

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)
April 24, 2018
DNR/DOC Industrial Park, Tumwater WA

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe
Beechie, Tim	NW Fisheries Science Center
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Cooke, Andrew	University of Washington
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Davis, Emily	Northwest Indian Fish Commission – CMER Staff
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish & Wildlife
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association – CMER Co-Chair
Johnson, Angela	Department of Natural Resources
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Green Crow - CMER Co-Chair
§Martin, Doug (ph)	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Nation
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Stewart, Greg (ph)	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff

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

*Indicates Decision

Science Session:

- ◆ **Assessment of Riparian Conditioning Using LiDAR and Aerial Photography**
 Tim Beechie (NW Fisheries Science Center) gave a presentation and answered questions.

- ◆ **Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring – Implementation Pilot Project**
 Andrew Cooke (UW Precision Forestry) gave a presentation and answered questions.

- ◆ **Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study – presentation**
Mark Hicks (Department of Ecology) gave a presentation and answered questions.
- ◆ **BCIF 10 Year Report – presentation**
Dave Schuett-Hames (Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission) gave a presentation and answered questions.

Decisions:

CMER

- ◆ ***February meeting minutes**
Chris Mendoza motioned for approval, Marc Hayes seconded – **Approved**
- ◆ ***March meeting minute**
Hayes motioned for approval, Harry Bell seconded - **Approved**

RSAG

- ◆ **Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring - Implementation Pilot Project – request for reviewers**

The review will be a joint CMER and RSAG review. Request called for reviewers. Hicks expressed concern that RSAG is loaded with so many voting members that he would like to get a fresh set of eyes on it. He asked if there were some potential reviewers outside of RSAG. Mark Mobbs and Doug Martin (volunteered by Bell) were suggested. Angela Johnson will ask Todd Baldwin to review it, as well.

Reviewers: Hicks, Julie Dieu, Mendoza, Bell, Hayes.

Updates:

- ◆ **Report from Policy – April 5, 2018 meetings**

Hans Berge reported on the budget discussion at the April Policy meeting. Jenny Knoth asked if CMER should be expecting anything from Policy. Berge said no. Joe Murray pointed out that this could be changed at the Board, with regards of the Riparian Literature Review; it could come back even though there is no money for it. Berge agreed.

Timber Fish & Wildlife Policy meeting minutes are located 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

◆ **CMER Science Conference**

Dieu reported that there will be posters for display at the conference; Amanda Manaster will bring one for the Roads project. Emily Davis is making one for the Type F project. Hayes wondered why there is 40 minutes for genetics and wants to know if he can talk on Van Dykes as well. This change will be made to the agenda.

SAG and TWIG Updates

Johnson asked if anyone had questions regarding the updates. Howard Haemmerle reported that LWAG revisions of Van Dykes are now back at ISPR. Johnson pointed out that the updates have been reformatted and some TWIGs were converted to project teams.

Discussion:

◆ **TWIG Process and How “Project Teams” are Formed From It**

Mendoza talked about his straw dog pulled from the Protocol and Standard Manual (PSM) and the Forest Practices Board Manual on how TWIG members are chosen. He noted that a more formal process could be placed in PSM Ch. 8, but as of right now the three TWIGs that have moved to Project Teams have stayed mostly the same. The members need to be able to change when someone is done with a section or expertise is needed for another part. He just wanted to keep it going and wanted to provide something for people to comment on.

Roorbach remarked that when they were writing up the duties of the Project Team they identified the need to have an oversight group outside of the Project Team.

Kneth pointed out that the straw dog is mostly in PSM Chapter 7. Discussion revolved around how to move this forward and what changes are needed. Mendoza stated that selection of the team is not in chapter 7. Bell expressed concern about the conflict of interest with someone being on the TWIG and then being paid to be on the Project Team. Right now, a list of potential members are created and then Berge reviews that list, but how are they approved by CMER?

Murray noted that now that the Adaptive Management Program is moving away from TWIGS, is there a need for a formal process for the last two TWIGS (Unstable Slopes Criteria and Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project) without a Project Team. Berge agrees that the study design phase is the TWIG process and now implementation will be the Project Team. If a TWIG member is chosen to be on a Project Team, Bell would like there to be documentation of the decision. Berge noted that those details are in the contract. Mendoza noted that with TWIGs going away, new projects now come to CMER and will follow PSM Chapter 7. Berge expressed the hope that CMER will remember the things that did and did not work from the TWIG process. Roorbach noted that one of the differences of a Project Team member is that they are committing time to the project. It would be useful for CMER to have the Project Team list of who is working on the project. Berge replied that those details are captured in the contracts. Roorbach would like documentation of all project team members, even CMER members working in-kind, what they are committing, and what they will be doing to be identified. Knoth thinks that would be captured in the Charter and Communication Plan identified in PSM Chapter 7.

Mendoza pointed out that the only criteria missing from PSM Chapter 7 is team selection criteria. He borrowed how a TWIG is picked as an example. Knoth thinks all that is needed is included in PSM Chapter 7. Berge noted that the Project Manager (PM) is a huge part of choosing what group will be able to work together and have the expertise that is needed. Mendoza noted that PMs have never had the authority to select a team, it was understood that the TWIG would know what expertise is needed more than PMs would. They have always been a team member, but not as a decision maker. Berge noted that PSM Chapter 7 is on Project Managers to get those details captured. There is a check-in at CMER on skill sets and qualifications, but there is no way CMER can select a member. Haemmerle pointed out PM responsibilities are detailed in PSM Chapter 7. Roorbach remarked that hopefully the Principle Investigator (PI) is working with the PM to make sure they have the right team. A PI needs to be identified for each project.

Hicks stated that this has been done a number of ways. Someone has to say, “that team looks complete.” That could be the PM or AMPA. They then coordinate the team. This doesn’t need wordsmithing, an excellent team is the desired outcome. Bell thinks the PI would be more capable to evaluate a project team member over PM and the PI would play a substantial role in team member selection or evaluation. Berge thinks that is true and agreed with Hicks, it needs to be flexible on how team members are selected. The PI would be a critical piece.

Knoth thinks there needs to be documentation, or CMER can look at decisions made so nothing is missed. Berge said the door is open to PM for any details needed. Knoth asked

if charters and plans will be coming out for the projects. Haemmerle reported that he has started working on them for the Roads Project and ENREP.

Knoth asked if CMER would be fine moving forward with PSM Chapter 7 as is. Bell noted that there are some edits needed in the PSM as discussed at the last meeting.

◆ **ISAG – CMER’s Role in Board Directed Projects**

Knoth noted this is not an ISAG issue, but a CMER issue. “How does CMER handle Board directed projects?” It was brought up at ISAG given that many thought that ISAG was being reformed to start work on the Board directed Potential Habitat Break (PHB) project and were confused that they were given a study design without room to discuss. Berge noted that PHB study never came to CMER. This was not a CMER project and stayed at Policy and the Board. However, he wanted to loop CMER and ISAG in given that as this moves forward it would be something that would likely come to CMER. Berge thinks there is a role for CMER on the PHB project. Mendoza noted that one of the reasons a Board directive is chosen outside of CMER is a lot of the time when something is a board directive it is due to need for an expedient result to avoid CMER’s process, which can slow it down. Berge remarked that another reason to send the study plan out to ISAG is so that it is not cold if it does come to CMER. Bell pointed out that the AMP is supposed to use the CMER process and this is a fundamental change for how it was done before. Berge noted that this was a “one off.” Bell noted that this was a major project of importance; the study design did not go to CMER as it was designed to in the past. Knoth expressed concern that the budget was determined that CMER did not agree to. Berge pointed out that CMER does not have a budget, they have a Board approved budget for CMER. Mendoza noted there have been several projects that the Board directed outside of the standard CMER process. Knoth wants to make sure that CMER stays aware of where this project is going and see ISPR comments. Berge replied that if the Board wants this project to be implemented it would go through the CMER process and follow the PSM.

Mendoza noted that one reason projects need to go to CMER to assign to a SAG, not Policy or the Board going to SAGs, is to avoid someone stalling it because they did not get to vote on it. If CMER is going to be included, then it should go through the standard CMER process laid out in the PSM.

Knoth requested that there be communication channels open for this and CMER stays informed. She asked when ISPR comments are expected to come back. Berge replied that he is expecting them soon and the study design team will be incorporating both sets of

comments into a matrix. Knoth asked if those could be sent out to all of CMER and not just ISAG, Berge agreed.

Public Comment Period

No public comments.

Recap of Assignments/Decisions approved

- ◆ Tim Beechie will not be sending out his PowerPoint, but does have a newly published paper he will send out to CMER.
- ◆ February and March meeting minutes approved.
- ◆ RSAG Extensive Pilot will be reviewed by Mark Hicks, Julie Dieu, Chris Mendoza, Harry Bell and potentially Mark Mobbs, Doug Martin, and Todd Baldwin.
- ◆ Van Dykes Literature Review will be added to the CMER Science Conference agenda.

Adjourn