# Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

## January 25, 2011
## DNR/DOC Compound

| Attendees | Representing |
|---|---|
| Almond, Lyle (ph) | Makah Tribe |
| *Baldwin, Todd (ph) | Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair |
| Bigley, Richard | Dept. of Natural Resources |
| *Dieu, Julie | Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair |
| Ehinger, Bill | Department of Ecology |
| *Hicks, Mark | Department of Ecology, SRSAG Co-chair |
| Hitchens, Dawn | Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator |
| Hotvedt, Jim | Dept. of Natural Resources, Adaptive Management Program Administrator |
| *Jackson, Terry | Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, CMER Co-Chair |
| Janisch, Jack | Department of Ecology |
| Kay, Debbie | Suquamish Tribe |
| Kurtenbach, Amy | Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager |
| *Kroll, A.J. | Weyerhaeuser, LWAG Co-Chair |
| *Lingley, Leslie | Dept. of Natural Resources |
| *Martin, Doug | Washington Forestry Protection Association |
| Mathews, Jim (ph) | Yakama Indian Tribe |
| *Mendoza, Chris | Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair |
| *Miller, Dick | Washington Family Forestry Association |
| Mobbs, Mark | Quinault Tribe |
| Phillips, Jeff | Skagit River Systems Coop. |
| Ricklefs, Jeff | Dept. of Natural Resources |
| Roorbach, Ash | CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission |
| Schuett-Hames, Dave | CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission |
| *Sturhan, Nancy | Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission |
| Stewart, Greg | CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission |
| Todd, Steve | Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG Co-Chair |
| Walters, Jody | National Marine Fisheries Services |

* Indicates official CMER members and alternates; ph indicates attended via phone & v indicates attended by video conferencing.

**Agenda**

Steve Todd requested to add WETSAG issues related to schedule L1 and dispute resolution.

**Future Science Sessions Topics**

The Alsea Watershed talk is confirmed for the April CMER meeting.
Chris Mendoza has a call into Phil Peterson to present at the March CMER meeting.
Jim Hotvedt reported that Doug Ryan, editor/presenter from a riparian workshop in 2008 held in Forks, may be willing to present on the results of that workshop.
Doug Martin suggested that Doug Ryan may be better suited to present in March as Phil Peterson's field season maybe starting at that time.

Dick Miller suggested Tom Spies in Oregon to present on vegetation succession in riparian zones.

Julie Dieu and Amy Kurtenbach stated that UPSAG plans to show CMER the Post Mortem report in track changes at the CMER March meeting. UPSAG plans to use this time for a major review of significant revisions/edits/comments and most likely will need two hours on the agenda. Terry mentioned that the Co-Chairs will discuss this possible agenda item need with Julie and Amy prior to the March meeting.

**Business Session**

- CMER 2010 Accomplishments

Jim Hotvedt shared that this document was developed by the project managers and showcases the fact that CMER, CMER staff, coordinator, and project managers, accomplish a lot of work in progress toward producing final research and monitoring reports. Sometimes it is important to remember CMER's efforts and many accomplishments in route to final report production, instead of only concentrating on the problems that are encountered along the way.

Julie Dieu added that this fact sheet demonstrates how CMER's work has progressed from primarily development of study designs to reporting on final results of projects.

CMER members were encouraged to send additions to Amy Kurtenbach.

Terry Jackson suggested that CMER share this with Policy.

- Policy January 6, 2011 Meeting - *Update* - Chris Mendoza provided an overview of the January 6th Policy meeting:
  - Policy focused on legislative updates. Policy noted that the governor's budget that was released in December appears to maintain funding levels for CMER in the short-term. It's early in the session however, and there will be more budget discussions throughout the legislative session so nothing is guaranteed at this point.
  - Accuracy & Bias Direction - Policy supports the direction to proceed with scoping a criteria effectiveness project utilizing existing data from the Post Mortem Study. Policy requested that UPSAG provide a briefing to Policy before proceeding with the study design. Terry Jackson added that Policy will provide a memo to CMER documenting their decision.
  - RMZ Resample - CMER co-chairs reported to Policy that LWAG was scoping out the possibility of the original author doing further analysis of the bird data and writing a report/publication. If LWAG recommends proceeding in this direction after scoping out the costs and benefits, they will bring a funding request to CMER and then to Policy.
  - Sub-Basin Roads Study - Policy was encouraged by the results of the first phase.
  - CMER & Policy co-chairs and the AMPA continued work on the Policy work list.

- CMER meeting schedule & location for 2011

Dawn Hitchens reviewed the CMER meeting dates & locations for 2011. She reminded everyone that, because of a state furlough day being on the normal CMER meeting date, the CMER meeting in February has been changed to Wednesday the 23rd. This is a very important meeting for all to attend because the CMER work plan and budget will be reviewed and approved for the next fiscal year.

- CMER September – November 2010 Meeting notes – ***CMER Approved the meeting notes with changes noted below***

Dawn Hitchens asked CMER if there were changes, edits or suggestions regarding the meeting notes for September through November 2010.

Dick Miller pointed out some grammar changes on page 2 of the September 2010 meetings notes. The change was made from Forests and Fish Adaptive Management Program to the Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program.

The title of the project listed on page 3 of the October 2010 meeting notes was corrected to the Westside Type F and N Extensive Temperature Monitoring Final Report.

CMER members approved the meeting notes as finalized with these changes.

- Research Paper: Social Learning as a Tool to Understand Complex Adaptive Management Institutions – *Announcement*

Nancy Sturhan announced that Kira Furman, the Simon Fraser University student, finished her master's thesis. Her research focused on a social science perspective on the adaptive management program. Kira provided a summary and recommendations that are worth CMER's time to review. Nancy suggested sending the link to the research paper out to the CMER listserv and CMER agreed.

- CMER Information Management Systems project – *Update*

Nancy Sturhan reported that she has received a bid from SHIAP, but needs to resolve a few issues on project information before bringing the proposal to CMER. This information will be used to develop the statement of work and a budget for the interagency agreement. She will have a final version for CMER next month.

SRSAG

- Soft Rock Study – *Update*

Chris Mendoza reported that SRSAG is meeting twice a month. Progress is being made and thus far there is agreement among the group to continue working toward the goals and timelines identified in the EPA grant.

- Clean Water Act – *Update*

Mark Hicks noted that there are no major changes. A summary of the milestones is available on the FPB website. This summary of milestones will be shared at the FPB meeting on February 8th.

LWAG

- Amphibian Genetics – *ISPR Update*

AJ Kroll stated that the Amphibian Genetics final report is undergoing the final review. One of the ISPR reviewers requested additional analysis. LWAG supports having the additional analysis conducted as this will not affect their budget or timelines for report completion.

It was clarified that this report reflects the first phase of the amphibian genetics portion of the project. There will be another assessment after one amphibian generation has passed. This second assessment will further inform the possible treatment affects.

- Buffer Shade Integrity – ***CMER Approved Request for Program Development Funding***

AJ Kroll reported that the request for CMER's approval is to have DFW staff complete the analysis for $3400.

Dick Miller recommended that the budget be approved.
Chris Mendoza seconded the motion.

- RMZ Resample – *Update on Further Analyses*

Scott Pearson at DFW is scoping out possible additional analyses on the bird data and will report back to LWAG. LWAG will then determine whether or not to bring a SAG request to CMER.

RSAG

- Hardwood Conversion Project – ***CMER provided Contingent Approval to monument study sites for future possible resampling***

Ash Roorbach reported that this project is nearing completion. This spring will be the fourth and last year for field work and some questions have emerged related to allotted time for post-harvest; is 4 years long enough for judging survival of planted conifers?, RSAG discussed this and approved re-visiting the sites in 2016 to assess the free-to- grow status of planted conifers. This will provide ten years' regeneration data for the hardwood conversion project. This request is to approve installation of permanent monuments at the sites for future sampling. The funding in this request is covered by current project funding. RSAG is requesting CMER approval for the contractor to monument the sites this spring.

This represents a change in scope of the project; therefore, RSAG will need to bring forward a request to CMER at a future meeting. RSAG will then need to provide a presentation to Policy on the rationale, and get approval by Policy before moving forward in this direction. Mark Hicks added that Policy will not meet in February. The earliest that RSAG can present this issue to Policy will be in March. How does that fit with the contractor's schedule?

Ash Roorach responded that the schedule for the contracted deliverables remains the same. The case studies summary and the synthesis report are on scheduled to be completed this next summer. The reports will go through the SAG, CMER review process this fall and winter, and then to ISPR by spring 2012.

Mark Hicks provided a motion that CMER provide contingent approval based on Policy approval.
Chris Mendoza seconded the motion.

- Extensive Riparian Temperature Type F Eastside – *ISPR Update*

Dick Miller stated that this report has two parts. The first phase represents the current "status" of temperature across forest lands regulated under the forest practices rules. The second phase will address the "trends" aspect of the status and trends monitoring. A rotating panel design has been developed to address the trends aspect. RSAG is currently addressing ISPR comments related to the rotating panel design. The budget does not currently include the "trends" phase. Policy will have to be briefed and provide approval before moving forward with the rotating panel design.

- Bull Trout Solar – *ISPR Update*

Dick Miller reported that RSAG has received the ISPR comments on the Solar Study Report "Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Current TFW Shade Methodology for Measuring Attenuation of Solar Radiation to the Stream". RSAG will review and address most of the comments before sending the remaining to the contractor.

- Bull Trout Shade Stream Temperature – *Update*

The field data has been collected. The contractor is analyzing the data and drafting the final report. The RSAG technical advisory group (TAG) is working with the contractor on the analysis phase. The contractor is scheduled to present the results to RSAG in the near future.

**Science Session**

Michael Pollock presented on the Evaluation of Riparian Management Regimes for Conservation of Wood.

- CMER Work Plan Revisions & Issues – *Update*

Terry Jackson announced that the SAG co-chairs need to be prepared to walk through their respective sections (significant revisions) of the CMER 2012 work plan at the February 23rd meeting. This is the meeting where CMER will approve the work plan and budget. This approved work plan and budget will be submitted to Policy for the April budget retreat.

The CMER project functions table will be sent out to the SAGs. The SAGs need to review the table and get any revisions to Terry by February 9th.
Terry Jackson facilitated the discussion on the two work plan issues in disagreement.

- RSAG was in disagreement over the language in the results section of the DFC Validation Project. Specifically page 78: *Differences in mean LCBAPA between the five site class groups were not statistically significant (either by map or field site class).*

The italic text above is what was in dispute. Both CMER co-chairs reminded CMER that this text was lifted from the abstract of the final report and that this should not be deleted or changed. In the future, quotes will be formatted so as to know the difference from the rest of the text within the work plan.

Dick Miller stated that the statement was not supported in the ISPR review because of unequal plot sizes. This issue of possible bias is not reflected in this statement in the work plan.

Dave Schuett-Hames clarified that ISPR stated that the results could be confounded, rather than "lack of support".

Chris Mendoza stated that this is not a new study and that the DFC Validation Study final report was already approved by CMER and Policy and accepted by the FP Board. Mendoza further stated that all CMER members present have already approved the CMER Work Plan (2011) with this exact language so any issues should have been raised then, not now. It is the responsibility of the every CMER member to read what they are approving and not come back a year later to question results that they previously approved. This sets a bad precedent by allowing CMER members to essentially nullify their prior approvals of Reports and Work Plans after the fact.

Doug Martin added that this is a direct quote and that he did not dispute the criticism. ISPR did state that the findings might be biased. He suggested leaving it as is with a footnote. The footnote should reflect the ISPR reference.

Mark Hicks added that this issue of concern is cited as one of the "gaps in knowledge" in the CMER work plan. The information is reflected in the gap section. He is concerned about the concept of nullifying prior approvals of CMER reports as CMER members could go back to any of their studies and cite bias results.

Terry Jackson asked if it is possible that the gap information solves the disagreement.

Mark Hicks also asked Dave Schuett-Hames if he responded to the ISPR comment.
Dave Schuett-Hames replied that he did; the resolution was to write up a proposal for Policy to standardize the plot widths, CMER delivered this proposal to policy as a recommendation, but Policy did not agree to fund it.

The dispute was resolved to keep the language as is in the work plan. Dave Schuett-Hames will work with Chris Mendoza and Dick Miller to insert a footnote to address the issue of concern. This will be resolved in time for CMER review next month.

- WETSAG – Steve Todd shared that WETSAG has a dispute over the interpretation of schedule L1 and the objectives/functions for wetlands. This may need to go to Policy for dispute resolution.

Mark Hicks added that Policy has identified the need to re-look at Schedule L1. From his perspective, following the water quality standards is logical. The water quality standards state existing and designated uses of wetlands, which include vegetation, critters, and human uses that need to be protected.

Nancy Sturhan stated that references to wetlands are scattered throughout the rules. She cited Forest Practices Rules **WAC 222 30** – timber harvesting section:

**WAC 222-30-010 Policy--Timber harvesting. …**
*(4) Wetland areas serve several significant functions in addition to timber production: Providing fish and wildlife habitat, protecting water quality, moderating and preserving water quantity. Wetlands may also contain unique or rare ecological systems. The wetland management zone and wetland requirements specified in this chapter are designed to protect these wetland functions when measured over the length of a harvest rotation, although some of the functions may be reduced until the midpoint of the timber rotation cycle. Landowners are encouraged to voluntarily increase wetland acreage and functions over the long-term. Other laws or rules and/or permit requirements may apply. See chapter 222-50 WAC.

Steve Todd added that WETSAG is at an impasse.

Terry Jackson added that WETSAG will need to document their areas of disagreement clearly, so that Policy will understand them and be able to provide guidance.

Chris Mendoza agreed to send this back to WETSAG with the definition that water quality refers to sediment, habitat, and temperature. It is inclusive of fish and wildlife habitat; water quality and quantity.

CMER members agreed to the broad approach and requested WETSAG to incorporate this into the work plan revisions.

Terry Jackson added that WETSAG needs to be prepared to present to Policy in March.

Steve Todd added that another dispute issue within WETSAG is the need to integrate the rule groups. Terry replied that WETSAG needs to work with UPSAG on opportunities for integration. However, there is not sufficient time to incorporate these ideas into the FY 2012 CMER Work Plan.

- CMER 2012 Budget – *Preliminary Look*

Jim Hotvedt facilitated the discussion on the CMER 2012 budget. He shared spreadsheets that reflected estimates on projected revenues for next year for the Adaptive Management Program. CMER needs to provide information for estimated project budgets in the years beyond 2012. The budget projections currently show 2013 with a funding deficit. Jim suggested that CMER think about recommended options for how to move forward with addressing the deficit. CMER needs to provide Policy with information on how the projects meet the mandate of the work plan and to help them to understand possible implications of cutting projects.

Chris Mendoza stated that deciding which CMER projects to fund is Policy and the FP Board's job, not CMER. If Policy decides not to fund specific CMER projects they may ask CMER for guidance in which case CMER can make recommendations. CMER is responsible for determining how much individual projects cost based on the amount of work / time it will take to answer critical questions developed from Schedule L-1 of the FP HCP.

SAGs need to send updated budget information or suggestions to Jim Hotvedt prior to the February meeting. The revised preliminary budget will be reviewed and approved by CMER on Wednesday, February 23rd.

SAGE

- Type N Characterization project: Forest Hydrology – *Next Steps*

Todd Baldwin shared that he gave a progress report at the December CMER meeting. At the end of the progress report he shared proposed alternatives.

SAGE would like to go back to Dan Miller to get input on possible modifications to the Sample Program.

The Water Type Modification Form Database is unlikely to increase efficiency of site validation.

SAGE proposes moving forward with field validation in 2011-2012 on the remaining 36 sites. The target is to have 105 sites.

WETSAG

- Wetlands Rule Group Strategy – *CMER Approval of Literature Synthesis*

Steve Todd reported that WETSAG submitted five different documents in preparation for this meeting. Two of the documents are SAG requests for CMER approval.

WETSAG requests CMER approval to set aside work on developing field methods to characterize the interaction of forest roads and wetlands. This will redirect WETSAG to 1) conduct a literature synthesis on the effects of forest practices on forested wetlands and 2) scope a forest practices and wetlands field survey.

The second SAG request is to approve the Forest Practices and Forested Wetland Literature Synthesis Project at $ 67,000. If approved, WETSAG will hire a consultant to conduct a literature synthesis on papers that describe the potential effects of harvesting forested wetlands and road construction on wetland functions that support fish, amphibians and water quality.

Mark Hicks added that WETSAG really does not need to limit it to forested lands; that the literature synthesis needs to include roads, temperature, sediment and vegetation and "A" and "B" wetlands as described in the FP rules. He suggested that the literature survey be conducted on a number of issues; take the broad approach.

Leslie Lingley added that she was under the impression from January 3rd meeting that WETSAG would be focused on forested wetlands as there is much known about A&B wetlands from the last literature review conducted by Sarah Cooke. She stated that it seems WETSAG is going backwards to look at A&B wetlands.

Chris Mendoza asked about the timeline in the proposal, as he thought it would not take that long. The SAG request indicates that WETSAG will need 1.5 years to complete the literature synthesis. Jim Hotvedt stated that CMER needs to realize how long it takes for OFM to approve the contract request, as well as the CMER and ISPR review process. Chris Mendoza motioned that CMER approve this with the understanding that WETSAG will present this to Policy.

Dick Miller expressed concern that CMER did not have enough time to review all five documents before this meeting. The documents were sent out to CMER after the deadline for submitting documents for the meeting.

Leslie Lingley proposed that CMER hold off on a decision and review the materials so CMER members are knowledgeable about what is being decided. CMER members agreed to hold off on making a final decision until the February CMER meeting.

UPSAG

- Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Monitoring – *Discussion of Potential Non-Consensus Items*

Julie Dieu reported that UPSAG received CMER comments on the new draft by December 6th; Amy Kurtenbach has reviewed them and created a matrix. The four co-authors have been discussing comments with reviewers. On January 10th UPSAG met and reviewed the comments with reviewers and on the 19th UPSAG meet with Paul Kennard. UPSAG has reached a point where reviewers' comments are at odds with each other. It is clear that UPSAG needs to hold broad discussions. Seven of the eight CMER reviewers are here to meet on the post mortem discussion. CMER reviewers, co-chairs, project manager and the AMPA met after the CMER meeting was adjourned.

- CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments:
  - Send Kira Furman's research paper link (pertaining to Adaptive Management) to the CMER listserv.

- SAG co-chairs will be prepared to share their primary work plan revisions at the February 23rd meeting.
- All CMER members will be prepared to approve the CMER work plan and budget at the February meeting.
- Dave Schuett-Hames will work with Chris Mendoza and Dick Miller to insert a footnote in the DFC Validation Study section of the work plan to deal with the "confounding" issue. This information will be given to Terry as soon as possible for incorporation into the Work Plan. CMER will review this language at the February CMER meeting.
- Send the CMER project functions table out to the SAG co-chairs. They will use this to make the revisions and return to Terry Jackson by February 9th.
- WETSAG will field comments on the five documents reviewed today (to Steve Todd) with the understanding that the requests will be up for CMER decision next month. This is due by February 1st. WETSAG will document issues of disagreement in a format that can be shared with Policy.
- Send comments on the CMER accomplishment summary to Amy Kurtenbach. These will be added to the summary and shared with Policy.

***Meeting Adjourned.***