

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**February 28, 2012
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe
Chesney, Charles	Dept. of Natural Resources, SAGE Co-Chair
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-chair
Gauthier, Mark	Upper Columbia United Tribes
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Hooks, Doug	WFPA
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept. of Natural Resources, AMPA
Jaspers, Kodi	Confederated Colville Tribe
Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG Co-chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager
*Kroll, AJ	Weyerhaeuser, LWAG Co-chair
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
McCrea, Chad	Spokane Tribe of Indians, SAGE co-chair
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
Phillips, Jeff	Skagit Coop
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

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

Agenda

Chris Mendoza requested to add the Report from Policy to the business section.

Business Session

➤ Policy Meeting – Report from February 2, 2012

Chris Mendoza reported Policy used some of the February meeting to undergo the LEAN process as facilitated by Strategica (the contractor). Policy members decided they will partake in the LEAN event identified for the Adaptive Management Program; CMER's scoping and study design process. This includes prioritizing CMER projects more in depth.

CMER is escorting Policy through the Schedule L-1 resource goals and objectives with the Type N projects. Policy has created two sub-groups: Type N Strategy and Type F Water Typing. They plan to use the afternoons of their meeting days for presentations from technical experts. Dave Schuett-Hames presented on the Westside Buffer Characteristic Integrity Function study and Bill Ehinger presented on the Type N Extensive Temperature study at their February meeting.

Decisions:

RSAG –

➤ Hard Rock Long-term Monitoring – *CMER Approved the minimum approach (\$184,000)*

Jim Hotvedt reported Policy requested Bill Ehinger (Type N – hard rock study) and Dave Schuett-Hames (Westside BCIF study) to submit a recommendation for extending the two studies and to include a schedule for the re-sampling.

Jim complimented Dave Schuett-Hames on using the findings report as the basis for presenting to Policy as this was well received. He referred to the February 23rd memo from Ehinger, Schuett-Hames & Hayes about extended monitoring for the Type N studies. Ehinger reported the reason for doing this is due to the second year data analysis where there were significant temperature changes. Policy agreed to the importance of watching the recovery rate at the reference sites and asked for a proposal of a longer-term approach rather a request year by year.

Todd Baldwin asked what does CMER do when we go out to five years and find no difference in recovery.

Chris Mendoza responded this is a good question and that Policy requested CMER to develop a proposal in terms of cost.

Jim Hotvedt clarified the proposal reflects monitoring to the fifth year, stop, and then go to tenth year. BCIF went to five years of monitoring; the proposal reflects the Type N Extensive Hard Rock to mirror the BCIF approach.

Todd Baldwin asked if it was beneficial for BCIF to go out five years.

Chris Mendoza added BCIF has certain types of stand data: reference, PIP buffers, clear cut and 50 foot buffers. There are more PIP sites in the Type N Extensive Hard Rock study. The changes in the BCIF study pointed out the picture changing in fifth year due to storms. Policy is interested in an approach to look at long term monitoring.

AJ Kroll asked if the original design intended to go back 10 years; the amphibian segment is phased at ten years. Are we documenting one more year?

Bill Ehinger responded right now we have funding for five years. Policy asked CMER to put together a long term plan which is what tables 1 & 2 reflect in the February 23rd memo. Is CMER okay with spending \$384,000 in FY13? In order for Policy to have flexibility in deciding, CMER needs to approve this for FY13, due to the timing of the budget retreat.

Jim Hotvedt clarified CMER will be approving the 4th year of continued monitoring today. The CMER budget is approved on an annual basis. The budget reflects \$384,000 budget for Type N projects in FY13. CMER is being asked to approve the budget for next fiscal year. Policy is asking for a long-term approach in extended monitoring.

Chris Mendoza added he did not think this is an all or nothing proposition. Policy can pick and choose or create a combination. CMER will go to Policy with a cost detail for each component with a recommendation for them to decide.

Jim Hotvedt asked about the channel metrics for \$200,000; does this include channel profile, large woody debris and small wood, and the fifth year monitoring.

Dave Schuett-Hames responded this is the DFW portion of the study and he could not answer the question as they provided this figure for the budget.

Mark Hicks added he thought the temperature and vegetation components were valuable. The studies are set up to track this now and we may not have these sites in the tenth year. This may create a challenge with landowners for harvesting purposes.

Todd Baldwin asked what CMER was supposed to approve, as he was unsure he understood the proposal well enough to support it.

Mark Hicks replied CMER was approving the FY13 amounts and components as laid out in the memo.

Dick Miller expressed his concern about the level of funding committed now and how that impacts funding for other studies. The \$200,000 for channel metrics does not provide enough detail. The proposal asserts the metrics for stream temperature are increasing. So what? For amphibians this may be a concern for performance; what about for sediment and stream temperature. These need to be linked.

Chris Mendoza added he did not think it is in the best interest for Policy to sacrifice an ongoing study and one clearly linked to CWA.

Mark Hicks added there is a strong interest in the vegetation and the stream temperature components. The \$200,000 for channel metrics is a surprise.

Jim Hotvedt offered the option to punt to Policy. The original idea was to have RSAG request the \$128,000 per year to extend the sampling into FY13 & 14 for the sediment and temperature components. RSAG would have brought this to CMER as a stand-alone request for approval.

Terry Jackson added CMER is saying sediment and stream temperature is most important to see the recovery of those sites and to have a tie in with the BCIF; CMER may want to explain to Policy the importance of LWD for amphibians. She expressed concern about CMER not wanting to make a recommendation when in fact CMER has a strong role in making decisions.

Bill Ehinger added this request is really a reflection of the sequence of presentations for the Type N strategy to Policy. The temperature hard rock component was presented this month and next month they will hear from DFW on the buffer shade.

Mark Hicks recommended CMER support the funding of Vegetation at \$56,000 and Stream Temperature/canopy cover/export at the \$128,000. CMER has a well-controlled study out on the ground right now. It would be a waste for CMER not to continue with this.

Todd Baldwin supported Hicks recommendation as this is congruent with the BCIF recommendations. He expressed concern on how this impacts future studies.

Leslie Lingley supported the recommendation with reservation.

Chris Mendoza motioned for CMER to support the minimum approach of \$128,000 and the \$56,000 for vegetation and stream temperature, canopy and export. CMER decided not to approve the \$200,000 for the channel metrics.

Terry Jackson seconded the motion.

CMER members were supportive of this motion with the one reservation.

➤ 2013 CMER Budget – *CMER Approved*

Jim Hotvedt reminded CMER members the request is to approve the FY13 budget. The budget worksheet was revised to reflect the CMER approved \$184,000 for the Type N Experimental projects. The budget worksheet reflects future years for CMER projects which are not slated for approval today. This worksheet is to show CMER the costs over time for projects.

FY13 CMER Budget Discussion Points:

Projects:

The Soft Rock project has a mixture of the EPA grant, pass-through and CMER funding.

The Eastside Type N Effectiveness is budgeted for \$75,000.

Mark Hicks asked if this figure was current; it may be best to budget it at the Tier 2 level.

Todd Baldwin reported that it made sense for SAGE to budget it in FY13; SAGE expects to have interim results by next spring and to start on the study design prior to June 30th.

Amy Kurtenbach suggested that before going out for a contract we should have the budget allocated. SAGE will use the soft rock results for the study design and ISPR will take time for the study design.

The Eastside Type N Characterization – Forest Hydrology Study:

SAGE did all of the site validation for this project. The original budget was \$1.2M and this has been reduced.

The Amphibian Genetics is in the Type N Experimental Hard Rock for 2016 at \$150,000.

Terry Jackson requested to add a line in the budget worksheet identifying the amphibian genetics project.

Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project \$50,000 in Tier 2:

The \$50,000 is for hiring an expert in analyzing the data.

The Eastside Type F Bull Trout Overlay Add-On:

This supports field work conducted by the Kalispel Tribe.

The Bull Trout Overlay Studies:

The budget reflects the continued work needed to close out the contracts.

The Hardwood Conversion Project:

The \$2,000 is for the continued working relationship with landowners (part of the original study design); and 2016 is the re-sample year.

The Extensive Riparian Status & Trends -Temp project:

The \$15,000 is for the westside ISPR step; currently the eastside report is in the ISPR stage.

Terry Jackson added this project may need to have budget reflected in future years to show the need for trends. Right now the project is about status and not trends.

The Unstable Slopes Criteria is budgeted at \$50,000 for the scoping stage.

The Wetlands Systematic Literature Review is budgeted at \$50,000:

This is the balance of the current contract.

The Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study is budgeted at \$75,000:

This is for the implementation step.

The RMZ – Re-sample (Bird study):

Policy approved the \$20,000 in July.

AJ Kroll reported that the study will be done.

Project Support:

The Contingency fund is budgeted at \$100,000.

The Grant writer remains at \$50,000.

The CMER Project Managers reflect full funding level. This assumes re-filling the vacant position.

Program Administration:

The budget for ISPR is a reasonable amount for work load in FY13.

The staffing & funding levels for staff remain the same as previous years.

Funds Available:

The funding levels are based on the projection in the FFSA. This may change due to the budget discussions in the current legislative session.

Chris Mendoza added CMER has been doing bare minimum in terms of projects aligned with the CWA. CMER may need to start the discussion about new projects.

Chris Mendoza motioned to approve the CMER budget based on the CMER revisions made during the meeting.

Terry Jackson seconded the motion.

CMER members were in agreement of approving the CMER FY13 budget.

The CMER Protocols & Standards Manual: Findings Report was deferred to the next CMER meeting.

Dick Miller announced he will send his comments and revisions to Jim Hotvedt.

Chris Mendoza excused himself for the rest of the meeting and transferred the meeting facilitation to co-chair Mark Hicks.

Updates:

LWAG-

➤ Tailed frog Literature Review – *Deferred to next CMER meeting*

Mark Hicks will work with Marc Hayes. He will take the lead to make sure a copy went out to the CMER reviewers, including Chris Mendoza. LWAG will develop the time frame for completing this project.

➤ Type N Amphibian & Shade Report – *Ready for CMER Review*

Mark Hicks will make sure copies are sent out to CMER reviewers. The conservation caucus will elect a reviewer. The due date for comments is March 20th; then it will go to ISPR.

➤ LEAN Opportunity Assessment – *Update*

Jim Hotvedt sent out the report for CMER. The recommendation from the consultant is included in the report. CMER and Policy have agreed to conduct a LEAN event on the scoping and study designs within the Adaptive Management process.

➤ CMER Science Conference – *CMER members approved hosting a half day science conference*

Mark Hicks reported on the changes that have evolved since the mailing went out for this meeting. The presenters slated for the afternoon session have withdrawn due to a conference scheduled for the same day. Does CMER support hosting a half day conference or cancel?

Amy Kurtenbach replied consultants have been negotiated with for the timing, the date and the presentations.

Mark Hicks motioned for CMER to host a half day conference.

Nancy Sturhan seconded the motion.

CMER members were in agreement for hosting a half day science conference.

CMER Report to Policy – Items to take to March 1, 2012 Meeting

- Hard Rock Long-term Monitoring – CMER Approved the minimum approach (\$184,000)
- CMER Approved the FY13 Budget – Preview for Policy
- CMER Science Conference – half day agenda
- Presentation by Marc Hayes on Type N Buffer Shade

The rest of the CMER meeting was devoted to *the Status and Trends Monitoring Workshop*. The power point presentations from the presenters are available on the CMER website under CMER meeting materials.