

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)
June 28, 2016
DNR/DOC Compound/Tumwater, WA**

Attendees	Representing
Andrade, Charlene	Department of Natural Resources
§Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe – CMER Co-Chair
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Berge, Hans	Department of Natural Resources - AMPA
Garlisky, Jennifer (ph)	UCUT – CMER Staff
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Hicks, Mark	Washington Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	WFPA – CMER Co-Chair
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Green Crow
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Chris Mendoza (ph)	Conservation Caucus
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Nation
Murray, Joe	Merrill Ring
Quinn, Tim	Department of Fish and Wildlife
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	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff

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

*Indicates Decision

Tim Quinn requested adding LWAG’s request for CMER discussion that was sent out in the April 2016 CMER mailing. He remarked that LWAG was told that it wasn’t a CMER issue and that the Co-chairs wouldn’t add it to the agenda. He thought that CMER members could bring forward issues regardless if there was a SAG request. Mark Hicks said he felt CMER members should be able to bring forward issues for discussion. Chris Mendoza replied that ideally there would be supporting documentation on what the issue is. Todd Baldwin replied that he wasn’t opposed to having the discussion, but that he had requested more information since December 2015 so he could frame up the discussion for CMER, and up until yesterday he hadn’t received any details about what the concern was about. The request was added to the agenda to be discussed after the completion of decision items.

Decisions:

UPSAG

- ◆ ***Literature Synthesis on the Effects of Forest Practices on Glacial Deep-Seated Landslides and Groundwater Recharge – Approval**

Charlene Andrade, on behalf of UPSAG requested the approval of the literature synthesis to be forwarded to TFW Policy. She reported that it had gone through multiple SAG and CMER reviews and that UPSAG is very pleased with the final product. She said that Dan Miller will be giving a presentation to Policy at their July meeting. Hicks moved to approve, Hayes seconded. – **Approved**

UPSAG will be responsible for writing the findings report for Policy (including the 6 questions). They will seek CMER approval in July or August.

CMER

- ◆ ***Meeting Minutes Approval – Approval of July-August 2015 and May 2016 meeting minutes**

Patti Shramek asked for approval of the minutes. Hicks requested edits to the May minutes, which were incorporated.

Jenny Knoth moved to approve the May 2016 minutes, Hicks seconded – **Approved**.

Hayes moved to approve the July-October 2016 minutes, as revised, Hicks seconded – **Approved**.

- ◆ ***Forest Chemicals Science Session – Approval to use the whole October 25 CMER meeting for presentations and travel costs for some of the speakers**

Jenny Knoth gave an update on the science session and reported that they have 10 people to give presentations. She requested the use of the whole October meeting for the presentations. Hicks replied that he would like to make sure any decision items would be on the agenda but updates could be removed. A.J. Kroll remarked that there needs to be a distinction between pesticides and herbicides. He also asked what CMER was trying to learn by this having these presentations. Knoth replied that a better understanding of how chemicals are used and the associated risks to aquatic ecosystems. Discussion revolved around what needs to be covered in the session, with emphasis placed on education on what is happening and what is within AMP purview. Hicks replied that he thinks this a great topic and acknowledged the effort that Knoth has undertaken for CMER.

Discussion then revolved around where to have the presentations and what decisions are anticipated for CMER to make in October.

Request to spend the whole day of the October meeting for the forest chemicals science session was **approved** as long as arrangements are made to cover any decisions that CMER needs to make.

Request to secure a venue if needed and to pay for travel costs for some of the speakers was moved by Hicks moved and seconded by Hayes - **Approved**

Patti Shramek will look for a venue for the CMER meeting the afternoon before or morning after the pesticide session and will work with Knoth to find a venue for the science session. CMER also discussed inviting TFW Policy and the FP Board to the forest chemical science session in October.

Agenda addition:

◆ **LWAG April Request for CMER discussion**

Tim Quinn gave the background of the issue. He said that Berge, Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA), decided to take over genetics chapter portion Type N Hard Rock Study during contract negotiations with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife. He felt this brought up questions of authority of the AMPA in that regards. He said that he had questions about continuity of the study and that Berge spoke with him at the break and explained the misunderstanding that seemed to still exist. Berge remarked that the issue is with contracting rules and timelines but that the species ID needs to happen right away, and that it had been communicated to LWAG by the PM (Andrade) in an e-mail several weeks ago. He reiterated the points in the e-mail that Charlene Andrade has been working on developing a scope of work with geneticists. He emphasized that the intent was to streamline the process of getting samples to a lab and getting the report written on time. He said that his job, as laid out in the Board Manual related to CMER, is to manage all CMER projects (technical, budgetary, and deadlines) as well as being responsible for the administration of contracts.

Quinn remarked that the process of getting this issue to CMER for discussion has been illuminating and he appreciates it being addressed. He feels that the human toll has been high in this process and appreciates Hans' commitment to work on fixing it. Someone asked who the PI was that did the first genetics analysis, and has that changed? Quinn replied that it was Andrew Storfer at Washington State University but that Steve Spear, a graduate student was the person that did the majority of the work and Quinn felt that Spear would be the best candidate for the current study. Berge said that he wouldn't preclude Spear getting the work just that we shouldn't reach out to anyone a head of time. Berge also clarified that the current project has a much different emphasis than the previous study and that the new analytical techniques, although more expensive, may suit the program needs much better. There was some additional discussion of analysis methods and whether the old methods should be used, or new methods. Hicks remarked that communication seems to be the issue and he is concerned that a decision was made to change methods without running it by CMER. Berge assured him that no decision about methods or a lab has been made and that any changes to any methods (e.g., Hard Rock at the April meeting) needs to go through CMER approval. Quinn reiterated that this issue was not a methodological problem in his mind and he feels that the issue can be resolved.

◆ **Buffer Integrity Shade Report**

Andrade noted that the report is back from ISPR and Hayes reported that he has spoken with Jim McCracken regarding the comments and that they appear to be minor. McCracken has communicated with Hayes that he will be able complete the report it in the fall.

Updates:

◆ **Report from Policy – June 9 & 10 meeting and field visit**

Hans Berge gave a report on the June 9 and 10 Policy meeting and field visit. 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>.

◆ **Biennial Budget – update**

Hooks reported that the budget CMER developed does not have enough money for all the projects listed. Policy's view is that the new projects are probably not going to be included in the biennial budget at this time and that project prioritization needs to be done. He asked that the SAGs continue to work with the Project Managers to make sure budget estimates are as accurate as possible. Bell asked if they needed to work on prioritizing the whole master schedule, and was there anything the SAGs needed to do. Berge replied that they need to work on submitting budgets that are accurate. He remarked that current projects are already over budget and when they aren't completed on time they cause a wave effect and push other priority projects out to a later date. Bell asked when this needed to be delivered to Policy. Berge replied that Policy will likely approve a budget that is balanced, but that if CMER wants to make adjustments for the next biennium, they will need to do so this fall. He also added that it is safe to assume that projects added this year won't get funded unless CMER can make a strong case about the priorities. Mendoza remarked that it is harder to project costs over a biennium instead of a fiscal year and Berge agreed. Mendoza stressed that previously approved mid-term projects should not affect the schedule of projects in the MPS. Berge remarked that with the new legislative proviso CMER no longer has the same ability to carry over funds and Board and Policy priorities have changed a little. He stated that the Adaptive Management Program has \$5.9M in the proposed budget (same as 15/17 biennium), but there isn't a guarantee that we will get that amount. That is one very important reason why CMER needs to prioritize their projects. Without prioritization, Policy may make decisions for CMER that don't reflect CMER's priorities.

CMER

◆ **Protocols and Standards Manual – review timeline for comments**

Roorbach reported that all comments have been compiled into a single working document and the TAG is going through them line by line to respond to them. Their responses will be embedded in the document. They are trying to meet every Friday to work on it and plan to have it to CMER for review in September and discussion in October.

◆ **ENREP TWIG – dispute resolution & study design update**

Haemmerle reported that there is a meeting scheduled for July 12 between TWIG authors and commenters. Stewart reported that all comments received to date have been incorporated into the report, and that a matrix of responses will be shared with CMER. The objective of the meeting is to give another opportunity for commenters and the TWIG to have open discussion about whether or not all the comments have been accepted, incorporated, or the rationale has been explained sufficiently.

Dave Schuett-Hames remarked that he felt that this is outside the lean process. He doesn't believe there is a negotiation process between commenters and the TWIG in the process. The TWIG is charged with producing a scientific document and not to negotiate what goes in the document. Hooks replied that he didn't think that this is the case and that it's just to make sure the comments were addressed. Mendoza agreed and he believes that the document will come to CMER for a vote at the next meeting. Schuett-Hames reiterated that the TWIG is often comprised of outside technical experts and this lengthy process may prohibit their participation in the future, not to mention the extra time it takes staff to deal with this.

Dispute resolution process: Berge reported that he looked at the process since the last meeting and spoke with Hicks about it and his concerns that policy issues are holding the process up. He spoke with both Doug Martin and Hicks and Martin said he isn't interested in holding up the study design for any of the issues stated in dispute. Martin replied that as long as the technical comments that he provided to the TWIG are addressed he has no objections to moving the study forward. Hicks said he accepts that as long as only the technical comments are addressed. Mendoza replied that if this issue is resolved he sees no reason for the July 12 meeting and the document should just be moved forward for approval. Hicks replied that he feels the meeting still needs to be held. Schuett-Hames replied that TWIG shouldn't be involved in this process except for putting together their scientific study design for CMER. Hicks suggests one alternative may be to separate the prescription issue from the technical comments and move the document forward.

Action: ENREP revised study plan and comment matrix will be distributed and if all commenters feel their comments were addressed, and everyone agrees a meeting is not needed, the July 12 meeting will be cancelled.

◆ **CMER Information Management System (IMS) – discussion and next steps**

Roorbach reported that Marilu Koschak is finished loading everything she has received from DNR and has budget left in her contract. She has updated the table of contents and all projects and has added six new ones. The Commission is updating the platform so it is accessible with multiple devices. They are also working on improving its accessibility to the public and CMER members.

ACTION: Roorbach will send the link and password to Shramek to send out to the CMER listserv so people can see the site and provide suggestions to him or Marilu.

◆ **CMER 17-19 Work Plan Revisions** – *Identification of participants willing to be on the subgroup to start working on revisions*

Doug Hooks remarked that revisions to the Work Plan for fiscal years 18 and 19 need to be started soon so that it can be ready for CMER approval in January/February 2017. He would like to set up a subgroup to meet by the end of the summer to work on logistics on how to get this completed and asked for volunteers. Shramek suggested that the subgroup set a schedule for when each SAG will work on their portion of Work Plan so that all the revisions are done in one document. She remarked that it was a difficult process to merge the multiple versions that were completed last time. The following people will be in the subgroup:

Chris Mendoza, Mark Hicks, Patti Shramek, and one member of each SAG.

◆ **Lean Process** – *update*

Hooks remarked that a review needs to be completed of the Lean process. Haemmerle reported that he is going through training provided by the State on Lean facilitation. He thought the CMER Lean process would be a good project for this training as a review of how the process has fared. He has reached out to CMER staff to see if they would be willing to work with him to find out what has worked and/or not worked. Hooks noted that the process has been revised as projects have progressed and before an assessment of how well the process has worked, it must first be determined how each project has differed from the process. Haemmerle asked if there are any CMER members who would be willing to spend a few hours with him going over their impressions of how the process has worked and share ideas of how to improve the process. He has nine weeks to complete this and would like three CMER members to participate. He anticipates time commitment of a couple two hour meetings. Mark Hicks, Chris Mendoza, and Harry Bell volunteered to help him.

Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study – Basalt Lithologies (Hard Rock) – *update on timeline for reviewing upcoming chapters for final approval.*

Andrade reviewed the chapter review schedule. All the chapters will be loaded onto Box when they are received back from ISPR. The Nutrient Export, Discharge, and Channel Characteristics chapters will be available the first of July. Discussion revolved around whether or not each chapter has its own six questions and findings report or to tie it in to the Synthesis chapter. Hicks remarked that he felt the PIs, CMER Co-Chairs, and Policy Co-Chairs should discuss how it should be handled. Bell asked who would be writing the synthesis chapter, their familiarity with the documents, and if they could author the six questions and findings report. Andrade replied that the team is still working on who will be authoring the synthesis chapter and that it depends on work load. Berge said that the ISPR associate editors for all the chapters will be involved in the review of the synthesis chapter since they are already familiar with the overall study design as well as the chapters they previously reviewed. Schuett-Hames said he felt it is inappropriate for the PIs to write the six questions and findings document and that they should be done by the SAGs so the science is separate from policy. Hayes remarked that he agrees with that in theory but the SAGs have a lot on their plates, and in some cases the SAGs are populated by authors of the chapters. Hicks remarked that the six questions are set and there is really only the extra seventh question that may need to be written by someone else.

ACTION: CMER and Policy Co-Chairs and PI's will get together to work out how to handle the six questions and findings report.

SAGE

◆ **SAGE Co-chair – update**

Baldwin reported that Jerry Bigeagle was nominated and approved to take Kodi-Jo Jaspers place as the new SAGE Co-Chair. There was also discussion at the SAGE meeting about the need to start looking for a replacement for Joel Adams.

◆ **Eastside Modeling Evaluation Project (EMEP) – update**

Haemmerle reported that the comments received from Baldwin and Bigeagle were sent to Mark Teply and requested CMER reviewers. He said he received a request from Baldwin for a presentation by Teply at SAGE and CMER. It was decided that a presentation to CMER would be sufficient. Comments are due by July 15, 2016 for CMER approval at the July meeting. Mark Teply will give a presentation at the July meeting.

RSAG

◆ **Hardwood Conversion Study – update**

Haemmerle reported that the project has gone through the 10 year re-sample and they are now working on getting a lead author to incorporate the results into the report. There is a budget of \$100,000 for this and RSAG is working on the scope of work that will go out for bid. He needs to know whether or not the report will go to ISPR for review so he can include that timeline and process in the contract if need be. Murray replied that he feels it should go to ISPR because of the change in the study. Hicks said he didn't feel it needed to go through ISPR but he won't stand in the way if that's what others would like. Mendoza said he doesn't think it needs to go to ISPR because Policy weighed in on the temperature component and accepted the original report as complete. Berge replied that he doesn't see why it wouldn't go through the ISPR process considering the time and money that was spent on the study. Bell said that he has a conflict of interest since he spent money to get temperature data since he couldn't get logger to harvest the year sampling took place. The discussion revolved around the why's and why not's of sending to ISPR. It was noted that CMER made a recommendation not to do study since they couldn't do random sampling, but Policy chose to move forward with the project anyway.

Action: Include the ISPR process in the contract.

TWIGs

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

Haemmerle reported that the TWIG is meeting today, they are working on the study design, and it's still planned to come to CMER in November/December 2016.

- ◆ **Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project (BAS)**
Haemmerle reported that Leah Beckett has sent out the first draft of the BAS and is collecting SAG comments. She will present at the July CMER meeting for 30 day review and approval in August.
- ◆ **Unstable Slopes Criteria (BAS)**
Stewart reported that the TWIG met June 10th and they have completed the first draft. They are meeting again in late August to review the draft. A document should be ready for presentation to CMER in August.
- ◆ **Type F Riparian Prescriptions (study plan)**
Schuett-Hames reported that the TWIG has been meeting every other week to work on the study plan. They need to consult with a statistician and he is working with Haemmerle to find one. There is no date for completion right now.

Public Comment Period

No comments.

Recap of Assignments/Decisions

- ◆ July agenda item – CMER 2017 Science Conference discussion.
- ◆ Glacial Deep-Seated Landslide Report approved.
- ◆ July-October 2015 and May 2016 meeting minutes approved.
- ◆ All day forest chemicals science session approved for October 2016 CMER meeting date (October 25). Patti Shramek and Jenny Knoth will work together to find a venue.
- ◆ Costs for forest chemicals science session venue and travel expenses for presenters approved.
- ◆ Shramek will find a venue for a half day October CMER meeting for decisions either the afternoon before, or the morning after, the forest chemicals science session.
- ◆ The ENREP revised study plan and comment matrix will be distributed and if all commenters feel their comments were addressed, and everyone agrees a meeting is not needed, the July 12 meeting will be cancelled.
- ◆ EMEP comments are due to Howard Haemmerle by July 15 for CMER approval of the report at the July meeting. Mark Teply will give a presentation at the July meeting.
- ◆ Howard Haemmerle will move to include the ISPR process in the Hardwood Conversion Study Lead Author contract.
- ◆ WetSAG will present their Best Available Science document at the July CMER meeting.
- ◆ Chris Mendoza, Mark Hicks, Patti Shramek, and one member of each SAG will meet by the end of the summer to work on the logistics for revising the CMER Work Plan for the 17-19 Biennium (Fiscal years 18-19).
- ◆ Mark Hicks, Chris Mendoza, and Harry Bell will meet with Howard Haemmerle to review how the Lean process has worked/not worked and to share ideas on how the process can be improved.
- ◆ CMER and Policy Co-Chairs and PI's will get together to work out how to handle the six questions and findings report for the Hard Rock Study.
- ◆ Ash Roorbach will send the CMER Information Management System log in information for Patti Shramek to distribute to the CMER listserve.

Adjourned