

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
April 25, 2017
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	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Bigeagle, Jerry	Spokane Tribe of Indians
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	WFPA – CMER Co-Chair
Jones, Bruce	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Johnson, Angela	Department of Natural Resources
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Green Crow
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
Murray, Joe	Merrill Ring
Ojala-Bardour, Reed	Department of Fish & Wildlife
Regmi, Netra (ph)	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commissions – CMER Staff
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Stewart, Greg (ph)	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser

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

*Indicates Decision

Science Session:

CMER Information Management System (IMS) - Presentation

Bruce Jones, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, gave a presentation on the CMER Information Management System and answered questions. Patti Shramek will send out the web address, user name, and password to CMER members.

Decisions:

CMER

***March 2017 Meeting Minutes – Approval**

Revisions were submitted by Reed Ojala-Barbour and Chris Mendoza. Marc Hayes moved to approve the minutes as revised, Todd Baldwin seconded - **Approved**

◆ **Discussion on charter process/approval**

Baldwin reviewed the Project Charter process and the thoughts behind who signs it and why. The Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM) states that it is approved at both CMER and Policy. He feels that it doesn't need to go Policy as it is designed more for the Project Managers (PMs) and project team, unless there is a change.

Chris Mendoza agreed with Baldwin and he thinks they're a good idea to help the PMs and project team. He felt the Forest Hydrology Study charter was very good as it laid out everything that needed to be done for the project the end product. He said that the idea behind getting the CMER/Policy signatures was a way to get buy in. He said that DNR weighed in and said that the signatures were meaningless because there was no repercussions if they didn't work out, and as long as the charter was voted on and approved by CMER that was good enough. The Charter can change as the project progresses, but if there are critical changes then it needs to go back to CMER and Policy for approval.

Howard Haemmerle stated that the signatory is the project sponsor and needs to be the person who can make decisions regarding the project, "signs the check," and is responsible for making sure the project continues to move forward. He feels that just having a space on the document for entering the approval dates would be sufficient.

Ash Roorbach remarked that the workgroup that is working on PSM Chapter 7 changes felt the approval dates were adequate and that the Charter would act as a communications document. They also felt that if there were major changes to the scope of work, budget, or critical questions then perhaps a new charter should be drafted. Harry Bell said he felt that critical questions changes definitely need to go to Policy.

Hans Berge said that he thinks that the CMER Co-Chairs should be the signatories on the Charter and that Policy should not be bogged down with this. That way there is project support and buy-off from CMER.

Doug Hooks remarked that there is no guidance in the PSM on how Charters are handled so there is no process to follow. Mendoza replied that they have been used for years, even

though there isn't a process or guidance in the PSM, but if CMER wants to have that then they should go ahead and approve Chapter 7 to deal with this. Berge suggested that they could just be used as a project management tool in the interim.

The rest of the discussion revolved around the need for Charters, how/if they worked in the past, and if the concept of the Charter could be incorporated into other documents that are already being used.

Hooks requested that the PSM 7 Work Group complete the work on making final revisions and bring it to CMER in May for approval. Haemmerle asked how long a review period CMER would like so the group knows how much time they have to meet and address the comments. Mendoza suggested the revised document go out to CMER two weeks before the next meeting.

Next steps: The PSM Chapter 7 workgroup will finish addressing reviewer comments and get the document to CMER two weeks before the May meeting for approval at the meeting.

LWAG

- ◆ **Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Basalt Lithologies Hard Rock (Executive Summary, Lessons Learned, and Glossary) – Request for review**

The SAG request was sent out on April 21 for review and comments are due to Aimee McIntyre and Howard Haemmerle by May 18, 2017. Everyone is expected to review and reply by the May 18 due date, even if it is no comment. Hayes stressed that the Executive Summary won't go to ISPR review so it needs in depth review by CMER. He requested that the reviewers review with the eye of anyone who picks it up who is not familiar with CMER and the process to be able to understand what went on.

- ◆ ***Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Basalt Lithologies Hard Rock – Approval to skip ISPR review Chapter 18.**

Berge reported that the sub-committee tasked with drafting the ISPR questions agreed unanimously that it would be a mistake to send Chapter 18 to ISPR. The ISPR reviewers would also have to review chapters 1-4 and comments, and the sub-committee felt that they felt that they would likely end up with comments that weren't productive and that could put the schedule in jeopardy for something that probably wouldn't add much value.

Jenny Knoth moved to not send the Summary and Discussion Chapter to ISPR given, that it will come back to CMER with edits for approval. This action rescinds the decision at the March meeting to send this chapter to ISPR. Mark Hicks seconded - **Approved**

Next Steps: Comments will be due 30 days after the Summary and Discussion Chapter is distributed to CMER. This will be done in time for final approval at the June meeting. Comments will be delivered to Howard Haemmerle and Amy McIntyre.

Updates:

Report from Policy – April 6 meeting – Hooks gave a summary of the April 6 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>.

WetSAG

◆ **Wetland Management Zone Charter – update**

WetSAG will bring the final charter to CMER in May for approval to move forward to project scoping.

CMER

Upcoming Reviews

Johnson reported on the following documents that will be ready for review in the next month:

UPSAG – *Non-Glacial Lit Review/Synthesis* – Distributed May 3, comments due May 19
reviewers: Knoth, Hayes, and Hooks volunteered Martin

LWAG – *Amphibian Genetics* – distributed May 5, comments due June 5, reviewers: Hicks, Dieu, Knoth

SAGE – *Fire Salvage Lit Review/Synthesis* – distributed May 15, comments due June 5,
reviewers: Bell, Hicks, Baldwin, Mendoza

RSAG – *Hardwood Conversion and Remote Sensing* will be ready for review in June

Hicks requested that due to the volume of documents that will need to be reviewed, if there is any way to postpone some of them, please do.

Lean Process – update

Haemmerle reported that he will be presenting his Lean process review to the Forest Practices Board (Board) at their May meeting. He revised his original document due to comments that he received from CMER members and presented it to Policy. He has now incorporated comments from Policy and is presenting this version to the Board. He stressed that he will be clear with the Board that these are his recommendations and they are not from CMER or Policy.

Shramek will distribute the revised Lean Recommendations draft to the CMER listserve.

CMER Budget

Berge reported that Policy balanced the budget at their April meeting and it will go the Board for approval in May. Haemmerle clarified that they balanced it for the next biennium, and that it shows has an over-expenditure in the first fiscal year (FY) and under-expenditure in the second FY. Berge said that it may change once it gets to the Board since their priority projects aren't reflected in the budget (Type F and Off Chanel Habitat). The Eastside CMER Science Staff position wasn't funded, but the vacant position at the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission will be re-allocated for Eastside work.

Shramek will distribute the Policy approved budget to the CMER listserv.

Adaptive Management Program Improvements

Berge reported that he received comments that were very caucus focused, and others that were program focused, from both CMER and Policy. These are a few of the comments that he received:

- One caucus, one vote (CMER);
- organization structure;
- norms/behaviors of participants; and
- questions about SAGS and how they get created and when they are not needed.

He is still working on some of the details of the recommendations. He feels CMER needs a more formal voting process and more discussion and he is giving consideration to one caucus/one vote and term limits.

CMER Work Plan – Archiving of old or terminated projects from Work Plan

Gibbs reported that there are already changes that need to be done to the Work Plan and asked for suggestions on how to keep it going without re-doing the document every six months. She suggested project sheets for updates on ongoing projects. Hayes suggested that the process for updating the Work Plan for the next biennium start six months in advance and that each SAG gets one month to work on and submit their changes. Mendoza suggested having an active projects version that can be updated as things are done.

Next Steps: Review draft Active Project Plan at future meeting (May or June if possible).

SAG and TWIG Updates – answer questions on written updates

- ◆ **SAGE:** Regarding the shade-temperature nomograph update, Mark Hicks asked that the language be changed to “Continue to work with Mark Hicks to understand the extent which the Riparian Characteristics and Shade may help inform the eastside shade nomograph.”

- ◆ **RSAG:** The May meeting will be moved to May 11 due to the Board meeting, and will be held at the UW Precision Forestry Lab.
- ◆ **LWAG:**
 - **Van Dykes** – The document has been through CMER review and is getting ready and a CMER request is being developed to send it to ISPR. The database on collections of Van Dykes specimens has been completed.
 - **Buffer Shade** – Jim McCracken is working on responding to comments and Hayes anticipates getting it back soon.

Public Comment Period

None

Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- ◆ The PSM Chapter 7 workgroup will finish addressing reviewer comments and get the document to CMER two weeks before the May meeting for approval at the meeting.
- ◆ Future meeting discussion (next two months) – walk through the process of a project from beginning to end.
- ◆ SAG request was sent out on April 21 for review of the Executive Summary, Lessons Learned, and Glossary of the Hard Rock Study. Comments are due to Aimee McIntyre and Howard Haemmerle by May 18, 2017.
- ◆ WetSAG will bring the final charter to CMER in May for approval to move forward to scoping the project.
- ◆ Approval to not send the Summary and Discussion Chapter to ISPR given that it will come back to CMER with edits for approval. This action rescinds the decision at the March meeting to send this chapter to ISPR. Comments will be due 30 days after distribution of the revised document.
- ◆ **UPSAG – *Non-Glacial Lit Review/Synthesis*** – Distributed May 3, comments due May 19
reviewers: Knoth, Hayes, and Hooks volunteered Martin
- ◆ **LWAG – *Amphibian Genetics*** – distributed May 5, comments due June 5, reviewers: Hicks, Dieu, Knoth
- ◆ **SAGE – *Fire Salvage Lit Review/Synthesis*** – distributed May 15, comments due June 5, reviewers: Bell, Hicks, Baldwin, Mendoza
- ◆ **RSAG – *Hardwood Conversion and Remote Sensing*** will be ready for review in June.
- ◆ Shramek will distribute the CMER Assignments worksheet, draft Lean recommendations, and the Policy approved CMER budget.
- ◆ Shramek will send the CMER IMS web address, user name, and password to the CMER members.
- ◆ Review draft Active Project Plan at future meeting (May or June if possible).

Adjourned