RSAG meeting and they have started working on the literature review. They are looking into temporal data, how it changes, what the cost is, and how it can fit into the literature review.

SAGE

◆ **Eastern Washington Type N Forest Hydrology Study** – *ISPR update*

Kodi-Jo Jaspers reported that she has received the ISPR comments and will be sending them on to Dan Miller for incorporation into the report.

UPSAG

◆ **Glacial Deep-Seated Landslide Project** – *update*

Sturhan reported that the sole source contract was rejected by DNR and that it will be competitively bid. She and Haemmerle are working on a Request for Quotes and Qualifications (RFQQ) to put out to bid. Julie Dieu commented that they considered putting it out as a Request for Proposal but decided to go with an RFQQ for a literature review. They expect to have the RFQQ out by June or July.

TWIG

◆ **BMP Roads Effectiveness Project TWIG** – *update*

Dieu reported that the TWIG had a phone conference on Friday and assigned jobs. Sturhan asked if they are having the same issue with scoping document vs study design. Dieu replied yes. They are meeting again next month.

◆ **Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project TWIG** – *update*

Leah Beckett reported that the TWIG's first in person meeting is in May. They will work on trying to get the scope of how many wetlands fit under the definition of forested wetlands. The TWIG is interested in how the Forest Practices Rules apply.

◆ **Unstable Slope Criteria TWIG** – *update*

Gregg Stewart reported that they are working on getting Policy's concerns about the problem statement and hope to get it approved by Policy next month. They will be working on the alternatives next.

◆ **ENREP TWIG** – *update*

Stewart reported that the TWIG hopes to get a modified version of the study design to CMER in the next two months.

PSM

◆ **Status of Chapter 7 review.**

Sturhan reported that she hasn't had much time to work on it, but they are working on a schematic as it is a large chapter and encompasses a lot.

Schuett-Hames commented that the TWIG process needs to be added to Chapter 7 and asked to put it on the agenda for the next meeting to discuss the process and how it could be incorporated.

CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- Hicks will submit a new mark-up of the Type F TWIG document by Monday, May 4, then meet with the TWIG to discuss concerns and see how they can be addressed. Anyone else wishing to comment must submit them by May 4, 2015.
- May science session item: Recap of criteria of what TWIGs are judged by, identify challenges thus far, and identify people who would be on a sub-group to work on this.

Adjourned