

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)
January 28, 2020
DNR/DOC Industrial Park, Tumwater WA**

Attendees	Representing
Austin, Brandon	Department of Ecology
§Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
chesney, charles (ph)	Member of Public
Cooke, Andrew	University of Washington
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Flint, Ben	Department of Natural Resources
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Ehinger, Bill	Department of Ecology
Hibbeln, Jacob	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Hicks, Mark	Department of Natural Resources – AMPA
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association – CMER Co-Chair
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
§Martin, Doug (ph)	Washington Forest Protection Association
McIntyre, Aimee	Department of Fish & Wildlife (Proxy for Marc Hayes)
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources
Munes, Eszter	Department of Natural Resources
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Schuett-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
Shramek, Patti	Department of Natural Resources
Stewart, Greg	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
Swanson, Scott (ph)	Washington State Association of Counties
Thomas, Cody (ph)	Spokane Tribe of Indians
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser

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

*Indicates Decision

Science Session

**Extended Riparian Vegetation Monitoring, Model Transferability Testing Presentation –
Presentation**

Andrew Cooke, University of Washington, gave a presentation and answered subsequent questions from CMER.

RSAG

***Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring, Model (ERV) Transferability Testing**

Request to approve final report

- Joe Murray reviewed the request and asked committee for approval.
- Harry Bell moved to approve the final report; Julie Dieu seconded. **Motion approved.**

Discussion regarding 6 questions

- Hicks stated that the Findings report and answers to the 6 questions are needed when there is an expectation for Policy to make a decision and should also happen whenever CMER is requesting funding.
- Joe Murray concurred with Hicks and stated that it was also a way to keep Policy up to speed with projects, therefore making it useful for multiphase projects.
- Dave Schuett-Hames recommended having different questions for different phases.
- Mendoza commented that answering the 6 questions for small exploratory projects like this could clog Policy's workload since they have to respond by answering questions 7,8, and 9 with set timelines. FP Board Manual Section 22 states that CMER's answers to the 6 questions should be done at beginning of project and the end, but does not specify which type of projects like pilot and exploratory reports.
- Motion: Task RSAG with answering 6 questions and bringing it back to CMER next month or as soon as possible. **Motion approved**
 - o Joe Murray commented that the timeline is a bit short for RSAG. March might be more tenable. However, if possible, 6 questions will be answered by next month.

Next Steps: Andrew Cooke should be available at least by phone at the February TFW Policy meeting to answer questions about this study and is scheduled to give a presentation to Policy in March.

Type N Soft Rock Study – approval to send report to ISPR

- Miskovic and Murray hoping to approve and send to ISPR now that everyone has had chance to review and PI's have worked with commenters to address their comments.
- Bell asked to add the same question to CMER's standard 8 questions to ISPR regarding the applicability of the temperature responses that the Hard Rock study asked of ISPR as he has not seen that reply yet.
- Hicks asked if CMER was going to break Soft Rock into several sections for ISPR like the Hard Rock study. He expects the normal process. Ehinger thinks it will need to be. If that is the case, Hicks needs recommendations for how to break up study. Ehinger agreed to help with this task.

- Miskovic commented that if the study is broken into several sections, there may likely be months of delays like there was Hard Rock.
- Ehinger stated that the most suitable reviewers are on the Type Np Workgroup and one declined to review to avoid the appearance of having a conflict of interest.
- AJ Kroll commented that participants in AMP need to spend more time thinking about how reviews are done and that there's a conflict of interest with people who are reviewing the work which they participated in. Critical for a transparent public process.
- Motion to approve sending the final report to ISPR (don't recall who made the motion and seconded); no discussion. All in favor but Bell, Motion failed.
- Harry Bell motioned that the final report be sent to ISPR with the same question that accompanied Hard Rock related to the applicability of temperature responses. Doug Martin seconded. Discussion: Mendoza clarified that the additional question would only go to the stream temperature model reviewer, not all reviewers. **Motion approved.**

CMER

Approval of December 17th, 2019 CMER Meeting Minutes – approval

- Harry Bell provided one edit, after which he moved to approve the meeting minutes as revised. Mendoza seconded. **Approved.**

LWAG

Amphibians in Intermittent Streams Charter – approval to forward to Policy

- Has been approved by LWAG
 - o McIntyre added that this is a living document and has room to change
- Doug Martin stated his concern that the project isn't integrated with other projects.
- Todd: abstained last month and wants to comment before LWAG moves on to scoping document.
- Todd Baldwin thought ENREP should be consulted for this because of the similarities in scoping. He also asked what \$50,000 for scoping was for. McIntyre clarified that the funding goes to literature synthesis, not the scoping document.
 - o Harry Bell motioned to approve Charter. Julie Dieu seconded. Todd Baldwin abstained. **Motion approved**
- Aimee says that we need to get policy approval to get contract for 50k used for lit review. 80 k for next fiscal, contingent on Policy.
 - o AMPA/PM noted that money was already approved by the Board based on recommendation from Policy ; indicated on the MPS
- **Next steps: LWAG / PM will Work on developing a contract to start literature synthesis**

Discussion

Following the lunch break the AMPA reported that the Eastside Scientist position has been filled and the start date would be mid-March. He also introduced the new CMER staff, Ben Flint (Supervisory project managers), Eszter Munes (project manager) and Jacob Hibbeln (Administrative Assistant to CMER and TFW Policy). Jenelle provided an update of the NWIFC staff recruitments.

ISAG -eDNA Pilot Study

Discussion about using the pilot study to inform a larger study

- Chris Mendoza reported that the e-DNA pilot report is in review at ISAG and should come to CMER in February. ISAG separated out eDNA from the three projects the Board motioned for CMER to develop, therefore it may or may not be a part of the strategy recommendation.
- Jason Walter stated that comments are due on 2/4/2020 and depending on the nature of the comments they may not be ready for the next CMER meeting.
- He also requested suggestions for an ISAG co-chair, which Mendoza supported.

CMER Budget

Master Project Schedule (MPS) Updates

- AMPA reported that there was no longer extra money due to budget revisions and scheduling of existing projects. The Budget numbers can vary considerably month to month because projects are getting moved into next fiscal year. Even though there's no money right now to fund new projects, CMER should rank projects now and have realistic cost estimates.
 - o Now \$9,000 in the red at the end of this biennium; acknowledging \$550,000 reserved by the FP Board for their water typing strategy. FP Board Water Typing committee requested to put \$75,000 into work related to the anadromous fish floor project to help with water typing rule making. This does not include DNR's part of the assessment for the cost benefit analysis.
 - o Mendoza: a state audit is ongoing- a report will be ready this fall.

Revised Charter for Roads Prescription Scale Project

- Ben Flint spoke on the first season of data collection and the challenges/learnings that have occurred. Additional work, above what was originally outlined within the implementation plan, is required to maintain site integrity due to excessive degradation being observed related to plot site integrity and equipment hardiness. . The bulk of these problems are planned to be fixed via two additional Public Works contract (one in each geography) and a contract increase with the USFS RMRS. The public works contracts will cover the site integrity issues (example was provided of the grader ripping up a

collection trough) and the USFS contract expansion will cover the data collection equipment hardiness issues (example of the cameras being stolen and tipping bucket counters not functioning). The additional funding request for FY 20 was presented as \$124,700. The first item being funded with the request is a handful of data collection one-time purchases – both as ways to make the project more efficient and to improve the hardiness of the data collection equipment (example of the lock boxes for the traffic cameras). The second item was the need for site maintenance, reconstruction and construction which was discussed previously as the USFS contract and the Public Works contracts. The last item discussed for FY 20 was the need to complete water sample testing which was never originally budgeted in the project. The estimated annual cost of water sample testing is \$30,420 which would apply across all remaining data collection years. Recurring expenses for increased site maintenance (USFS and Public Works) and the cost of testing water samples was discussed for the \$76,400 additional funding request for FY 21. Doug Hooks asked a question regarding the need for improved communication with landowners and operators. The response from Flint was that Julie Dieu is working on fact sheets to give to operators and landowners for completing road maintenance activities around the study sites. Additional discussion occurred regarding the water sample testing. It was clarified that the testing of water samples was never budgeted or accounted for within the project and that the average annual cost in subsequent biennium's would increase around \$32,000 to account for the testing. This discussion lead into the need for additional funds in subsequent biennium's for the added role of site maintenance for USFS and Public Works. The bottom line is that it will cost more than originally intended. New estimates have been included in current budget and more detail regarding the out-years will be provided at a later meeting. Julie Dieu noted that the original project budget was artificially reduced by 15% by the previous AMPA and that our current spending levels are in line with what was originally planned for the project (with minor differences).

- Mendoza asked for clarification on extra costs associated with “sampling”. Flint clarified by saying that lab costs for water testing were never budgeted and that the sample collection was accounted for, but lab costs were not accounted for in the original plan.
- Hooks: inquired about a draft of an updated charter. Flint said that a charter is drafted and hopefully will have one accurately reflecting costs by February meeting.
- Mendoza motioned to approve CMER request for more money, seconded by Julie Dieu.

Motion Approved.

Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project (EMEP) – *update and request for additional funds*

- Miscommunication between ISPR and AMP which caused setbacks.
- Estimated budget increased by \$4,000. Once the contractor gets this back, they ideally will be able to finalize this next week. Need to incorporate CMER's answers to 6 questions into study.

- Todd Baldwin motioned to increase EMEP budget, seconded by Debbie Kay. **Motion approved.**

Forest Wetlands Effectiveness Project (FWEP) Literature review – update and request for additional funds

- At the end of FY 19, not all of the monies allocated in the MPS had been utilized.
- WetSAG reviewed deliverables and would like to finalize those and bring contractor in to move project along- \$8001 to complete project- less than what was left at the table at the end of FY19.
 - o WetSAG did not pay out the full contract because there wasn't enough time to complete contract
- Harry Bell motioned to approve additional funds, seconded by Aimee McIntyre. **Motion approved.**

Ranking Projects to go to TFW Policy

- Hooks proposed either live action voting or postponing, giving people time to think. Mendoza commented that this was not how it was done last year as CMER voting members emailed their rankings to co-chairs who tallied and distributed later. Policy had already decided budget at last year's meeting prior to CMER ranking so they did not adopt all of CMER's rankings.
- Hicks thought that AMP can give an overview of active projects and then give people time to discuss and vote later.
- Miskovic: wondering how CMER's prioritization fits in with Policy's budget meetings

Contract Overview by Patti Shramek

This presentation covered the general timeline and process of various types of contracts used by the Adaptive Management Program. This information is particularly useful to CMER because it contributes to charter accuracy.

Recognition of Dave Schuett-Hames

The AMPA presented a plaque to Dave Schuett-Hames to commemorate his 32 years of service associated with the CMER program. This was Patti's last meeting with CMER. She will now be able to focus on her contracting work. CMER recognized her dedicated support to the program over the last 8 years.

Overview of Additional Project Proposals for unspent funds- questions from CMER

Project Managers gave presentations on additional project proposals and Board approved voting members have one week (2/5) to rank them (1 – 8) and then send to Hicks and the co-chairs.

Public Comment

- From Charles Chesney- mentioned additions/edits to December meeting minutes. Page 6 of 7 regarding roads updates. Suggesting that the contributors be acknowledged by name.

Hicks' report from TFW Policy Committee

- Approve literature review
- Experimental prescription
- Explore where it would be appropriate for experimental prescriptions for 25, 50, 75 foot.
- All of the above should be completed by May.

Action Items/Decisions

1. RSAG ERVM Transferability Report - approved
2. RSAG tasked with answering 6 questions for the ERVM Transferability Report and bringing it back to CMER next month or as soon as possible. Approved.
3. Send Type N Soft Rock Study to ISPR on condition that Harry Bell's additional question regarding the applicability and adequacy of the prediction modeling methods that were used to estimate temperature response used in the Hard Rock Study be included.
Approved
4. Motion to approve LWAG Amphibians in Intermittent Streams Charter- Approved.
5. Motion to approve CMER Request for more money (\$4,000.00) for EMEP. Approved.
6. FWEP Literature Review- motion to bring review to a finale- Approved.
7. CMER Voting Members have one week (until 2/5 at noon) to rank projects for unspent funds and send to CMER co-chairs and AMPA.
8. December meeting minutes were approved.