

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee  
(CMER)**

**November 20, 2012  
DNR/DOC Compound**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
chesney, charles (ph)	Dept. of Natural Resources, SAGE Co-chair
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Hayes, Marc	Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept. of Natural Resources, AMPA
Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG Co-chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept. of Natural Resources
*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
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Greg	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Sturhan, Nancy (ph)	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Wilhere, George	Dept. of Fish & Wildlife

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

**Agenda** – No changes were made to the agenda.

**CMER Monthly Science Session** – Chris Mendoza facilitated the discussion and provided an overview of the CMER Master Schedule as negotiated by three of the six caucuses last spring. The main purpose for the CMER Master Schedule is to ensure that priority projects are fully funded and completed on a set timeline, and additional human resources are identified if needed so that CMER can plan accordingly. CMER and Policy will still have the opportunity to modify this schedule (by consensus) based on shifting work plan priorities, projects unforeseen resulting from research yet to be completed, and review and potential revisions to Schedule L-1.

Jim Hotvedt added the budget figures for the projects identified in the CMER Master Schedule were place-holders based on past experience with completed CMER projects. This was one of the main issues within the negotiations; long-term stable funding for the Adaptive Management Program. The budget figures reflected in the schedule is a base to work from for going to the Legislature for long-term stable funding.

### Decision & Actions:

The Co-chairs will check to see if there are projects in CMER work plan that are missing from the settlement Master Schedule. The Co-chairs will take feedback from CMER on the Settlement Agreement Master Schedule to Policy.

This includes:

- a. Project 2. Amphibian Genetics was originally to begin in 2015 not 2017, and Amphibian population metrics resampling was to occur in 2019 and 2020. No funding is shown for the non-genetics part of the amphibian sampling. (Note: LWAG will quickly recheck these dates and get back to CMER co-chairs).
- b. Project 3. Soft Rock budget estimates are incorrect. In particular year 2015 would also be approximately 360,000 rather than 75,000 dollars.
- c. Project 30. It may have been determined that the Eastside N BCIF is to be subsumed (if feasible) into the Eastside N Effectiveness Study.
- d. Project 25. The Westside F effectiveness study should use the same name as in the workplan (Note: since it is the same I clearly did not get Doug Martin's concern).
- e. Projects 32-37. CMER has issues it needs to resolve regarding long-term extensive monitoring, and the relative cost/benefit of directly measuring temperature.
- f. Project 40. Westside N BCIF resampling was to happen in 2013 based on prior agreement with Policy, but the Master Plan shows monitoring in 2026 and 2031.
- g. A Van Dyke's Salamander study from the workplan is missing from the Master Schedule. (Note: Co-chairs agreed to look for other missing projects).
- h. Alert/remind Policy that resampling efforts may be detrimentally affected by the loss of reference sites (predominantly affecting BCIF and the amphibian re-sampling effort portion of the Type N Hard Rock study).

Nancy Sturhan reviewed the number of projects on the master schedule and she developed a chart that shows the various stages of projects. She discovered CMER will double the number of projects at the start-up phase. Nancy suggested CMER will need a new project manager to handle the doubling of the work load. She also identified the level of expertise needed for projects and highlighted that CMER is short on wetlands expertise. Based on the high number of priority projects connected to this rule group; she thought CMER could keep this expert busy for the next 10 years. She will provide feedback to Policy on a) whether the Master Schedule project timelines (when overlapping) can be achieved using existing human resources, or if not, b) the extent to which additional resources/assistance (the gap) would be needed to meet the Master Schedule timelines.

### **Business Session:**

#### **LWAG –**

- ♦ Review and Synthesis of Literature on Tailed Frogs (genus *Ascaphus*) with Special Reference to Managed Landscapes (report) – ***CMER approved an interactive ISPR process***

Marc Hayes reported to CMER there was a potential to have an interactive review for this literature synthesis; this saves time in the review process and LWAG is familiar with all

the individuals on the review list. There are no controversial issues connected to this literature review.

Doug Martin clarified past interactive reviews were facilitated by the AMPA, not the authors. This provides a third party approach.

Chris Mendoza motioned to approve LWAG's request under the conditions laid out. Dick Miller seconded the motion. CMER members were in consensus.

### **CMER FY14 Work Plan & Budget – CMER approved LWAG's changes except page 28**

- ♦ LWAG submitted updates and changes to their respective sections. CMER members approved all the changes except page 28. LWAG will revise page 28 and return to CMER with those modifications.

### **UPSAG – Update**

- ♦ Post-Mortem Report Six Questions/Findings Report  
Julie Dieu reported she and Greg Stewart have developed a draft. They had some confusion about how to respond to *Question #6: How much incremental understanding does the study represent?* They thought this seemed like a synthesis question and asked CMER for clarity in what they were supposed to be doing.

Mark Hicks & Jim Hotvedt reported Policy understood the research report implicitly included the synthesis of the research. The direction from Policy was to have the authors answer the standard six questions that typically accompany the research report; send the authors responses to the same set of CMER reviewers for them to answer the six questions and to document any disagreements if there are any that may emerge from this process.

Julie Dieu clarified CMER is supposed to provide a six questions document to Policy. The authors respond to the six questions, the authors send their responses to the CMER reviewers and document the disagreement if there are any. She suggested an UPSAG/CMER meeting may need to be organized to discuss the real disagreements and to figure out how to incorporate this into the document. This document will be sent into CMER for approval to send to Policy.

The CMER Reviewers were Terry Jackson, Paul Kennard, Nancy Sturhan, Mark Hicks, Doug Martin, Dick Miller, AJ Kroll, and Alice Shelly. The UPSAG Reviewers were Leslie Lingley, Isabelle S., Chris Mendoza and Ted Turner.

### **LEAN Process – Recommended Revisions**

Mark Hicks reported that at the last CMER meeting the charter for the Eastside Type F was discussed and there was some confusion. He has met with the TAG since that meeting to discuss the timing issue and the TWIG process. He clarified implementation of the TWIG was an outcome of the LEAN process CMER undertook last winter and

spring. It seemed there were some hiccups with trying something new and it was important to try to fix this before another generation of issues emerges for CMER. The recommended revisions attempt to clean up the timing, clarify the role of the initial writing point of the TWIG and the AMPA's role. He pointed out the AMPA has more of a role in forming the TWIG and jumpstarting one.

Marc Hayes suggested rewording 1.3 to make sure the AMPA does not write the charter.

### **CMER Information Management System (IMS) - Update**

Nancy Sturhan reported the NWIFC was gearing up to develop the contract proposal for this year's work. She counted 56 projects were not in the IMS yet; there were 20 projects in the system. There were 35 projects with GIS components. Teresa Miskovic has returned part time to review the projects and collect what information is needed. She noted Teresa will be checking in with CMER members about project components. Nancy plans to have a proposal for CMER next month for approval of the projects to work on for this year. The NWIFC has received \$20,000 a year for this work.

### **CMER - CMER Monthly Science Sessions Update**

Mark Hicks reported Eddie Cupp will present on the Bull Trout Overlay Study next month and Kathy Dube' will present on Road Prescription Monitoring in January.

### **CMER Protocols & Standards: Status Update**

- ♦ Chapters 4, 5 & 6 – Comment & Review  
Ash Roorbach reported he presented on chapters 4, 5 & 6 at the last month's CMER meeting. CMER agreed to send these chapters to the SAGs, as Chapter 4 has a decision-making table, and CMER needs their input. The comment deadline has been extended to November 30<sup>th</sup>. He will bring back those comments to the December CMER meeting.

### **LWAG – Update**

- ♦ Stream-Associated Amphibian Response to Manipulation of Forest Canopy Shading  
Marc Hayes reported the draft of this report went back to the CMER reviewers. The CMER reviewers endorsed the comments matrix with exception of Chris Mendoza. Marc met with Chris and addressed the comments; Chris responded that some of his comments were not addressed in a manner he'd hoped and Marc Hayes has not received a response from Chris.

Chris Mendoza reported that the authors had already made several changes in response to reviewer comments and he was almost there; but that there were still a few comments he expected to be more adequately addressed.

Mark Hicks reported he had commented about the need to be clear about how shade was manipulated and requested this to be addressed in the abstract and summary.

Marc Hayes replied that comment was addressed by Jim McCracken.

Mark Hicks requested Marc Hayes to send him an email before it gets to CMER.

Marc Hayes replied normally it comes to CMER and the comments are identified as addressed or not addressed.

Dick Miller asked if this explanation take place in the matrix.

Mark Hicks replied this normally does take place in the matrix.

### **RSAG – Update**

- ♦ Eastside Extensive Riparian Status & Trends Monitoring Final Report (Eastside Type F Extensive)

Amy Kurtenbach reported the draft final report needs to go through a final RSAG review. Bill Ehinger brought it to RSAG, the report went through ISPR, and the author is responding to the ISPR comments. Once this is completed, the report will be forwarded to CMER reviewers. The CMER reviewers are: Todd Baldwin, Leslie Lingley, Marc Hayes and Chris Mendoza. Amy will forward the draft final report and the ISPR matrix to the CMER reviewers. The CMER reviewers have two weeks to comment; the due date for comments was December 7<sup>th</sup>. Amy will collect the CMER reviewers' comments and take it back to RSAG.

### **SAGE – Update**

- ♦ Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project  
charles chesney reported Ash Roorbach and Dave Schuett-Hames submitted a summary to SAGE. They are pursuing a method for regional patterns and vegetation. Greg Stewart is preparing 3 or 4 MBG data sets (vegetation models); SAGE has a TAG to work with Ash & Dave to bring this project to a conclusion. The TAG decided to drop the plant association groups due to the guidance given in the book and supported getting a sample to characterize the plants. EWRAP was characterized 40 feet off the slope one transect per site. This method is inconsistent with the plant data method. Any indication of disturbance, caused the plot sample to move to the next undisturbed plant site. EWRAP is full of disturbance, noisy data, making it hard to identify with confidence the plant community in that area and undue disturbance. Greg evaluated 25 data sets.
- ♦ Eastside Type N Characteristics Forest Hydrology Project  
charles chesney reported the next SAGE meeting will be at the Kalispel Casino and the contractors will be there to present on the initial results. They are into database construction and are putting all 2012 field data into this database.

He also reported the contractors did not correctly communicate with the landowners about access as communicated to him by Jim Matthews. About seven major landowners contacted Jim Mathews and reported they were not correctly communicated with. Thirty sites were added to this project. Jim Mathews wanted a full accounting of what happened as he was the hunter for the sites and made the initial contact with the landowners. charles added this has not been discussed much and he would hate to see the spirit of cooperation diminished.

Jim Hotvedt suggested taking the positive approach; send a letter to all landowners and give them a status update with a statement about expectations for being contacted and apologizing for not doing so if this is the case. He wanted to use a positive approach with a status and an apology. This resided with the AMPA.

#### **TWIG – Update**

- ♦ Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project -  
Greg Stewart sent a memo to Jim Hotvedt with the recommendation for forming a TWIG for this project. Amy Kurtenbach suggested pulling the TWIGs off from the SAGs on the CMER agendas.

#### **CMER – Items to take to December 6, 2012 Policy Meeting:**

- ♦ CMER co-chairs will review Appendix A in the CMER work plan to ensure projects are reflected in the CMER Master Schedule; revise timelines and incorporate CMER feedback. They will write up the revisions/decisions and this will be shared with Policy.
- ♦ Nancy Sturhan, Dave Schuett-Hames and Jim Hotvedt will meet and draft up the human resources needed in order to accomplish what is reflected in the CMER Master Schedule and this will be shared with Policy.

#### **CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments:**

- ♦ CMER co-chairs will review Appendix A in the work plan to ensure projects are reflected in the CMER Master Schedule, revise timelines and incorporate feedback from the CMER meeting today. They will develop a revised CMER Master Schedule and share this with Policy.
- ♦ Nancy Sturhan, Dave Schuett-Hames and Jim Hotvedt will meet and write up the human resources needed in order to accomplish what is reflected in the CMER Master Schedule. This will be shared with Policy.
- ♦ The TWIG IWT for the Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Study will meet ASAP.

***Meeting Adjourned.***