

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
July 26, 2016
DNR/DOC Compound/Tumwater, WA**

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe – CMER Co-Chair
Beckett, Leah	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
§Bell, Harry (ph)	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Cedar, Kevin	Cramer Fish Sciences
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Garlesky, Jennifer (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes – CMER Staff
Gauthier, Marc (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	WFPA
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Green Crow
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protections Association
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Indian Nation
Ojala-Barbour, Reed	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuetz-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Stewart, Greg	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Teply, Mark	Cramer Fish Sciences
Walter, Jason (ph)	Weyerhaeuser

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

*Indicates Decision

Science Session:

Eastside Modeling Evaluation Project (EMEP) Presentation

Kevin Cedar, Cramer Fish Sciences, gave a presentation on EMEP and he and Mark Teply answered questions. A revised draft of the report will be available the end of August.

Decisions:

TWIGS

- ◆ ***ENREP** – *Approval of study design and questions to go to ISPR*
Doug Hooks asked for clarification of the SAG request. Is the request for approval of the study design and additional questions to go to ISPR, or just the study design? The following topics were discussed regarding this subject:

- Is the study design approved first, then the questions, or vice-a-versa?
- Should just the standard eight questions, or add more?
- Are the questions appropriate for ISPR, or do they try to lead ISPR down a path different than the study design?

Chris Mendoza remarked the study design should be approved first, then the questions. He also stated that he felt that the questions shouldn't be used to settle a dispute. Mark Hicks expressed his frustration with the delays in getting this study design completed and stated that in this case it is probably appropriate to discuss questions first.

Hooks reported that a meeting held on July 12 to try to resolve the issue and that reviewer comments were incorporated into the report. There were extra questions submitted by Harry Bell and Doug Martin. Martin reported that they did not come to resolution at the meeting and that he and Bell asked to add two technical questions to send to ISPR. Discussion revolved around the appropriateness of the questions as some of them can be considered policy questions. Hicks and Hans Berge felt that the questions could be re-written to be more technical and different ways to edit the questions were discussed. Hicks and Julie Dieu suggested that the Best Available Science (BAS) document should be sent with the study design and questions. Mendoza said that stream temperature questions related to clean water act standards are typically answered by Ecology, who regulates them, not ISPR. Greg Stewart replied that the extra questions are mostly scope questions and that he feels that CMER should just vote on the study design, and if not approved, it should go to dispute and be resolved at CMER, instead of sending it to ISPR. Dieu agreed with Stewart. Dave Schuett-Hames encouraged CMER members to do their job and not to send it to ISPR to resolve the issue. Hicks replied that they have been doing their job and it's not getting anywhere. He feels that sending this to ISPR could help shake out the scope vs. technical issues. Schuett-Hames replied that you can predict what will come back from ISPR and that CMER will be right back where they are at this moment and will have to deal with resolving the issue, just several months down the road.

Hooks suggested that discussion move on with approval of the TWIG request, because he was hearing that study design may not be approved.

Schuett-Hames moved to approve the ENREP Type Np (wet) Study Design, standard ISPR review questions, and additional submitted ISPR questions from Martin and Bell. The TWIG also request authorization to have the study design and questions transmitted to the UW for ISPR review, Martin seconded. – Not approved.

Mendoza moved to send the study design with the standard CMER questions striking the additional questions from Martin and Bell. – **Not approved.**

Since there were two decisions that were non-consensus Mendoza requested to start the dispute resolution process.

Next steps: Co-chairs and AMPA will meet with commenters to develop the frame work for a guided resolution.

LWAG

- ◆ **Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Basalt Lithologies (Hard Rock – approval of chapter 13 (Periphyton).**

Reed Ojala-Barbour gave an update on the changes to the chapter and asked for approval to send it to ISPR. – Hicks moved to approve, Mendoza seconded - **Approved**

CMER

- ◆ ***Meeting Minutes Approval – Approval of March-June 2015 and June 2016 meeting minutes**

Patti Shramek asked for approval of the March-June 2015 minutes. Dieu motioned to approve, Baldwin seconded. – **Approved**

Hooks requested a motion to approve the June 2016 minutes. Knoth moved to approve, Hicks seconded - **Approved**

Updates:

- ◆ **Report from Policy – July 7 meeting**

Hans Berge gave a report on the July 7 Policy meeting. 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

- ◆ **Reformation of ISAG**

Berge reported that he is working on re-forming ISAG and has put together recommendations for Co-chairs. He proposed hiring out-side experts to help the SAG define its research goals in order to get this moving and onto the Master Project Schedule for funding in the next biennium.

Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Doug Martin, Jenny Knoth, Jason Walter, Sarah Zaniewski (Squaxin Island Tribe), and Derek Marks (Puyallup Tribe) expressed interest in being on the SAG. Hooks encouraged others who might be interested in participating to contact himself, Berge, or Todd Baldwin to let them know.

Action: Within a week an email will be sent out to set a meeting date.

Bell asked what ISAG will be doing in relation to RSAG. Berge replied that it is in-stream issues; water type model, off-channel habitat, etc. Bell replied that they are interdependent and if water typing is changed then buffers, etc. may need to change. Ash Roorbach asked if Berge has any sense on how this relates to the permanent water-type rule that will be finalized soon. Berge says no relation at this point, but there may be things that come down from Policy when the rule is finalized.

◆ **2017 CMER Science Conference – Discussion and date selection**

Patti Shramek and Berge went over the products that may be ready for presentation and asked if CMER had an interest in doing a Science Conference in 2017. Mendoza replied that he thought it would be useful to do, even its one day. Hicks remarked that in the past the SAGs were asked to submit suggestions for presentations.

Next steps: SAGs will discuss at their next meetings and submit projects for review and decision at the August CMER meeting.

◆ **Forest Chemicals Science Session (October 25) – update**

Knoth reported that speakers are lined up and everything is ready to go and it will be held in the auditorium at Office Building 2.

◆ **October CMER Meeting New Date/Location (October 24) – update**

Shramek reported that the October meeting will be held on Monday, October 24 at the DNR/DOC Compound in Tumwater. The room is reserved for the whole day, but the length of the meeting will be determined closer to the date and will depend on how many decision items will be on the agenda.

RSAG

◆ **Hardwood Conversion Study – update**

Hicks reported that the scope of work for the lead author for the 10 year re-sample was approved by RSAG and is ready to be incorporated into the contract.

◆ **Remote Sensing – update**

Hicks reported that Dr. Moskal attended the last meeting and gave an update on the study. The August RSAG meeting will be held at PAC Forest in order to look at site selection.

TWIG

◆ **BMP Roads Effectiveness Project (study plan)**

Dieu reported that the June meeting was held in Boise and was the TWIGs second face to face meeting. They had a field trip to look at sites that have equipment. They decided that the tipping buckets will need to be bigger for Western Washington. She gave an update of where the TWIG is at on developing the study design. She anticipates a draft study design coming to CMER in November/December.

◆ **Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project (BAS)**

Leah Beckett reported that a complete draft of the BAS has gone through the TWIG and that the final draft should be ready to come to CMER for the 30 day review period in a couple weeks. She will give a presentation at the August CMER meeting, for approval at the September meeting.

◆ **Unstable Slopes Criteria** (*BAS*)

Stewart reported that they have a GoTo meeting scheduled this week and that they haven't gotten as much done as they wanted because of vacations and scheduling conflicts. They may be ready for a presentation at the October CMER meeting.

◆ **Type F Riparian Prescriptions** (*study plan*)

Schuett-Hames reported that the TWIG is continuing to work on the study design. They are meeting every three weeks. Right now they are waiting to get statistical support on-line to help. In the meantime the group is continuing to refine the document.

Additional Discussions:

Hooks asked about the Hard Rock chapter's schedule. Schuett-Hames replied that it is taking longer than anticipated at ISPR. Depending on the comments that come back, the schedule could get set back a little. Berge replied that the issue may be the Synthesis chapter getting done on time. CMER needs to buckle down and review/comment in a timely manner when they receive it so it gets done in time.

Roorbach asked about the timing of filling the Environmental 4 position. Berge replied that interviews have been conducted for the Environmental Planner 3 position and that the EP4 solicitation closes on Monday, August 1, 2016.

Mendoza asked if there would be a decision on the Glacial Deep-Seated Literature Synthesis findings report and six questions that went out on Monday. Dieu replied no, that it didn't get finished with Charlene Andrade leaving. UPSAG will have it completed and ready for CMER approval at the August meeting. Dieu asked that if anyone has comments on the draft that went out on Monday to please submit them to her by Monday, August 1st.

Public Comment Period

No public comment

Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- ◆ Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Basalt Lithologies (Hard Rock – *Chapter 13 approved.*)
- ◆ ENREP – not approved, dispute process started.
- ◆ March-June 2015 and June 2016 CMER meeting minutes approved.
- ◆ SAGs will discuss the list of possible presentations for a 2017 science conference at their next meetings and submit projects for review and decision at August the CMER meeting.
- ◆ Comments on Glacial Deep-Seated Lit Review findings and six questions due to Julie Dieu Monday, August 1.
- ◆ AMPA and Co-chairs will meet with Policy to discuss how to handle the findings report and six questions for the Hard Rock Study.
- ◆ Update on FY16 mid-year projects at August meeting.

Adjourned