

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee  
July 28, 2009  
DNR/DOC Compound - Tumwater  
Meeting Notes**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Black, Jenelle	CMER Staff, NWIFC
Cahill, Candice	Rayonier, WETSAG Chair
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Dube', Kathy	Watershed Professional Network
Gilrein, Bob	Spokane Tribe of Indians, SAGE Co-Chair
Hayes, Marc	WDFW, LWAG Co-Chair
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology
Hitchens, Dawn	DNR/ CMER Coordinator
*Jackson, Terry	WDFW, CMER Co-Chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, Project Manager
*Martin, Doug	WFPA Contractor
McConnell, Steve (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miller, Adrian	WFPA
*Miller, Dick	WFPA Contractor
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Moon, Teresa	DNR, Project Manager
O'Sullivan, Allison	Suquamish Tribe
Phillips, Jeff	Skagit River Systems Cooperative
*Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC
Veldhuisen, Curt	Skagit River Systems Cooperative

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

**Agenda**

No changes were made to the agenda items.

**Science Session: Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Project**

Kathy Dube', Watershed Professionals Network (WPN), presented on the first sampling of the Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project. The first sampling included surveying connectivity of roads to streams, answering six monitoring questions and monitoring sites through time.

### **Adaptive Management WAC & Manual Training**

Nancy Sturhan facilitated the first training for the Adaptive Management Program (WAC 222-12-045) and Part 1 Overview & Participants in the Board manual. The main intent of this training is to review what is included in the Washington Administrative Code for the AMP. Ideas, comments and suggestions can be tracked by the CMER coordinator as parking lot issues. CMER will return to the parking lot issues and address them. Policy is going through the same training and has the same structure for the parking lot issues. CMER also wants to review Policy's Parking Lot issues.

### **Business Session**

#### **SAG /CMER Items**

- CMER – Work Breakdown Structure for Report Completion & ISPR – Update

Amy Kurtenbach shared that this is a project management tool. The break down structure is the beginnings of what is identified for a complete project. The milestones for the project are identified and the steps for completion are addressed. The project managers met and brainstormed all the tasks for a typical generic project, reviewed the Protocols and Standards Manual and the training document from Nancy Sturhan. This tool also shows a bit about what the ISPR process is step by step. Amy requested that CMER review this and provide feedback by August 18<sup>th</sup>.

#### **UPSAG**

- Roads Sub Basin Effectiveness Project Report - ***CMER Approved CMER Reviewers***

Curt Veldhuisen stated that UPSAG is requesting CMER reviewers of the roads sub-basin report. CMER reviewers include Doug Martin, Mark Hicks, Dick Miller and Nancy Sturhan. The comments are due by August 18<sup>th</sup>. Page 30 in the report will be cleaned up and the revised graph will be emailed to the CMER reviewers. A CMER reviewer matrix will be developed to reflect substantive comments and will be completed in time for the September UPSAG meeting. UPSAG plans to bring this back to CMER in September.

- RSAG - Water Temperature Evaluation of Hardwood Conversion Treatment Sites – This was tabled until the next CMER meeting as the RSAG co-chair was absent.

- RSAG – Extensive Riparian Monitoring – Vegetation Component Methods Development ***CMER Approved canceling the project due to technical compatibility issues***

Jenelle Black reported that the original approach was to look at aerial photos to get a statewide view and get site information at the same time. The contractor was to develop a protocol; he investigated the digital and vegetation ground data. He found that technological compatibility and limitations remain. Technologies are changing rapidly; and therefore, it is difficult to develop a protocol now for a study two years down the road.

The contractor presented a revised proposal for a pilot test from which to develop a methodology that would essentially require that CMER fly custom photography when CMER is ready to

implement the study. RSAG has chosen to not continue the proposed line of work at this time given the inadequacy of the existing photography and the lack of funding and Policy's priority for the project in the CMER work plan. They would like to step back and investigate alternative approaches and developing technologies, as well as to potentially reevaluate the information needed out of the project given the current trend in CMER priorities. \$16,000 has been spent on this project to date. \$59,000 remains in the contract. RSAG would like to postpone the project at this time.

Amy Kurtenbach emphasized that CMER approves canceling the project and not the contract. DNR has the administrative authority to cancel a contract and she wanted to make sure that this is part of the record.

There was no opposition from CMER in postponing the project to a later date.

#### SAGE

- Type N Forest Hydrology Draft Final Study Design – ***CMER Approved the Study Design & ISPR Review Matrix***

Amy Kurtenbach requested CMER's consideration for a simultaneous review and approval of the draft study design and ISPR comments matrix. CMER reviewers were designated and have provided comments. Amy reported that once SAGE received CMER's approval, then the ISPR comments will be addressed before completing the final version of the study design. The contract expires next month. The changes were not that extensive so SAGE has already incorporated them into the study design. SAGE will bring the final study design to CMER next month.

Chris Mendoza stated that SAGE does not have the rationale for making or not making changes documented, this needs to be done when a SAG chooses not to directly respond to the ISPR comments by providing a comment matrix.

Amy Kurtenbach replied that SAGE should have addressed every comment even the ones that were not applicable.

Todd Baldwin stated that the turnaround time for comments will be two weeks; that comments about not responding to ISPR are due by August 5<sup>th</sup>. Once these have been received, then the contractor will respond to the ISPR. SAGE will deal with the lack of contractor response if that becomes an issue. SAGE has been following and paying attention to this.

SAGE is requesting comments be sent into Amy Kurtenbach by August 5<sup>th</sup> and she will insert all comments into the matrix. This will be done within the time frame without extending the contract.

CMER agreed to the simultaneous review and time frame.

#### CMER

- DRAFT Report on the DFC Alternative 3 (Request from the FPB) – ***CMER Approved to forward the report to the Forest Practices Board***

Chris Mendoza reported that a sub-group worked on this and that it is due next Monday for the Forest Practices Board. He urged CMER to get comments to him submitted before the end of the week as an executive summary needs to be written for the Forest Practices Board.

#### Background-

The Forest Practices Board had three alternatives under consideration for Desired Future Condition (DFC). This draft looked at alternative three which increases the DFC BAPA threshold to 325 ft<sup>2</sup>/acre, but additionally allows the 20 trees per acre required to be left in the outer part of the Inner Zone to be included in the basal area calculation when running the DFC model. CMER has been asked to provide a report to the Board highlighting the differences between alternatives 1 and 3.

Chris Mendoza requested CMER approval of the report to forward to the FPB. There was no opposition from CMER members on this request.

- CMER Land Owner Data Sharing Memo - *CMER delayed Approval of the memo to share with Policy*

CMER members agreed to continue working on refining the memo. This will be acted on at the next CMER meeting (August 2009) and shared with the CMER co-chairs two weeks before the next CMER meeting.

- Policy Meeting - *Update* on July 2, 2009 meeting:
  - The CMER Approved 10% Budget Reduction Summary for FY 10 was shared and discussed at Policy

- CMER Budget - *Update*

The Forest Practices Board wanted an update on the budget as they approved the Policy preferred budget. The CMER budget is in a little better shape than what was presented in May as the carry forward from FY 09, the FFSA, and the cost savings summary have helped. Based on those changes, it looks like the reductions will take effect in FY 11 rather than FY10. The Forest Practices Board may make another decision at their August meeting based on this updated information. CMER members requested a copy of the budget that was shared with the Forest Practices Board.

- CMER Report to Policy – *Discussion* - Items being taken to Policy for its August 4, 2009 meeting:
  - CMER Decision on the Extensive Riparian Monitoring – Vegetation Component Method Development.

***Meeting Adjourned.***