

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)**

December 14, 2010

Office of Attorney General - Financial Services

**4th Floor Meeting Room
1110 Capitol Way South**

Attendees	Representing
Almond, Lyle (ph)	Makah Tribe
*Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Bigley, Richard	Dept. of Natural Resources
Bisson, Pete	USDA Forest Service – PNW Lab
Black, Tami	NOAA Fisheries
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Heide, Pete	Washington Forestry Protection Association
*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
*Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser, LWAG Co-Chair
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
Mathews, Jim (ph)	Yakama Indian Tribe
McGinnis, Mike	Shoalwater Bay Tribe
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Tribe
Phillips, Jeff (ph)	Skagit River Systems Coop, UPSAG Co-Chair
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, North West Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, North West Indian Fisheries Commission
*Sturhan, Nancy	North West Indian Fisheries Commission
Todd, Steve	Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG Co-Chair
Veldhuisen, Curt (ph)	Skagit River Systems Coop
Walters, Jody	National Marine Fisheries Services

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

Science Session

Peter Bisson with the USDA Forest Service - PNW Research Station presented on Washington's Riparian Ecosystem Management Study (REMS): Approaches, Surprises, and Lessons Learned from 12 Years of Headwater Stream Research.

Future Science Sessions: Doug Martin will check to see if the ALSEA watershed results study presenter is available for March or April 2011.

Business Session

➤ Policy Update – December 2, 2010 meeting:

Terry Jackson reported that the Policy meeting focused on legislative updates from the caucuses. The legislative updates focused on small landowner legislation, hydraulic permit application legislation, and budget issues.

Policy announced that a sub-group of Policy would be meeting this week to discuss the approaches for Testing the Accuracy and Bias of Unstable Landform Identification Project (Accuracy & Bias Study). Policy plans to report back to the CMER co-chairs before the next Policy meeting on January 6th.

Policy was informed that CMER may decide not to hold an Annual CMER Science Conference next year, and the possibility of hosting a workshop relating to mass wasting associated with the 2007 storm. The Policy and CMER co-chairs, along with the AMPA, spent the afternoon working on integrating the identified tasks from the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) training parking lot list, the AMP strategic plan, and the Stillwater report into the Policy work list.

Policy is still working on resolving issues related to the dispute resolution process.

SAG /CMER Items

➤ CMER Science Conference - ***CMER Decided not to host the 2011 science conference.***

Dawn Hitchens reminded CMER of their decision to hold off until this month to take a formal vote on not hosting an annual science conference in 2011.

Chris Mendoza motioned not to hold the science conference in 2011, and Dick Miller seconded the motion. CMER approved the motion.

Discussion Points:

UPSAG will take the lead for organizing topics, lining up speakers & setting a date with oversight provided by CMER for the workshop. UPSAG will share information about details at the next CMER meeting (January 2011).

Julie Dieu stated that UPSAG does not want to get boxed into the March date that was set for the annual science conference. Chris Mendoza stated that ideally the workshop should be held such that it corresponds with the finalization of the CMER Post Mortem Study. Depending on how long the CMER and ISPR review process takes, that could be as late as fall 2011.

➤ Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Monitoring - *Update*

Julie Dieu reported that UPSAG has received comments from eight CMER reviewers. Amy Kurtenbach is preparing a matrix with all major comments. The UPSAG Co-chairs/ report authors will hold meetings and/or conversations with CMER reviewers and attempt to address all relevant comments. The comment matrix may be finished by the next CMER meeting (January 2011).

SAGE

➤ Type N Characterization Project: Forest Hydrology – *Presentation on Site Selection Results and Possible Alternatives*

Todd Baldwin gave a progress report on the site selection process and results from the fieldwork and office screening process conducted by SAGE members during the summer of 2010.

Main Objectives (of the Type N Characterization Project: Forest Hydrology):

- To determine the spatial and temporal characteristics of surface water discharge in Type N streams across eastern Washington FFR lands;
- To investigate process relationships between stream hydrology, landforms and management activity;
- To develop criteria for characterizing and mapping streams with similar characteristics across the FFR landscape; and
- To establish a potential pool of study sites for Type N extensive and effectiveness monitoring.

Primary Goal for the site selection:

Validate a minimum of 100 sub-basins containing a regulated Type Np Stream.

Site Selection Process:

SAGE used the Miller 2 Environmental Model /Sample Program. SAGE calibrated the model to select a pool of sub-basins connected to the DNR hydro layer, based on a set of prescribed criteria. SAGE estimated that they needed to draw at least 150 sites in order to get 100 sites validated. SAGE assumed that based on the models level of accuracy they would incur a 1/3 rejection rate; however, the field site validation results ended with a 2/3 rejection rate which left only 1/3 validated.

SAGE started with a sample of 20,000 sub-basins. The minimum Type N basin size was 23 acres or greater with 25% classified as forest lands regulated under forest practices rules. SAGE drew from 16 counties; 14 of them were included in the first draw of 150 potential sites.

SAGE collected data on sub-basins that were both validated and rejected. There was an even distribution of sites in Kittitas, Klickitat, Stevens, Pend Oreille and Ferry counties. SAGE found a 100% rejection rate in Okanogan & Lincoln counties. SAGE reviewed the first 150 sites (143 sub-basins) where 46 were validated and 97 were rejected.

Greg Stewart asked how SAGE determined the 25% forest lands regulated under forest practices rules and why they were not eliminated in the GIS before the draw? Todd Baldwin responded that SAGE used the DNR sub-basin hydro layer and this identified if the sites were forest lands regulated under forest practices rules. SAGE conducted a second draw due to the 2/3 rejection rate.

Jim Mathews added that the draw included a lot of sites that were 100 acres or more; SAGE did not want to increase the basin size thresh hold as this could potentially eliminate Type N basins with desired characteristics needed for the study.

Site selection results showed that 39% of the first 150 sites were not Type N streams and 27% of the sites did not have landowner permission. Todd pointed out that “no access” is not the same

as “no permission”. No access meant that it was unsafe, the road had berms, or it was too far to walk in to reach the site.

SAGE rejected sub-basins that had three or more small forest landowners (concept approved by CMER last summer). SAGE based this decision on the difficulty of getting permission from small forest landowners. SAGE used the Sample Program model on a total of 500 sites. SAGE has visited 232 sites; they have yet to evaluate Chelan & Stevens counties.

Next steps:

SAGE wants to consult with Dan Miller to get input on possible modifications to the Sample Program.

SAGE will explore the use of DNR’s Water Typing Modification Form Database to increase efficiency of site validation.

SAGE proposes moving forward with field inventory in 2011-2012 on the 62 sites that have been validated.

Discussion Points:

Curt Veldhuisen asked about unequal rates of rejection and running the risk of a sample not being representative of the study design. Is it possible to set up a sample with proportional representation?

Todd Baldwin – SAGE has found 176 miles of Type N streams & 99 miles of NS streams as identified by WDNR and may be able to use this database to speed up the validation work. Should SAGE put an emphasis on this to reach statistical validity with geographic representation?

Doug Martin stated that the study targets geologies which are based on rock type and precipitation classes; SAGE should not be worried about county location and other jurisdictional boundaries. Todd Baldwin stated that it depends on what percentage of eastern Washington falls into the precipitation & rock type classification. Doug Martin replied that if SAGE wants to say something about those sites in the precipitation class, then SAGE may need 25 more sites. Jim Mathews responded that this is a good point but that by referencing the Water Type Modification Form Database it may be possible to tie it back to rock type & precipitation type.

Todd Baldwin asked what it would take to have Dan Miller use the Water Type Modification Form Database and feed that into the model. Jim Mathews responded that the water typing is in the hydro layer and that this is tied into the GIS. Nancy Sturhan added that the DNR hydro layer changes over time and is updated.

Terry Jackson asked if SAGE is using physicals; Todd Baldwin replied yes.

Mark Hicks asked if Dan Miller can set some strata sizes and if SAGE has a contract to ask these questions and get the feedback they need. Todd Baldwin replied that another contract would be required with Miller2 Environmental.

Greg Stewart added that the odds are small of the water typing data being random. SAGE could use parcel data from counties and screen variables through that data to come up with the original population.

Todd Baldwin added that in the Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project (EWRAP), SAGE was unable to get all of the sites validated in the first field season.

Mark Hicks added that it sounds like another field season with the use of screening techniques would help make it easier for SAGE and this study.

Chris Mendoza asserted that CMER may want to submit ideas on how to improve the site selection screening process and that CMER will need to make a decision concerning the next steps SAGE will be taking toward timing of their next field season and the study.

LWAG

➤ **RMZ Resample Report - *CMER Approved the Policy Six Questions document***

Teresa Miskovic requested CMER approval of the LWAG request to approve the six questions document to send in with the RMZ Resample report to Policy.

Jim Hotvedt asked if LWAG is sending the whole resample report and six question document or the second part of the RMZ Resample report with the six question document that CMER approved. Teresa Miskovic responded that LWAG will send to Policy what CMER approved.

Chris Mendoza motioned to approve this request.
There was no opposition from CMER.

UPSAG

➤ **Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring – *CMER Approved the Policy Six Questions document***

Julie Dieu requested CMER approval of the UPSAG request to approve the six question document to accompany the roads sub-basin final report.

Doug Martin requested that UPSAG provide context for the readers by adding a sentence about covering eastern and western Washington and the sample size in question number four.

Leslie Lingley motioned to approve this request.
CMER approved the UPSAG request with a small exploratory sentence to be added in question number four of the six question document.

WETSAG

➤ **Wetlands Mitigation Study - *Presentation & Discussion on White Paper***

Steve Todd stated that the white paper was sent out ahead of today's meeting and that this is timely with the CMER work plan updates that WETSAG is working on. He complimented Ash & Teresa for taking the lead in writing the white paper & developing the budget. WETSAG needs feedback from CMER to determine if the approach identified in the white paper is acceptable.

WETSAG and the CMER reviewers are recommending taking a step back from implementing a field study at this time and instead focus on conducting a Forest Practices and Wetlands Literature Synthesis to re-prioritize questions being addressed in the CMER wetlands research program. The scope of the literature synthesis would include roads, harvest, herbicide, and pesticide activities. Additionally, WETSAG recommends starting the scoping and developing a Forest Practices and Wetlands Field Survey that would inform and complement the results of the literature synthesis.

There are three main issues from the CMER reviewers:

1. Difficult to assess the effectiveness of the road mitigation sequence rule.

2. Lack of consensus on the project scope.
3. Harvest of forested wetlands likely represents a greater risk to wetland functions than roads.

The reasons why WETSAG recommends a literature synthesis: not ready to hire a recognized expert through an RFQQ process; a synthesized literature review will go beyond forested wetlands; this may rank risks and identify wetland functions that would help prioritize the work and identify future studies.

The main reason for a field survey is that this will quantify the occurrence of wetlands and interactions with Forest roads and harvest activities. This will complement the literature review and identify how common the Forest Practices activities occur with wetlands across the landscape. Results of the survey may suggest that harvesting of forested wetlands is likely more common than the occurrence of road activities in or adjacent to wetlands. WETSAG expects to use Forest Practices Applications (FPAs) from fall 2003 to fall of 2010. Based on the field trip last fall, WETSAG found that the frequency of harvesting forested wetlands within the FPAs is more common than roads in or adjacent to wetlands.

WETSAG asked if CMER agrees on the suspension of the original focus on the mitigation sequence associated with roads connected to wetlands, and is seeking approval to go forward with the literature synthesis.

WETSAG was looking at any and all road interactions during development of the study design for the Wetlands Mitigation Study. The literature synthesis would help with identifying and focusing in on the interactions that pose the most risk and uncertainty, that would then help to inform the study design.

Terry Jackson commented that she is confused about what the literature synthesis is supposed to accomplish. She participated in the field trip and the meeting afterwards at NWIFC. It seems that the literature synthesis is currently too broad and that WETSAG is going back to step one (i.e., looking at how to focus the whole Wetlands Rule Group). She thought WETSAG was closer to designing a study based on the highest risk to the resource and greatest scientific uncertainty (i.e., primary focus on harvest of forested wetlands, with roads being secondary). She thought that the literature review would help to focus the study on areas where forested wetlands are most sensitive to forest practices. She was concerned that we might spend a lot of time and money to confirm what we already know.

Ash Roorbach replied that if CMER is willing to assert that roads are not necessarily a higher risk to wetlands than harvest, then WETSAG needs documentation & justification for de-emphasizing roads in the study design. This is why the literature synthesis would assist WETSAG in identifying those variables for the study design.

Doug Martin stated that CMER already has the Cook literature review and that it is too broad. WETSAG needs to have really well defined questions to get a more refined review relevant to the forest practices rules. WETSAG needs to be focused on the most critical and relevant questions.

Leslie Lingley spoke with Walt Obermeyer of the DNR's compliance monitoring program and he pointed out that there were 70 -80 FPAs with roads and only one is close to a wetland. Dave Schuett-Hames stated that if WETSAG does conduct the literature synthesis, that it be based on prioritization of scientific uncertainty and resource risk; a broad literature review is unnecessary. WETSAG needs to identify some focused questions for the literature synthesis and for

developing a study design. He recalled that on the field trip, Tom Hruby suggested that WETSAG could identify potential risk based on location.

Chris Mendoza reminded members that CMER and WETSAG have already provided a recommendation to Policy based on pursuing the road mitigation sequence, and that the next steps were already identified. Given the substantial change in WETSAG's newly proposed monitoring strategy, he recommended that WETSAG and CMER continue to further develop the strategy over the next month. CMER will review the recommendations on how to move forward at their January (2011) meeting.

Forming a working committee was suggested to help WETSAG refine the scope, and develop recommendations for next steps and re-prioritize the four projects on WETSAG's work plan list. The working committee is comprised of WETSAG members, Leslie Lingley, Chris Mendoza, Terry Jackson and Mark Hicks. They will work on recommendations for next steps and prioritization of the WETSAG project list. This will be shared with CMER at the January 2011 meeting.

- CMER Report to Policy - *Items to take to Policy for January 6, 2011 meeting*
 - Testing the Accuracy of Unstable Landform Identification (Accuracy & Bias Study).
 - Six questions for RMZ Resample Project and Road Sub Basin-Scale Effectiveness Study.

- CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments
 - WETSAG continued work with sub-committee and bring back to CMER in January.
 - Post-Mortem Study CMER Review roundtable discussion.
 - CMER Work plan revisions and project budget estimates on SAG agendas.

Meeting Adjourned.