Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research
DNR /DOC Compound

September 22, 2009
Meeting Notes

Attendees	Representing
Almond, Lyle (ph)	Makah Tribe
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Black, Jenelle (ph)	CMER Staff, NWIFC
*Hicks, Mark (ph)	Ecology
Hitchens, Dawn	DNR, CMER Coordinator
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, CMER Co-chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, Project Manager
* Lingley, Leslie	DNR
*Martin, Doug	WFPA Contractor
*McConnell, Steve (ph)	UCUT
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Moon, Teresa	DNR, Project Manager
O'Sullivan, Alison (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
*Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC
Veldhuesin, Curt (ph)	Skagit River Systems Cooperative

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

Agenda

Steve McConnell requested to move the Forest Ecosystem Collaborative (FEC) briefing to the front of the meeting before the science session.

Announcement

Due to the Christmas holiday, CMER needs to revise the December meeting date to the15th. It was noted that RSAG meets on the December 9th. If an action item is required for CMER approval, RSAG will need to submit the meeting materials to the CMER coordinator by December 10th. CMER members were reminded that the November CMER meeting is scheduled for the 17th.

Forest Ecosystem Collaborative Overview

Chris Mendoza gave a brief overview of the Forest Ecosystem Collaborative (principals' meeting) that was held September 1 and 2, 2009. Initially Policy committed to this principals' meeting to cover Forests and Fish issues like securing a long-term funding source and to resolve differences between stakeholders within the Adaptive Management Program. The meeting on September 1 and 2 turned out to be a broader discussion about the future of forestry in Washington. The organization of the meeting was set up with round table discussions about these issues for the "inner circle" of principals while the outside circle of observers watched and listened to their conversation. Many of the Policy leads were hopeful that this meeting would help get some of their key issues resolved. However, this meeting did not address many of the Policy issues and many voiced their concerns about a lack of focus on the Forests and Fish HCP.

Nancy Sturhan shared that she attended the meeting and was on the outside circle as an observer. The main focus of the meeting was a round table on the future vision on Washington forest lands. Issues concerning the forest ecosystem, climate and defining green energy were primary targets. Approximately 45 minutes was spent on discussing the existing collaborations in Forest and Fish. She suggested sending the Commissioner of Public Lands speech out to CMER and the summary of nine issues identified to work on.

This information will be sent out to the CMER membership.

Science Session

- Stillwater Response Matrix:

Policy and CMER co-chairs will meet this Friday to complete the response matrix. CMER members will note that the format is similar to the ISPR response matrix approach. Policy has started to review Stillwater's recommendations concerning the critical questions in CMER's work plan.

Discussion Points:

The first three recommendations from the report are connected to schedules L1 and L2 in the Forest Practices HCP. A review of L1 and L2 is timely. The connection between the critical questions and schedule L1 or L2 needs clarification. It may be timely to re-format them to identify potential problems and important issues.

CMER members highlighted the fact that Policy needs to keep CMER informed of their current management issues and concerns. Their management issues and concerns may have changed since 1999. The Stillwater recommendation #5 - to create a master timeline - was viewed as an important recommendation by CMER members. This could be used as a timeline check for the projects. This would give CMER a better means of tracking questions that have been answered and what has been given to Policy.

The Stillwater Recommendation #6 - to deemphasize model development - was discussed. CMER has put a lot of effort into developing and validating models at the expense of developing and implementing more effectiveness studies. The Last Fish Habitat Model was a management or "rule" tool. Models do have a role in CMER. CMER needs to provide a response that states careful consideration of models is required on a case-by-case basis. CMER needs to consider model feasibility and applicability and recognize the trade-offs. CMER also needs to be careful on how they are used.

This isn't as big a problem on the eastside as CMER has several effectiveness monitoring studies going on in Eastern Washington, though they are managed by RSAG (example: BTO shade/temperature/solar study).

The Stillwater Recommendation #7a: Expand extensive monitoring, and embrace the need for *natural* as well as *managed* sites. This is an important issue for CMER to address. The example of spatial variability in the riparian rule group gives context for what is being measured. CMER needs to address and explain why we would want to expand some of the spatial attributes as part of accounting for natural variability. CMER also needs to discuss both spatial and temporal measures and identify which ones would be the most useful to keep for extensive monitoring.

The Stillwater Recommendation #7b: absence of intensive monitoring. This requires a joint discussion between CMER and Policy. Perhaps use a science session in the near future would help facilitate this discussion. CMER should have this discussion first, before going to Policy, to better understand and more clearly define intensive monitoring.

The key aquatic conditions and functions identified in Table 4.2 and the recommendation to integrate the work from the Stillwater Report was discussed. CMER discussed possibilities for developing a similar table that would link projects with resource objectives, functions, and performance targets. CMER formed a sub group that worked on the AMP accomplishments where a table was created. This table can be sent out to the SAGs to populate and help us track CMER work plan results. This table will also help CMER begin to address the Stillwater Report's recommendations, and could serve as a cross walk between the work plan and the Stillwater recommendations.

The due date of October 16th was highlighted for the SAG leads to populate and complete this table. This will line up the work for the mailing of meeting materials for the CMER October 27th meeting.

SAG /CMER Items

RSAG

- Water Temperature Evaluation of Hardwood Conversion Treatment Sites - *CMER Decision Requested*

Ash Roorbach reported that RSAG needs a decision from CMER in order to bring this project to completion. Three alternatives were laid out:

1) Do not accept & archive data; lose 5 years of work and three contracts at $34,000 each.
2) Provide funding to edit the report; data archived, no analysis – 3 months at $7,000.
3) Provide funding to completely re-analyze & write the report – 9 months at $30,000 to draft.

Chris Mendoza pointed out that $99,300 was the overall cost for this project and that spending 7K more to clean up the report would be well worth the expense.

Terry Jackson reminded CMER members that this project is focused on case studies and that the study was not originally designed to address temperature. She did not believe that it addressed actual impacts to stream temperature from Hardwood Conversion. . She thought that though there was some communications of concerns with Mark Hunter (WDFW contract), there was not a clear understanding by Mark of what RSAG's concerns were. RSAG first requested that data be taken out of the report, and once this was done, RSAG thought that the report was inadequate. Mark Hunter from WDFW has now taken on a different job and is not available to spend much more time on this report.

Chris Mendoza pointed out that this is a Policy directed project and that CMER already informed Policy of the implications of using a non-random site selection method for the Hardwood Conversion Project. Since this project does not have randomly selected sites, the applicability to the AMP is unclear.

Steve McConnell disagreed with the characterization of the study. The origin of the project does not matter. This reflects before & after data in monitoring streams. Steve sees value to getting the data further analyzed and finalizing the Report.

Mark Hicks pointed out that CMER has waffled on this back and forth for two years. He recognized that there are budget issues that will prevent CMER from doing additional analyses. There is too much variability with this project; e.g., the design for the temperature component was not well controlled and cannot be replicated. Mark agreed that case studies have value but not on hardwood conversion. He supported option #2.

Chris Mendoza stated thtat he and Steve McConnell have spoken off-line and have agreed to disagree. Both agree that CMER needs to complete this as $99K has been invested. Chris supported option #2 with the reservation to go to option #3.

Terry Jackson responded to the statement on case studies. She agrees that there is value from case studies; however, CMER needs to see them for what they are. CMER cannot conduct robust statistical analysis on case studies. She emphasized that from listening to the discussion, it seems that option #2 may be the way to go.

Leslie Lingley asked if this was considered a high priority project.
Terry Jackson responded that this project was lobbied for by the small landowners through Policy.

Steve McConnell stated that this started out with a silvicultural focus and that the temperature variable was added later. Steve expressed discomfort with option #2. He supported hiring someone to further analyze the data to see if it has value, and that this needed to be answered by someone else.

Lyle Almond expressed that he supported option #3.Terry Jackson stated that Tim Quinn agreed to one more iteration of the report and Bill Ehinger was to be the go between. This has been done. Mark Hunter

has taken on another job with DFW and can no longer work on the project; if CMER and Policy want further analyses, they would have to hire someone else.

Doug Martin stated that he questioned the utility of option #2. There is more data that has not been analyzed. Mark Hunter used the supplemental data to interpret the results, thus the results are not understandable.

Terry Jackson stated that so far CMER votes are tied for options #2 & #3 (3 to 3).

Chris Mendoza suggested that it may be good to check in with Policy on this. CMER needs to ask them what type of information they were expecting to get out of this Report for hardwood conversion.

Chris Mendoza stated that if CMER is in non-consensus then this goes to Policy for a decision.

Terry Jackson stated that these options would be taken to Policy to get their input. She requested that CMER members discuss this with their respective Policy people in order to move the issue forward.

- CMER – Land Owner Data Sharing Memo – Revisions from Policy - ***CMER Approved***

Chris Mendoza shared some minor, non-technical edits from Policy to the memo. The data-sharing memo will be inserted in the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual and will be implemented on a case-by-case basis.

- CMER – Project Plan CMER Review **– *CMER Approved***

Amy Kurtenbach shared that the project plan was brought to CMER last month. She has received comments from Terry Jackson, Dick Miller and Nancy Sturhan. Comments reflected repetition. The intent of this document is to pull what Policy identifies as important and document process changes throughout the project life.

Chris Mendoza asked if this could be listed as Project Management and Development (7.1) in the Protocols and Standards Manual.

Amy Kurtenbach suggested that this be listed as CMER Project Information.

This was agreeable to CMER members. There were no rejections or concerns by CMER members in attendance.

- Project Review Timeline – Example Using Buffer Integrity Shade - *Discussion to identify steps*

Teresa Moon shared that she used the first phase of the Type N Buffer Integrity Shade report to populate the matrix. The matrix, to be used as a tool for project management, illustrated that it will take a total of 280 days to complete all of the drafts and review stages for a draft report to meet SAG and CMER approval.

Chris Mendoza asked if it really takes three months for the SAG to review a draft report and, that based on his experience attending all the SAGs, the review time is highly variable depending on the complexity of the project and the participation of SAG members leading up to the review.
Teresa Moon replied that this is what it takes.

Amy Kurtenbach added that this is a best-case scenario. This reflects ideal conditions and a conservative time frame. Many of the CMER members in attendance have worked thru SAGs and understand the time it takes for the steps to be completed. She anticipates that eventually this log will be transferred into a

Microsoft Gant chart, which will be easier to work within a project. This is not a Policy document. This is a project management tool that will go into the CMER PSM.

She added that she would like to keep building this and bring it to CMER for review. She is currently working on the contract version. CMER can use this to track the milestones of projects and to have a programmatic tool for project management.

Mark Hicks added that this work is really important to CWA milestones, and that it was a good way to see when projects aren't meeting timelines and to keep projects moving. It is important for CMER to understand if a target date is missed, this tool will help CMER identify the resources involved and how to make improvements.

- CMER – Protocols & Standards Manual - *Update From Sub-Group*

Chris Mendoza stated that the sub group needed a lead editor to incorporate comments and suggestions. This is on hold.

- CMER – Soft Rock Scoping Document - *Update From Sub-Group*

Chris Mendoza shared that the sub-group has not met recently due to other CMER / SAG priorities. This project has been taken off the fast track for now.

- CMER – Data Management Project – This will be on next month's agenda.

- Policy September Meeting Update:
  - Terry Jackson shared that the work of FEC was discussed earlier in the meeting.
  - Fixed width RMZ Policy sub-group for SFLOs: Policy recently developed a charter and will look at different proposals.

- Independent Scientific Peer Review:

Currently there are no new studies for ISPR.

- CMER Report to Policy - Items for the October Policy meeting:
  - Co-chairs will take a blank format of the strategy to inform them of the work plan approach and use of the recommendations from the Stillwater Report. The Policy place holder piece needs to be identified in the work plan.
  - Official Board appointed CMER Members – vacancies need to be filled.
  - Co-chairs will seek direction from Policy on the Hardwood Conversion Temperature Report.

- Announcement - meeting tomorrow for DFC Desk Top Analysis.

Meeting Adjourned.