

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research DNR /DOC Compound

December 15, 2009
Meeting Notes

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Black, Jenelle	CMER Staff, NWIFC
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
*Hicks, Mark (ph)	Ecology
Hitchens, Dawn	DNR, CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	DNR, AMPA
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, CMER Co-chair
Kroll, AJ	Weyerhaeuser
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, Project Manager
*Martin, Doug	WFPA Contractor
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miller, Dick	WFFA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, NWIFC
*Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC

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

Agenda

There were no changes made to the agenda.

Science Session

➤ CMER Information Management Project

Nancy Sturhan, Bruce Jones and Marilu Koschak, from the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, presented the CMER Information Management Project. CMER approved the pilot project in 2007, supported continuing the project in 2008, and today it continues with seven CMER projects. The objective of this project is to collect CMER data (scoping documents, research papers, spatial data, etc.) and to set up one location for storing and retrieving CMER research information. The information has been programmed in an Access database. The linking function provides the ability to retrieve project information and the respective deliverables and data. The information system has GIS capability, where site location data is connected through ARC GIS. The major data layers for project site-specific information can be retrieved. This is not a web-based application. This is a compact disk application and an installation and user guide has been developed for CMER. CMER needs to test drive this application and provide feedback. CMER reviewers can schedule time to go to the SSHIAP office for this level of review.

Business Session

➤ CMER 2011 Work Plan - Review Suggested Timeline

Terry Jackson reviewed the timeline for completing the CMER 2011 work plan. Policy will need to have the CMER work plan at their March meeting in time for the April budget meeting. CMER has this meeting and the January meeting to work through major sections. The CMER

February is slated for approval. The SAG co-chairs are encouraged to use their monthly meetings to update their sections of the work plan. The CMER co-chairs will work with the SAG co-chairs to get this done.

➤ **CMER Assignment - Projects/Functions Table & Strategy Worksheet**

CMER members continued working on populating the projects and functions table that will be included in the CMER work plan. Examples were given for the Policy place holder and the link to adaptive management which will be incorporated into the work plan.

SAG /CMER Items:

➤ **CMER – Soft Rock Scoping - *Update***

The sub-group has a meeting scheduled for Thursday. There will be more to report at a later CMER meeting.

➤ **CMER - AMP Strategic Goals, Objectives & Tasks - *Continue Review***

This was shared with CMER last month. This is the strategic plan Policy developed. This document reflects the assignments and associated deadlines.

➤ **CMER - 2010 Science Conference - *Tentative Dates April 8th or 15th***

CMER members reported that field time conflicts with this time of year. Policy offered the Department of Ecology as a location if CMER picks a March date. CMER reached consensus to have the later date in April for the science conference and to have it at the OB2 auditorium. The CMER coordinator will update the science conference guidelines and time lines for the project managers, SAG & CMER co-chairs.

➤ **SAGE – Type N Characterization Study: Forest Hydrology Study Design - *CMER Approved the study design***

Project manager, Amy Kurtenbach, reported that CMER reviewed the final draft of study design two months ago. The CMER comments were not substantive in nature.

CMER reached consensus to approve the study design.

➤ **UPSAG – Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Report - *CMER provided contingent approval to forward to ISPR***

Project manager, Jenelle Black, provided the overview for CMER. This report is reflective of the first sample event. The report has been through the UPSAG and CMER review stages. Jenelle reported that some of the comments reflected concerns about the statistics. The ISPR review would be good place to pursue those concerns. UPSAG requests CMER approval to forward this to ISPR.

Discussion Points:

Doug Martin pointed out that the disclaimer on this report does not follow the standard and that the overall report format does not follow the standard. He requested that the AMPA pull up the standard disclaimer and use it for all CMER reports.

Amy Kurtenbach requested clarification about the level of involvement for developing the ISPR questions. She requested clarification as she will be assigned to this project. Do all of the reviewers come up with ISPR questions or does it come back to CMER? In prior meetings CMER talked about having the previous CMER reviewers review the questions.

Jenelle Black replied to include the CMER reviewers when reviewing the ISPR questions. The CMER reviewers have read the reports and can gauge appropriate questions with the SAG. The following volunteered to review the ISPR questions for this report: Amy Kurtenbach, Doug Martin, Nancy Sturhan, Dick Miller, Mark Hicks, and Chris Mendoza.

CMER provided contingent approval to forward the Roads Sub-Basin report to ISPR premised on the fact the UPSAG co-chair and project manager would address the CMER comments from today's meeting.

➤ CMER - AMP Planning – Synchronized Project Reviews - *Discussion*

Project manager, Amy Kurtenbach, provided the background and rationale for synchronized reviews. The level of project management will be reduced to two project managers for all of the CMER projects. There are several projects coming up with reports for review. Several CMER members have shared that there is a lot of time spent in report reviews. She suggested a synchronized approach to SAG and CMER review of project documents. The primary example shared with CMER was the Post-Mortem report as this will be reviewed by UPSAG within the next two months. She recommended bringing in CMER reviewers to assist with the UPSAG review step. Once UPSAG is at a final draft stage, she recommends bringing in CMER reviewers to assist. This may expedite the UPSAG review.

Discussion Points:

It was unclear for some CMER members about the distinction of roles between SAG and CMER reviews. The current process has a distinct separation of SAG reviewers and CMER reviewers. If you are a member of the SAG you can review the draft report at the SAG review level. The SAG review should address the scientific merits of the report at a more rigorous scale. . Once the SAG has approved the report to move on to the CMER level, CMER reviewers can then review the report on a higher level and hopefully catch things that might not be caught at the SAG level.

It was pointed out that a synchronized review may create process efficiencies. This approach brings in the CMER review stage earlier, this occurred with the Roads Sub-Basin report. CMER reviewers join in with the SAG reviewers without losing independence. The draft report is passed along to different people to review it at synchronized times.

The project manager will come in with a list of current projects and their respective status for reviews and use this list to identify final CMER reviewers. This will be done at the next CMER meeting (January 2010). This can be used as a planning tool for CMER.

➤ CMER – Potential use of Net Map - *Discussion*

Doug Martin shared with CMER that this tool is popular among the services and forestry groups. This is not just a database but a query system to derive attributes which can locate, for example, roads that are likely to deliver sediment. At this time, FFR lands are missing. The Environmental Protection Agency has an RFP out right now to support the Puget Sound

Partnership. The potential exists where the tribes could sponsor responding to the RFP, identifying Net Map as a tool. CMER could invite the Net Map contractor to give a presentation at our next science session.

- Policy Meeting Update on December 10, 2009 meeting:
 - Policy discussed potential legislative items:
 - WFPA the timber industry is seeking a 5 year extension in RMAPS
 - All caucuses want FREP reinstated
 - DNR is preparing funding reduction scenarios
 - UPSAG presented on Post-Mortem project.
 - Policy /CMER co-chairs and AMPA continued working on parking lot issues from AMP training

- CMER Report to Policy – Items for Discussion for the January 7, 2010 Policy meeting:
 - Policy placeholder for the CMER work plan

Meeting Adjourned.