

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
December 18, 2007
NWIFC
Draft Notes**

Attendees:

*Baldwin, Todd (v and ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Black, Jenelle	NWIFC, CMER Project Manager
*Butts, Sally	USFWS, CMER Co-Chair
Cramer, Darin	DNR Forest Practices, Adaptive Management Administrator
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG co-chair
Dunphy, Greg	Lummi Tribe
*Ehinger, Bill	WDOE, RSAG Tri-Chair
Heckel, Linda	DNR Forest Practices, CMER Coordinator
Heide, Pete	WFPA
*Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, CMER Project Manager
*Martin, Doug	WFPA contractor
*McConnell, Steve (v and ph)	UCUT
*McCracken, Jim	Longview Timberland, LWAG Co-Chair
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus contractor, RSAG Tri-Chair
*Miller, Dick	WA Farm Forestry Association
*Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Moon, Teresa	DNR, CMER Project Manager
Phillips, Jeff	Skagit River System Cooperative
Robinson, Tom	Counties
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC, CMER Co-chair
*Veldhuisen, Curt	Skagit River System Cooperative

* indicates official CMER members and alternates

v indicates attended via video-conferencing; ph indicates attended via phone

Assignments:

From December Meeting:	
Send the Post-Mortem response matrix prepared for the ISPR reviewers to the original CMER reviewers ASAP	Julie Dieu
Send revised Post-Mortem Study Design to original CMER reviewers on January 14, 2008	Julie Dieu
CMER Reviewers need to have comments back to Julie by January 18, 2008	All Reviewers
Make edit changes to the Project Managers Roles and Responsibilities section of the PSM and send it to CMER for their review at the CMER January meeting.	Darin Cramer
Confirm the January CMER meeting science session (Red Alder, Wildfish Conservancy, or Risk Model)	Sally Butts

Science Conference Presentation abstracts are due to Linda by January 14 th .	All presenters
--	----------------

Assignments:

From November Meeting:	
Schedule a meeting of the Type N sub-group for mid-January (week of the 14 th) and send it out via email.	Nancy Sturhan
Bring summary of BTO add-on site selection issues at the January meeting, both the original BT study and the BTO add-on study.	Terry Jackson

Assignments:

From October Meeting:	
Presentations due to Linda by noon on 2/19/08 to load onto the laptop for conference.	All Presenters
Accuracy and Bias Study report and recommendation back to CMER in December	Laura Vaugeois/Jenelle Black

Assignments:

From September Meeting:	
Update the CMER membership rosters with phone numbers	Linda Heckel

Minutes from October meeting and action items – Sturhan/Heckel

Minutes from the November meeting, with Dick Miller’s comments, were approved.

Policy Meeting Recap– Cramer

Darin reviewed the items that were discussed at the December Policy meeting which included: Information management system update; DFC policy questions 8-9 recommendations are due to policy in January; Buffer Integrity/Shade Effectiveness project request for additional funding; Water typing/compliance monitoring; and the Forests & Fish Support Account discussion.

Groundwater Recharge Area Rule – Deep Seated Landslides Science Session - Veldhuisen

Before Curt started his presentation Dick asked him to update CMER on the roads project that the Skagit River System Coop (SRSC) is working on. Curt explained that the Skagit River System Coop is a tribal enterprise and has two member tribes, Swinomish and Sauk-Suiattle Tribes. The project is an issue that came up because they approached DNR state lands to do some RMAP effectiveness monitoring within SRSC basins on state lands. It raised a question of why isn’t DNR state lands a part of the CMER projects? It was a decision from Policy that CMER doesn’t do projects on other HCP lands, including DNR State Lands. What complicates this is DNR state lands HCP follows FFR rules for roads. Some feel that DNR state lands should be a part of the CMER project. DNR state lands NW has declined to have SRSC do the project because they would like to be in the CMER study or develop their own study. There is discussion going on about how DNR state lands and CMER projects might have more integration on projects and how they can coordinate better in the future.

Curt then presented an overview of the ground water recharge/deep seated landslide rule and the scoping work that UPSAG has done. UPSAG needs more time to finish the scoping report and develop specific recommendations.

Accuracy and Bias Study Design - Dieu

Julie Dieu updated the group on where they are with the Accuracy and Bias Study revisions in response to the CMER review. They are a little behind of meeting their deadline of making edits. Garth Anderson from DNR's NW Region is working on it and he should be able to complete this week and then it will go to the next UPSAG meeting. CMER members will see the document at the January CMER meeting along with a recommendation.

Post-Mortem Study Design and Big Storm Report - Dieu

Julie then gave a briefing on the storm damage. The Astoria and Willapa Hills areas saw the largest wind damage, gusts were up to 130 mph with sustained at 50-60 mph. Quinalt area had some damage, especially in old growth stands, but north of there was not.

The largest rainfall occurred in the upper Chehalis Watershed, more so than in the Aberdeen area. As the water came down the valley to Aberdeen it dissipated and was a non event as it arrived. The backside of the Willapa Hills/Grays River area (east slope) has some landslides. Isolated areas in the Chehalis took a horrendous amount of water 14 inches in 12 hours with a little rain on snow component. Discreet areas have a lot of landslides that are quite deep and wide. They initiated in areas of low to moderate risk. The Doty area flood station gauge hit 30 feet before it was washed out.

Julie mentioned the photo in the Seattle Times and mentioned that before judgment is passed on a single photo, we need to get our facts. Chris commented that regardless of the photo's quality the SPL's (shallow rapid landslides) still blew through the RMZ that resulted in direct delivery to Stillman Creek.

Jenelle stated that landslides also happen lower in the watershed too; and that such things occurred in response to such high storm intensity wasn't really surprising.

Landowners are still trying to figure out their losses (trees, roads, bridges, etc.). They are doing damage assessment and the basic message is they feel there are probably enough landslides to justify initiating the Post-Mortem Project. Pete thought this is a great opportunity for CMER to use the Post-Mortem Study Design for it is a well- thought -out and understood project. Raise the level of recognition of CMER. Doug agreed and said there is so much in the press about this, quantifying it is really important. Because a lot of different landowners are affected, it could be really helpful to do this study now.

Sally questioned if this storm damage would trigger a lot of salvage logging? Julie wasn't sure because the market is in the slump right now, low timber prices, etc. Tom Robinson said a lot of companies are pulling back and salvage off state lands might be growing because other landowners aren't logging.

Julie then talked about the ISPR review of the Post-Mortem Study Design. This took a long time; it went to ISPR in April and was completed in November. UPSAG has been working on responding to ISPR comments; of those comments, 3-4 substantive changes have been agreed upon by UPSAG.

There were a lot of comments that could be lumped into the category of “we heard you, thank you, but...” ODF feels very strongly we need to use watershed as the sampling unit. Other reviewers thought that you have to pick something and either one, watersheds or the four-square-mile blocks, can be valid. UPSAG have chosen square blocks for landowner access and ease of GIS selection and data analysis. ODF collected a lot of channel data, they still feel more needs to be collected. UPSAG is going to work with them. Extensive set of “sorry buts” comments – about the natural environment just not a perfect place to be doing research. Likely to be a problem but there isn’t much we can do about it.

The timeline for this is to go to the FPB in February. That would mean to CMER at their January meeting for approval/buyoff. Policy will see it in February. The group feels this is the right time and want to expedite this. Julie asked that once the CMER reviewers get the revised study design and associated materials on January 14th that they have their review completed by January 18th. She will send out an email ASAP with all currently available materials and to alert CMER reviewers not present today.

Darin asked that CMER members please talk with their policy representatives to make them aware this is coming to them in February to get up to speed. If UPSAG has something short they could present to Policy in January that would help. Julie will work with Darin on this.

Question about the CMER Work Plan - Miller

Dick Miller asked a question is ISAG responsible for streams and stream typing? What was heard from people is that no one agency is stepping up to the plate to get it done. Some say it should be landowners, some say it should be compliance monitoring. Dick also asked if the wild fish group was following standard protocol and is that information being fed into the database? Industry was actually doing stream typing and sending that information in, but is that being put into the database? There seems to be a lot of effort but it isn’t coordinated nor is anyone stepping up to the plate to get it done.

Chris Mendoza mentioned that there WAC 222-16-031 says the landowner is responsible for typing their streams. In the absence of not doing that, there are physical defaults that must be used that are spelled out in WAC - 031. But, there is a small landowner office to assist the small landowners to do that, but they are underfunded. Terry reminded the group that there was new funding available this biennium to assist the smalls with their water typing issues. Dick’s concern was that people are collecting data and there is some barrier getting that into a common statewide database.

Darin reminded the group that there is a process that needs to happen: 1. form submitted to DNR regional office and 2. there needs to be concurrence. It is voluntary but the form is needed for the database to be changed. CMER’s work on water typing is done and turned over to Policy.

The model is as good as it gets. People don't like it because it isn't 100% accurate and they aren't accepting model error on their land.

Julie stated that the policy decision at the time was to split the modeling error between over and under prediction of fish habitat. However, most field folks can't seem to live with that error.

Project Management – Cramer

The latest draft of the project manager roles and responsibilities section was presented by Darin. Members suggested building in some flexibility based on specific project needs. It was also noted that #6 was in conflict with another responsibility. Nancy said that was in error and will be deleted. Nancy also mentioned that PMs, PIs and SAG representatives need to work together and keep the 3-way leadership going during the project process.

Darin will make the suggested edits and send it to CMER prior to the January meeting for another review.

ISPR Update – Cramer

(Please note that due to technical difficulties, Todd Baldwin and Steve McConnell were unable to connect in to the meeting. Both Todd and Steve wanted to comment on this draft and participate in the discussion).

Darin mentioned that the fish projects that are at ISPR haven't seen any movement since the last CMER meeting. He checked the status tracker and the test bed review is supposed to be done but he hasn't heard anything from them yet. The stream simulation project still doesn't have reviewers assigned.

SAG Issues

Teresa Moon presented a CR 101, Pilot Rule making, for the Type N Experimental Buffer Project. One treatment site needs an even-aged harvest pilot rule for the treatment to occur in 2008 - One landowner cannot have more than 240 contiguous acres in even aged harvest. One of the treatment sites on Rayonier land would exceed this rule, disallowing harvest until 2009, if the pilot rule is not approved. This is going to Policy in January and to the FPB in February.

Amy Kurtenbach updated the members on changes that occurred with the WETSAG committee membership. Dave Parks has left and Candace Cahill of Rayonier is now a co-chair. Other members include: Harry Bell, Green Crow; Deanna Jacobsen, Suquamish Tribe; Charles Chesney, DNR; Jill Silver, 10,000 Years Institute. Ash Rohrbach and Amy are assisting WETSAG with a scoping document. They are still missing DOE and DFW, EPA and they would also like some more tribal members. Current project being worked on is mitigation effectiveness. Next month they are meeting on January 15th, at the tribal center in Poulsbo. They will pick someone to attend CMER meetings and would like to identify one more co-chair.

CMER Report to Policy – Sturhan/Cramer

Items being taken to the January Policy meeting: Type N Experimental Buffer CR 101 request; update on Mass Wasting Prescription Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project (AKA Post-

Mortem) that will be coming to them in February; CMER Co-Chair reminder; Science Conference update, and an update on the Fish Passage projects.

CMER Science Conference Update - Sally

Sally reviewed the tentative agenda for the presentations. There are fewer talks than in the past but we still have a full conference. Some members mentioned they may have to pull their talks. Sally will work directly with those members to see if they will stay on the agenda. Doug mentioned that water quality/Type N should have a talk at the conference. Sally said they are going to have posters, but will follow up with Jack and Bill. Teresa let Sally know that WSU is going to be doing a presentation on Type N Genetics.

Sally mentioned that Andrew Gray from the Forest Service had suggested a poster on forest inventory statistics. However, Andrew withdrew his suggestion to prepare a poster realizing that the focus of the conference was on CMER research.

The Wild Fish Conservancy, Jamie Glasgow, put together a write-up and is still interested in talking at the CMER Conference. Sally read the write-up. Jamie wants to show the work they have been doing in the field, regarding water typing, and the discrepancies found. It would be useful to have a little context with this discussion. Terry mentioned the interactive tool they have on the internet and suggested others go and look at it www.wildfishconservancy.org

Doug stated the group has done good work, but it doesn't fit into the conference mission, the effectiveness of FFR. There are other CMER projects that need to be presented at the conference such as the DOE water temperature study. Terry mentioned that maybe Jamie could still give his presentation to CMER at an upcoming meeting.

Julie mentioned that UPSAG would like to go before the amphibians talks because talking about dirt and rocks after photos of cute creatures is tough; she thinks having the topics blocked up as they are on the current draft would be the best way to go.

RSAG suggested the FPA Desktop Analysis be an agenda item at the conference presented by Steve McConnell. Terry Jackson raised a concern that this presentation, and the issues surrounding it, might be "too hot" and that we may not want to include it in the conference. Her rationale was that the model used at the time of these analyses has been found to be flawed. The report itself was good, but pending the outcomes of the model discussions, the information and/or results may change. Sally then queried CMER members to see if there were other topics that they would like to see presented. Suggestions included the BCIF Type F BTO-Add On, Extensive Monitoring, Type N Water Quality and Hardwood Temperature Modeling (DOE) and the Amphibian Genetics from the Type N Basalt Study. As there is not room for all of these in the program, Dick Miller suggested that CMER rate these talks and select from among them. On his suggestions, these projects were written on the board and rated by CMER members present. Based on the voting, the above topics were selected for inclusion in the conference. It was decided that the Desktop Analysis be dropped from the agenda.

Sally agreed to talk with the presenters of these topics to see if they could commit to presenting at the conference. Dick mentioned he could give presentation about a stream-risk model developed by Gordy Reeves, at a future CMER science session. Mark Mobbs suggested that we try to have Gordy do this presentation.

Sally reminded the group that the meeting to dry run the presentations is scheduled for February 12th and includes Dick, Nancy, Darin, Sally and Linda. Anyone else is invited to attend. Place and time will be coming out shortly. All abstracts of presentations are due to Linda by January 14th.

Future Meetings

CMER 2008 Regular Meetings: January 22, February 26, March 25, April 22, May 27, June 24, July 22, August 26, September 23, October 28, November 25th and December 16.

2008 Science Conference: February 20th, 2008, OB2