

# Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation & Research Committee

June 22, 2010  
DNR/DOC Compound – Tumwater

## Meeting Notes

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
*Hicks, Mark	DOE
Hitchens, Dawn	DNR /CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	DNR/ Adaptive Management Program Administrator
*Jackson, Terry	WDFW, CMER Co-Chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, Project Manager
*Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
*Lingley, Leslie	DNR, Scientist
*Martin, Doug	WFFA
*McConnell, Steve (ph)	UCUT
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	DNR, Project Manager
*Miller, Dick	WFFA
Phillips, Jeff	Skagit River Systems Coop.
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, NWIFC
*Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC

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

### Agenda

Dawn Hitchens requested to add an agenda item – Coordinator’s Corner. This will be an ongoing topic regarding administrative support information for CMER.

### Science Session

Dan Miller presented on Net Map. Net Map is a GIS data catalog, analysis and documentation tool. Net Map has been a component of Earth Systems Institute since 1997. It is distributed on the website, free, and you can register to get updates. The main funding comes from grants & contracts to build data coverage. The origins are from Watershed Analysis and the platform is ArcGIS. Earth Systems Institute would like to move to digital, develop a subscription base, and set up a dedicated server to enable a simulation modeling tool.

### Business Session

Dawn Hitchens, CMER Coordinator, requested establishing a deadline for submitting CMER meeting materials. The deadline for submitting materials for the meeting will be 12:00 noon on

the third Tuesday of the month, the week before the CMER meeting. This will create efficiencies in the administrative support for CMER.

Dawn also requested that anyone wanting to participate by conference call, please confirm telephone conference call participation the day before the CMER meeting. There are logistical steps required to organize conference calls, so confirmation by participants is needed to make it successful.

Doug Martin asked about the “Go-to” meeting method. It seems that CMER could take advantage of these tools for those CMER members remotely participating. This is an avenue where they can see the power point presentations from the science sessions.

This will be investigated and organized.

The CMER meeting notes for the April 28, 2009 meeting were approved by CMER. The CMER meeting notes for the March 23, 2010 meeting were approved with two changes submitted by Teresa Miskovic.

- RSAG request for approval of the FPA Field Check Report, the FPA Desktop Analysis Report, and the six questions.  
**CMER approved the two reports and the six questions & agreed to forward to Forest and Fish Policy on the condition that the format of the six questions document be corrected.**

Amy Kurtenbach, Project Manager, reported that the FPA Field Check & the FPA Desk Top Analysis reports are completed. The six questions were the same as those that went before Policy before the UW peer review; editorial changes were recommended and they have been made. However, the formatting for the six questions document is not correct. The formatting will be corrected before sending on to Policy.

- RSAG Request for conditional approval to forward the CMER Review Response Matrix (Bull Trout Solar Study) on to contractors following CMER Reviewers approval of the matrix. The contractors can then revise the report based on CMER comments. **CMER approved that the CMER Review Response Matrix be forwarded to contractor after approval of CMER reviewers.**

Amy Kurtenbach, Project Manager, reported that the report came to CMER last month. The CMER reviewers were Leslie Lingley, Steve McConnell, and Todd Baldwin. The CMER comments were put into a comment matrix. RSAG is attempting to work efficiently to meet contract timelines.

- CMER Task List and Science Topics – *Review the template and identify its purpose*  
Co-chair Jackson reviewed the spreadsheet for the CMER task list and identified that CMER needs to keep an on-going list of tasks and set up due dates. CMER members reviewed identified tasks and provided input on end dates. The main tasks discussed were the Protocols and Standards Manual, the Stillwater Report CMER response and the CMER Work Plan.

**Action Item-** CMER Co-chairs will send out a note to the SAGs co-chairs to start the work on the CMER work plan. This note will identify when SAGs need to have their work completed and submit it for the CMER review. The SAGs need to follow the CMER work plan deadlines this year.

➤ *CMER Coordinated Review Table – Update*

Amy Kurtenbach, Project Manager, reported that a memo went out two months ago about CMER projects that are being coordinated in the review stages. There are two major projects, the Post-Mortem Study & the Bull Trout Solar Study, that need additional CMER reviewers. One of the requests by CMER was to bring this table to all of CMER to identify the reviewers.

Discussion Points:

The question was asked if the FPA Desktop Analysis Report and FPA Field Check Report are ready to be loaded on the web site. It was determined that this needs to first go to Policy for informational purposes. These reports are completed and have been approved by CMER.

Project Updates:

➤ *Type N Characterization Study: Forest Hydrology*

Todd Baldwin, SAGE Chair, provided an update. SAGE is moving forward with the site validation work. SAGE is using the DNR hydro layer maps for an office review and field review. SAGE needs to determine if they can locate enough streams with perennial flow to survey. The EWRAP method is being followed, but on a larger scale. The first real update for SAGE will be in July regarding sites validated and sites rejected.

Discussion Points:

Co-chair Mendoza inquired about the inclusion of small landowners in the site selection process.. SAGE is working on a one-page memo to submit to CMER about the operational and logistical difficulties that arise from including SFLO sites within the Forest Hydrology study. This will be done after the July SAGE meeting.

AMPA Hotvedt asked if SAGE will need a statistician at the end of summer for the site analysis. SAGE Chair Baldwin suggested that SAGE may need to contract Dan Miller for statistical consultation. This will need to be discussed with SAGE.

Mark Hicks asked about the site validation and if SAGE is checking for flowing streams. SAGE Chair Baldwin reported that they are checking streams for perennial flow or connection to a channel. SAGE will have Dan Miller verify the pool of sites. So far, 100 sites have been validated for sampling (in the office) & 100 sites have been rejected due to either no stream or landowner issues. SAGE should be finished with their site validation by early October. An update of the results will then be provided to CMER at their October meeting.

➤ *Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project (Post-Mortem)*

UPSAG Chair Dieu reported that the CMER review closed three weeks ago. Eight reviewers provided comments. UPSAG is looking at a major re-write of sections. Alice Shelly, on-call statistician, has provided input on the statistics and Greg Stewart is working with her. UPSAG

would like to bring the revised report back to the CMER reviewers at the October UPSAG meeting. After that there will be three weeks for review/comments.

➤ Roads Sub Basin – Update

UPSAG Chair Dieu reported that Amy Kurtenbach brought the ISPR comments to UPSAG yesterday. The three ISPR reviewers provided solid and productive comments. The turnaround time may be a few weeks by the contractor.

Dick Miller asked if the ISPR commented on confidence variables. UPSAG Chair Dieu responded that most of the reviewers felt that it wasn't necessary.

Co-chair Mendoza asked if the ISPR comments will go out to the CMER reviewers. UPSAG Chair Dieu reported that UPSAG and the contractor just received them and that she will remind the project manager (Amy Kurtenbach) about this step.

➤ Wetlands Mitigation – Update

Project Manager Teresa Miskovic reported that the wetlands mitigation study plan is being revised based on comments received. Ash Roorbach will send the revision out to reviewers. The standing issue of WETSAG's need for resources and people to contribute remains. Jill Silver has stepped down as she has another contract that absorbs her time.

Co-chair Mendoza inquired about DOE having representation in this SAG. Mark Hicks responded that DOE will have technical assistance with document review but is unable to provide day to day involvement. This project needs someone that can evaluate wetland functions.

➤ Soft Rock - Update

Co-chair Mendoza reported that the scoping document is being revised and the study design is also moving ahead concurrently. They are attempting to follow the timeline to get out in the field by summer 2011.

➤ Tribal Industry Collaborative (TIC) - Update

Co-chair Jackson stated that based on discussions at RSAG, there does not appear to be a clear understanding by everyone on how this will move forward within CMER and the certainty of how the data may be used in the end. This should be discussed at Policy to make sure that everyone is on the same page and there is a successful outcome. The main issue at the Policy level lately is non-CMER science. In order for this to be successful we need to make sure it goes through the processes adequately to avoid an argument at the end. Although it appears that TIC is following the protocols, their project plan is really not going thru the CMER process. Co-chair Mendoza stated that there are different views on this point. He agreed that the tribes & industry are filling in the gaps for field work and providing resources. The issue is the difference in protocols and process between CMER research and non-CMER research. How or if we follow the CMER process, and the implications for how that research is considered by Policy and the Board, is the main point of disagreement. How information used to inform Policy is out of our hands, but the CMER process for generating research is not.

AMPA Hotvedt stated that TIC is not following the Extensive Status and Trend Temperature study design completely. The rotating panel has not yet been reviewed and approved by CMER.

➤ Lessons Learned from CMER Projects – Update

Nancy Sturhan shared the draft table, which includes preliminary information on a few projects. This table is a work-in-progress and needs additional input. The intent is to learn lessons from the experiences of past projects, so that we can do better in the future. Nancy will work with the CMER co-chairs before sharing the table with CMER next month. She asked for assistance to identify more projects and expand the table.

➤ CMER Co-chairs progress on Stillwater Report recommendations – Update

Co-chair Mendoza stated that Policy and CMER co-chairs met to discuss the recommendations from the Stillwater Report and developed a matrix. A CMER sub-group meeting is scheduled for next week to review the initial work done by the Policy/CMER co-chairs and to come up with methods for responding to the recommendations

➤ CMER Report to Policy – Discussion

Items being taken to Policy meeting on July 1, 2010:

Suggest Policy's budget retreat be done before the CMER work plan.

FPA Desktop and Field Check reports and six questions

TIC

***Meeting Adjourned.***