

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
March 23, 2010
DNR/DOC Compound – Tumwater**

Meeting Notes

Attendees	Representing
Almond, Lyle (ph)	Makah Tribe
*Baldwin, Todd (v)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Crawford, Rex	DNR, Natural Heritage Program
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Gamon, John	DNR, Natural Heritage Program
Hayes, Marc	WDFW, LWAG Co-Chair
Heide, Pete	WFPA
*Hicks, Mark	DOE
Hitchens, Dawn	DNR /CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	DNR/ Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Janisch, Jack	DOE
*Jackson, Terry	WDFW, CMER Co-Chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, Project Manager
*Lingley, Leslie	DNR, Scientist
*McConnell, Steve (v)	UCUT
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	DNR, Project Manager
*Miller, Dick	WFFA
O'Sullivan, Allison (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
Rocchio, Joe	DNR, Natural Heritage Program
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, NWIFC
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, NWIFC
*Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC
*Veldhuisen, Curt (ph)	Skagit River Systems Coop.

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

Agenda

Marc Hayes needs to give his presentation first as he cannot be here for the afternoon.

Science Session

John Gamon, Rex Crawford & Joe Rocchio from the DNR Natural Heritage Program presented on the Natural Heritage Network's Ecological Integrity Assessment Program. They applied for the EPA grants at same time CMER did and are interested in the potential of the interconnections

between these two programs. The DNR Natural Heritage Program focuses on terrestrial & riparian efforts, rare plants & ecological systems of the state. They are connected to international and national conservation efforts and metrics. The program provides a statewide inventory to help establish metrics and assessment of health/conservation.

CMER Grant proposals submitted to EPA –

Update by Jim Hotvedt, Adaptive Management Program Administrator

May 14 is the notification date by EPA. Once notified EPA assigned staff will interact with the grant applicant to work up a final design. Successful grant applicants will be identified in August. These grants reflect funding for the federal fiscal year. The CMER work plan and the FY11 budget will be presented to the FPB on May 11th. CMER has developed a budget without the EPA grants. This will be revisited if CMER receives EPA grant funding. The following are summaries of the EPA grant applications:

- Wetlands Mitigation project - The grant application reflects the Puget Sound region not just the Olympic region. The sample size is increased to 90 sites (additional 30 sites). The approach moves away from a pilot study to 3 years where year 1 is devoted to method development & analysis; year 2 is devoted method implementation and collect more data; year 3 analyze data and report writing. This is a \$157,000 request. The CMER Work plan identified starting Phase 1 with CMER \$ then transition to the bigger scope if EPA grant is given.
- Type N Soft Rock - There is no final scoping document & final plan for this project. There have been several sub-committee meetings held to work out an approach. CMER may approve a formal name for this group today. This is a \$700,000 request. The EPA grant asserts that this project is designed to assess the effect of forest practices on the water quality of the headwater streams that flow into Puget Sound in support of potential rulemaking to improve the current forest practices regulations. The proposed study is designed to answer several primary critical questions:
 1. What are the magnitude, direction and duration of change in temperature, sediment, and wood inputs with respect to different buffer treatments in areas of relatively incompetent lithology?
 2. How do changes in riparian stands and the functions they provide (e.g., shade, microclimate, bank stability, in-channel gravel features,) affect stream temperature and sediment and woody debris storage composition within the Type N network?
 3. How do changes in riparian stands and the functions they provide affect stream temperature and sediment exports from the Type N network?
- CMER Information Management System project - This is a \$200,000 request. The EPA grant application is a full blown approach with a web based application. The attraction for this application is the data management and storage of all CMER and TFW research and monitoring; and increased access to the data for CMER, Forest and Fish stakeholders, and the public.

Business Session

- CMER February 23, 2010 meeting notes were reviewed and Miller suggested changes.
CMER approved meeting notes with suggested changes.

Discussion Points:

Pete Heide commented on the statement in the meeting notes about the co-chair's statement for consensus on the CMER work plan. This raises the question about the changes in the work plan and the fact that the DFC changes did not follow the process and that this will be presented to Policy as a consensus document.

Co-chair Jackson reflected back that she agreed that the DFC material was not included in the materials for review prior to the CMER meeting, and that typically CMER members can decide to not accept information brought to a meeting if there was not adequate time to review it. However, a hard copy of the material was brought to the meeting, allowed time for review during the lunch break, and discussed in detail after lunch. The co-chair repeatedly asked if anyone had concerns, questions, or needed time to look at anything a little closer. No one expressed concerns at the time, and CMER accepted the text at the meeting. It is up to the people at the table to speak up if they need more time to review the material. The outcome of this process was a consensus document at the February CMER meeting. In the future, we will need to be more careful and deliberate about information coming to CMER meetings without adequate prior time for review.

Nancy Sturhan suggested CMER spend time at the next meeting to develop a schedule for next year's work plan. This schedule needs to reflect major milestones and a schedule to work through the process of changes. CMER can also start this process earlier this year.

Co-chair Mendoza asserted that the CMER members can inform their Policy representative about this non-consensus in the process.

- CMER FY11 Budget – revised budget table

Since CMER approved a budget at the last meeting, these revisions reflect agreed upon budget modifications and timelines among the SAGs. CMER will need to approve these budget revisions for the budget retreat in April. Jim Hotvedt, AMPA, reviewed the revisions made in allotments to specific projects based on conversations held in between CMER meetings. The revisions are as follows:

Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment -Soft Rock – originally had \$271,000, reduced to \$100,000. Since this is one of the CWA priorities, Department of Ecology will dedicate a portion of their FFR implementation pass through funds to this project. The \$100,000 will support site selection.

Eastside Type N Characterization - Forest Hydrology reduced the total price of \$800,000 down to \$600,000 in 2012 where the majority of the field work will be conducted. This is based on a telephone conference call with SAGE co-chairs. The \$50,000 for FY11 will

support the first year of finding sites and testing out the methodology, with the following year as the first field phase of a two-phased study. This study is a precursor study for the Type N effectiveness project for the Eastside. SAGE is willing to do some of the ground work now to get this study implemented.

Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization - changed the budget and the outlying years. SAGE co-chairs agreed that this study would not be able to get started this year, and suggested that the budget projections be moved out one year. SAGE reorganized this study to be a 2-phased study.

Discussion Points:

Co-chair Jackson stated that the work plan does not address the phase 1 & 2 for the Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization; this would need to be revised.

Co-Chair Mendoza stated that targets are not clearly identified in the Eastside portion of the work plan, but they are listed in Schedule L-1. Is this a process based system or targets based system? SAGE will need to be prepared to address and explain the differences before Policy. CMER will need to be clear on what the study will & will not provide.

SAGE Co-chair Baldwin asked if it really is SAGE's decision to develop targets as a priority for Policy.

Co-chair Jackson reminded CMER that documents are being prepared for the budget retreat. One document will provide a summary of projects. CMER co-chairs will cut & paste information from the work plan for this document. SAGE will be asked to assist in clarifying the approach for the Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization study. The CMER work plan does not address phases 1 and 2, so this summary will be helpful for the budget retreat and in helping to make decisions.

Timeline changes were made to the following projects:

Roads Sub-Basin moved out two years.

Amphibians & intermittent streams moved out one year.

Action Item:

Co-chair Mendoza moved that all proposed budget changes be approved to share with Policy at the budget retreat on April 1st.

SAGE Co-Chair Baldwin seconded the motion.

CMER approved the revised budget table to be included in the CMER FY11 Work Plan for Policy to review at the April 1st budget retreat.

SAG /CMER Items

- LWAG – Type N Experimental Buffer in Basalt Lithologies –WSU Genetics
Co-Chair Hayes reported that this study has gone through the CMER review and approval steps and that this is ready to submit to the ISPR for review.
CMER Approved to send this report to ISPR.

- LWAG – RMZ Resample Study Recommendation Memo
CMER reached Non-Consensus on this recommendation.

Co-Chair Hayes reiterated the request – The RMZ Re-sample final report has been through LWAG, CMER, and ISPR final reviews. LWAG requested clarification on selected comments. These comments have been clarified and all have been incorporated into the CMER response matrix. Typically, a contractor would respond to the matrix and revise the report, but unfortunately the contract was not renewed when it expired in June 2008 due to lack of performance. No contractor is available to revise the document.

Two options exist for addressing the comments received during the ISPR process:

- 1 - Request permission from LGL, the original contractor, to make the appropriate revisions to the report
- 2 - LWAG could attach an addendum to the report that lists the recommended changes and briefly summarizes report history and focal results. LWAG is recommending this course of action.

Option 2 is not ideal but it represents the best option for finalizing the report in an interim manner within the current economic climate until CMER can make the decision of how to move forward.

Discussion Points:

Need to clean up the report internally.

How can CMER go about including the missing data?

Look at the potential for including the data on the website for other researchers to analyze.

Major concerns were expressed about the appearance of lack of accountability for the amount of funds infused into this project, and for the lack of quality in the final deliverable.

The design needed to be redone due to a new contractor on board; not tracked well; many things have transpired that are not satisfactory. The original treatments were a state buffer and non-buffer; attempting to glean information on a treatment approach that was pre-FFR.

LWAG's proposal (Option 2) is what CMER can realistically do; want to avoid making the same mistakes over again. Much of what happened with this study has been changed. CMER needs to look at the processes and see where the gaps exist. This would help with the P&S Manual update.

Action Item – Next Step:

CMER agreed to develop a sub-group to solve this outside of CMER. Co-chair Mendoza will work with Hayes, Miskovic, Lingley, Stringer and Sturhan. This sub-group will set up a timeline, write up clear statement of the problem, and report back to CMER in December. Hayes recommended September for the sub-group to convene due to the fact that field season has started.

➤ Project Managers – Status Reports on CMER projects

Jim Hotvedt, AMPA, introduced this section of the business meeting as an informational piece for CMER so as to showcase the status of the projects that are on their way to ISPR.

Teresa Miskovic, Project Manager -

- Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment - Hard Rock (non-amphibian) - Pushed the completion dates out to 2014 due to delays in harvest at some of the sites.
- Amphibian Genetics research report is going to ISPR this month.
- BCIF – finalizing final report; revisions occurring now; RSAG review to CMER in June.
- Buffer integrity/shade effectiveness – This is in the data analysis phase.
- Bull Trout Add-On – This summer is the first fifth year of post harvest sampling - will occur over several years; final report several years out.
- Riparian Extensive Temperature – Eastside Type F is going through CMER review; Ecology is responding to CMER comment matrix. The Westside Type F and N reports will be going through RSAG review at the end of the month. All 3 extensive temperature reports will be pulled into one report. They will be submitted to ISPR next January.

Amy Kurtenbach, Project Manager -

- Mass wasting prescription-scale effectiveness monitoring (Post-Mortem) – Yesterday was the deadline for UPSAG review of the draft report. Plan to use the April meeting to go thru these comments.
- Solar radiation/effective shade – There are two components to the Eastern Washington Riparian Effectiveness Study for Shade, Temperature and Solar Radiation. The solar component finished field work a year earlier than the shade/temperature component. The contractor is working on the draft final report. After RSAG review, the report should be coming to CMER in the next month or two. The report will then be submitted to ISPR. The report will then sit on the shelf to wait for the shade/temperature study to be completed. Once the shade/temperature study goes through the review processes, the two components of the study will be combined into one final report. RSAG is still working out the process for this to be implemented.
- FPA Desktop Analysis – RSAG is combing through the data. RSAG expects this to be completed according to schedule.
- Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring – The Project Manager is working on the comments matrix.
- Eastside Type N Forest Hydrology – SAGE is working on screening sites in preparation for 2010 field season.
- Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment (EWRAP) – The data is being entered into model for analysis.

Ash Roorbach, Project Manager – CMER staff -

- Riparian Hardwood Conversion- ongoing project and organized into staggered harvest sites/case studies. Last case study is due in winter/spring 2012. The case studies will be pulled together for CMER review. RSAG has reviewed the first series of case studies, and those comments have been reviewed and responded to by the contractor (harvest information, site descriptions, maps, first planting information). RSAG needs to review

and make the necessary decisions on the contractors' response. The next step will be to take the economic data, silviculture treatment of four-year data and compile this into one study. Projected date of completion is spring of 2012.

- Wetland Mitigation Effectiveness - expected to start this year. WETSAG had a study design go through the SAG and now in CMER review and approval steps; the next step is to submit it to ISPR. There is no project manager yet assigned to this project.
- RSAG – Final report for Hardwood Conversion Temperature Study
CMER Approved Final Report for posting on CMER website.

RSAG is requesting CMER approval of the revised Hardwood Conversion Temperature Study Report. RSAG was unable to support the statistical analysis of the original draft prepared by Hunter and found many editorial issues of concern. After much debate, CMER went to Policy with several options for direction on how to finalize the report. Policy provided direction to RSAG to: make the necessary editorial revisions, and to include the raw data in an Appendix. Policy directed RSAG to do no further data analysis at this time. When complete and approved by CMER, this report could then be available on the website. At some future time when internal capacity or contracting monies become available, Policy and CMER may consider conducting a statistical analysis of the data to determine if useful information can be gleaned from the work.

- CMER – Co-chairs terms and rotation
Jim Hotvedt, AMPA reviewed the nomination and selection process for co-chairs. CMER members can nominate people from different caucuses. The expectation is to have two year terms staggered among the co-chairs. The nominations go to the AMPA. A seven-member selection committee of CMER reviews the nominations and selects one or two to recommend to Policy. Policy has final say of the CMER co-chairs.

Co-chair Jackson is willing to continue one more year.

Co-chair Mendoza stated that the Conservation Caucus is supportive of his continuation as CMER co-chair for another two-year term which would allow for the one year stagger with Co-chair Jackson.

Points of Discussion:

Caucuses need to start thinking about and planning for the next year's CMER co-chair term to replace Jackson. Starting next year, we need to get the terms staggered.

Jim Hotvedt, AMPA summarized that the two co-chairs are willing to stay. If this is agreeable to CMER then this is the state of affairs. If CMER wants to nominate others, this needs to occur before the April meeting. If there are no other nominations, CMER will have the two co-chairs continue.

- CMER – CMER Membership Review
Jim Hotvedt, AMPA summarized that some of the SAGs are disproportionately staffed and CMER needs to review this. Nancy Sturhan has done an excellent analysis for Policy.

Amy Kurtenbach reemphasized that the tool that helps to get this done is called a project charter – Policy is familiar with the charter concept - this gives the authority to do the work, identifies the resources required to get the work done, and lays it out. There is a clear level of expectation up front. This approach reinforces the project status document.
- CMER – Form an “official” Scientific Advisory Group (Soft Rock SAG) to replace the existing Soft Rock technical advisory group (see CMER PSM).
CMER took *No Action on this item.*
- CMER – Form CMER sub-group to begin responding to Stillwater Review
CMER co-chairs will revisit with Policy co-chairs to go through the Stillwater Response September 2009 matrix & set up a meeting with the sub group in May.

CMER Sub Group:

Chris Mendoza	Leslie Lingley
Dick Miller	Terry Jackson
Doug Martin	Jim Hotvedt

- CMER – Budget Retreat April 1st
Co-chair Jackson requested to have representation at the budget retreat on April 1st. New projects - Soft rock, Forest Hydrology, & Channel Wood Characterization need appropriate representation. Ongoing projects need appropriate representation as well.
- CMER – Science Conference April 13th
CMER Coordinator Hitchens gave an update on the logistics, schedule & location.
- Policy Meeting - March 4th Update -
 - Weyco Report – Policy reached no consensus on sending the report to ISPR. Policy formed a sub group to work on the issue of external science.
 - AMP training parking lot issues – CMER & Policy co-chairs met to organize the information and have assignments for identifying action items and establishing a priority system.
- CMER Report to Policy - Budget Retreat on April 1, 2010:
 - CMER FY 11 Work plan, Budget & Memo
 - CMER Project Summary
 - Link to Adaptive Management
 - CMER Project and Functions Table

Meeting Adjourned.