

# Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**February 23, 2011  
DNR/DOC Compound**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Almond, Lyle (ph)	Makah Tribe
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Ehinger, Bill	Department of Ecology
Hayes, Marc	Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
*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
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
Miskovic, Teresa	Dept. of Natural Resources
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Silver, Jill	10,000 Years Institute
*Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

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

## **Agenda**

No changes were made to the agenda.

## **Future Science Sessions Topics**

Chris Mendoza reviewed the science session topics for rest of the year. March, April, May, June & August presenters and topics were confirmed. The suggestion was made to have the discussion about the Stillwater recommendations for the July session.

## **Business Session**

WETSAG

- Wetlands Rule Group Strategy – Change in research/monitoring direction – ***CMER Approved the Systematic Literature Review Request for \$67,000***

At the last CMER meeting, WETSAG requested CMER approval to set aside work on developing field methods to characterize the interaction of forest roads and wetlands; and to 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. CMER tabled that request to allow time for people to review the materials and alternative research strategy.

WETSAG received many comments and incorporated them into the revised research strategy document that is before CMER. The three primary issues raised in the Research Strategy for the Wetland Protection Rule Group review were:

1. Difficulty in assessing the effectiveness of the mitigation sequence rule.
2. Harvesting forested wetlands likely represents greater risk to wetland functions than road construction/maintenance.
3. The primary question of rate of incursion of roads in wetlands, and the risk that roads pose to wetlands can likely be addressed through less costly approaches.

WETSAG supports conducting a systematic literature review, as the first step, for the following reasons:

1. To develop research hypotheses
2. Inform the Road Mitigation Project
3. Provide efficiency in developing future WETSAG projects
  - a) **Wetland/Stream Water Temperature Interactions**
  - b) **Wetland Hydrologic Connectivity**
  - c) Wetland Mitigation Effectiveness
  - d) Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring
4. Develop wetland function metrics and parameters
5. Identify data gaps

#### Discussion Points

Mark Hicks updated the group about the compliance monitoring steering committee work and that he and Jill Silver have talked to compliance monitoring staff at DNR regarding incorporation of some wetland information into the roads emphasis sample.

Doug Martin suggested that the FPA exploratory analysis, conducted by WETSAG, should be made into a stand-alone document (categorized as an exploratory report), which would not need to be peer reviewed. Other CMER members agreed that this was useful information and should be made into a separate document.

WETSAG is on the next Policy meeting agenda (March 3) for a presentation. The presentation will be to update Policy on the revised research strategy, the systematic literature review, and the justification for moving in the new direction. The request will be for Policy to support moving in this new direction, which will be documented in the FY12 CMER Work Plan. This Policy presentation will also help to prepare Policy for making decisions at the Budget Retreat in April. Nancy Sturhan and Terry Jackson brought up the fact that there is a disconnect between the Forest and Fish Report (FFR) and schedule L2, with little clear documentation of original intent. L2 stresses hydrology, but the FFR includes more about forested wetlands, etc. This has generated confusion over wetland research priorities and the appropriate research strategy for WETSAG. CMER approved the SAG request to go forward with the alternative research strategy and the systematic literature review. CMER suggested changes to the wording within the SAG Request: (1) to eliminate #2 (*to scope a forest practices and wetlands field survey*) and the language that references this option, and (2) to move the \$67,000 earlier in to the SAG request document.

## RSAG

- Type N Experimental – Hard Rock Study - Option to sample third year post-harvest temperature and canopy - *CMER approved the request of the third year data collection for an additional \$30,000 and to send this recommendation to Policy contingent upon their interest in continuing to monitor the sites for recovery.*

Bill Ehinger reported that in reviewing the data, all sites (with the exception of one site) have post-harvest temperature data for the three treatments (no harvest, 100% harvest, 50% buffer, 0% buffer). An analysis of the stream temperature data shows significant and substantial increases in the daily maximum stream temperature at the N/F junction in all 0% harvest treatments, in two of the three FFR buffer treatments, and three of the four 100% buffer treatments. Increases in daily maximum stream temperature for the Jul-Aug period ranged from 0.4 to 3.3 C in the 0% buffers, from 0-2.1 C in the 50% buffers, and 0-2.0 C in the 100% buffers. Second year post-harvest temperatures were somewhat lower, but followed a similar pattern.

Similar patterns were seen at the upstream monitoring locations where significant temperature increases were seen at the majority of the harvested basins across all buffer treatments, except for the PIP itself where significant temperature increases were seen at less than half of the harvested basins.

The study plan included only two years of post-harvest monitoring, which will be completed in spring 2011 at 13 of the 17 basins. However, two years may not be adequate to understand trends in recovery of elevated stream temperatures caused by harvest treatments to pre-harvest levels. If Policy is interested in understanding the recovery of stream temperature beyond two years post-harvest, they need to approve going forward in this direction and approve the budget needed. This approval needs to occur before April so that temperature monitors can be kept in the streams after downloading the data for the past season.

Chris Mendoza clarified that monitoring the long-term recovery of treatments effects on stream temperature is different from simply studying if there was an effect caused by the treatments or not. They are two separate questions and Policy needs to be made aware of the implication for both. He also raised concerns about any potential delay in finalizing the Hard Rock Study caused by collecting recovery data for a third year post harvest. Bill E. stated that it would not delay the timeline for the Hard Rock Study completion and that the 3<sup>rd</sup> year of data collection could simply be added as an addendum to the report or documented separately.

The additional cost for a third year of post-harvest sampling of stream temperature and canopy cover for FY2012 would be \$30,000. If monitoring is extended beyond a 3<sup>rd</sup> year of post-harvest sampling for stream temperature and canopy cover, the annual cost would be estimated at \$104,000. CMER members supported the request for the third year data collection for an additional \$30,000 if Policy is interested in monitoring recovery, and asked Bill to provide a presentation at the next Policy meeting. This presentation will provide Policy with the information they need (1) to decide if monitoring recovery of the treatment effects beyond two years is of interest via a third year of data collection, and (2) if so, to make a corresponding budget decision at the Budget Retreat in April.

### **2012 CMER Work Plan:**

Terry Jackson reported that CMER will review the significant changes in the FY12 CMER Work Plan and CMER Project and Functions Table. The goal of this meeting is for CMER to approve the CMER Work Plan and associated budget for FY12, so that it can be forwarded to Policy in preparation for the April Budget Retreat.

### **2012 CMER Project and Functions Table:**

Dick Miller expressed concern that the CMER Project and Functions Table did not only address functions. It was not clear which of the columns were functions.

***CMER members agreed to rename the table “CMER Project Objectives and Targets Table” and approved the FY12 CMER Work Plan with suggested modifications.***

### **2012 – 2020 CMER Budget Table:**

Jim Hotvedt reviewed the work done to date for the CMER projects. CMER needs to approve the budget related to CMER projects only for Policy consideration. CMER does not vote on or approve that portion of the budget sheet related to the FF Support Account funds, DNR administrative costs, and DNR’s projected total costs for the Adaptive Management Program. This needs to be clarified in the meeting minutes and at the Policy Budget Retreat.

***CMER members approved the budget table related to CMER projects with identified changes to send to Policy for their consideration.***

### **Business Session**

- CMER Meeting notes December 2010 – ***CMER Approved the meeting notes to be finalized and placed on the web site***
  
- CMER Report to Policy for March 3, 2011
  - 2012 CMER Work plan and budget update
  - CMER Co-chair - need to identify the replacement for Terry Jackson
  - RSAG – Ash Roorbach will present the proposal for the resampling of Hardwood Conversion Study sites in 5 years in order to assess regeneration of conifers, and the need to re-monument the sites
  - WETSAG – Ash Roorbach will present on the revised research strategy for WETSAG and the proposed Systematic Literature Review
  - RSAG – Bill Ehinger will present the preliminary results from the Type N Experimental Hard Rock Study and the implications for monitoring a third year of post-harvest sampling as it pertains to recovery of stream temperatures. This includes a budget estimate.

### **CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments**

- WETSAG will revise SAG Request, based on CMER suggestions
- WETSAG will separate out the FPA Exploratory Analysis into a stand-alone document
- WETSAG (Ash Roorbach) will provide a presentation to Policy on the proposed alternative research strategy and the proposal to conduct a systematic literature synthesis.
- RSAG (Bill Ehinger) will provide a presentation to Policy on the implications of conducting a 3<sup>rd</sup> year of temperature/canopy sampling to address long-term temperature recovery in the Type N Experimental Buffer Project (Hard Rock).

- RSAG (Ash Roorbach) will provide a presentation to Policy on the proposal to conduct additional future sampling at the Hardwood Conversion Study sites in order to address regeneration of conifers, and the need to re-monument the sites for that purpose.
- Terry Jackson will make the suggested revisions to the CMER Work Plan and the CMER Project, Objectives and Targets Table, and send the documents to the editor prior to sending on to Policy.
- Nancy Sturhan will bring the CMER Information and Management Project proposal to the next CMER meeting for approval.

*Meeting Adjourned.*