

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
May 25, 2010
DNR/DOC Compound
Tumwater**

Meeting Notes

Attendees	Representing
Almond, Lyle (ph)	Makah Tribe
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Black, Tami	NOAA Fisheries
*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

Jim Hotvedt announced he will send out the CMER budget that was presented to the FPB on May 11th.

Amy Kurtenbach would like to add CMER workload capacity to today's agenda.

Science Session

Greg Stewart presented on the design of experiments & the multi variant data method.

Science Session Topics & CMER Task List

Co-chair Jackson facilitated the discussion on updating the table for scheduling science topics for the rest of the year and on populating the CMER work list.

Business Session

- RSAG – Solar Radiation/Effective Shade Draft Final Report
CMER approved the request for CMER Reviewers

Amy Kurtenbach, Project Manager, reported that the contractor has finished all field work for the solar study, and a draft of the final report is in the comment review stage with RSAG. Doug Martin, Terry Jackson, Eddie Cupp, and Chris Mendoza were the RSAG reviewers. RSAG decided to send this component of the larger Shade/Temp/Solar study through the complete review phases (including ISPR) and finalize the report. Then the solar study data will be integrated into the shade and stream temperature component of the study and into one final CMER report.

CMER Reviewers: Leslie Lingley, Todd Baldwin, and Steve McConnell. The CMER review process is due in two weeks; June 11th is the due date for CMER reviewers to submit their comments to Amy Kurtenbach, project manager.

- RSAG – FPA Desktop Analysis and Field Check Final Reports
CMER approved the request to accept the final reports

Amy Kurtenbach, Project Manager, reported that UCUT is the contractor for this project and that the project manager changed when Jenelle Black left. These reports have gone thru ISPR. Steve McConnell has been working on finalizing these reports. He incorporated the ISPR comments and RSAG has approved the final reports. The CMER reviewers have approved the revisions. RSAG requests that CMER approve these two final reports.

Discussion Points:

This project started five years ago and ended up being one of the most complex CMER projects. McConnell and Roorbach have done an excellent job. The FPA Model and Manual Report have been used to some extent by DNR. CMER will submit this in July for Policy to review.

RSAG needs to make sure the six questions are current. Does a findings report need to accompany the six questions that will go to Policy?

The Adaptive Management Board Manual states that within three months of a CMER approved final report, that a findings report will be completed. The findings report includes the results of the report and identifies and potential implications for rule making. The plan for this project is to get the current versions of the FPA reports, answer the six questions, and then bring the documents back to CMER for final adoption. CMER has yet to complete a “findings report” as described by the AM Board Manual and needs to develop this process. Therefore, development of “findings reports” for the FPA Desktop Analysis and associated reports will not take place.

CMER approved the request to finalize the two reports.

- **UPSAG – Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project (Post-Mortem)**
CMER approved the request for CMER Reviewers

Julie Dieu, UPSAG Co-chair reported that eight CMER reviewers met on May 4th. A link was set up to get the documents out for review. The review process has been open for three weeks for the designated reviewers. The CMER review is due by June 8th, two weeks from today.

Amy Kurtenbach, Project Manager, reported that UPSAG used the on-call statistician as a reviewer. Part of the Post Mortem project funds was used for this statistical review. Co-chair Mendoza requested that in the future CMER be notified and provide approval when the on-call statistician and technical editor are going to be used by a SAG. Any CMER funding used for these contractors needs to be approved by CMER, not just the SAG.

Discussion Points:

This project is involved in the new coordinated review process. In the past CMER was informed at the CMER meetings and whoever was at the meetings signed up for the CMER review. This coordinated approach allows CMER reviewers to be involved earlier in the process.

The point was made about the quality of written reports along with a suggestion that before reports are submitted to ISPR they should be submitted to the on-call technical editor (JVP). ISPR comments should focus on substance not grammar, punctuation, etc. CMER will consider the need for this on a case-by-case basis.

The question was asked if the Post Mortem draft report needed to be submitted to the on-call editor and the answer was no. CMER reached agreement to approve the request for CMER reviewers with one abstaining.

- **SAGE – ESICCS (Large Woody Debris Study)**
CMER approved the ISPR Response Matrix

CMER reviewers, Jackson and Miller, provided comments. Doug Martin has received a go ahead to make the final comments and send this to the CMER reviewers. After this step is completed, SAGE will send the study design to CMER for final approval.

CMER reached agreement to approve the ISPR response matrix with one abstaining from voting.

- **WETSAG – Wetland Mitigation Effectiveness Study, Pilot Study Plan**
Request Approval of CMER Response Matrix

Teresa Miskovic, Project Manager, reported that this project is in the CMER 2010 Work plan. Five CMER reviewers have reviewed the study design document; their comments are in the comment matrix. WETSAG thought it would be good for CMER to review the matrix before revising the pilot study plan document.

Points of Discussion:

Mark Hicks stated that he has underlying discomfort in the overall approach; still speculative in terms of testing the field methods without having the specific approach. There remains too much of a qualitative approach rather than a quantitative design. This is a big study, where two years of investment of time and money is a major concern.

Leslie Lingley reported that there are a lot of statements in the study plan that asserts the field work can document a change. This is hard to do unless a baseline exists and the study design can make that comparison. Other CMER projects have a feasibility study and she suggested that this document may fit that definition. This study design is not an effectiveness mitigation study. Instead it is about figuring out how to do it. WETSAG may need to parse it down to a feasibility study; the study metrics to implement in the field are not finalized. Leslie suggested WETSAG reconfigure what this project is supposed to do and that a pilot does not need 60 sites. She suggested that the sites can be picked out based on a list of the FPAs that are scheduled to go out in the field.

Jill Silver, if WETSAG is asked to revise the study design, they need DOE's help. There are currently no study designs out there to draw from. She put out a request that CMER put more resources in at this stage to help develop the appropriate study design.

Ash Roorbach, CMER staff, stated that CMER's concerns are unclear; WETSAG developed study design based on the framework of an experimental design: ID factors, screen the variables before you implement a large study, test the methods, and then implement. Roorbach agreed these are untested methods, which is why a pilot approach is laid out.

Mark Hicks stated that he did put a cover letter together where he stated concerns about the scope, seems too big of an approach, start out at a smaller level, especially since you're plan includes contracting this work out.

Leslie Lingley stated that now is the time to hire a professional wetlands scientist to develop & refine methods. It seems the big picture is refining the methods of how to do this; then continue to conduct the random samples and collect data. As it stands it seems like a lot of money for refining methods without side boards to the approach.

Teresa Miskovic, Project Manager, stated that that is why Ash Roorbach suggested checking in with CMER before launching the full project.

Jill Silver WETSAG chair stated that the approach is to work on the methods development before putting a lot of funding into a larger study. Co-chair Mendoza stated that CMER has done phased projects in a number of ways; CMER has done feasibility studies that were piloted. WETSAG has methods they have developed; WETSAG now needs to go out and test them to clarify what information needs to be collected and not collected. The different opinions expressed by CMER members may be a matter of semantics. WETSAG will not have answers until they get out in the field and then tweak the methods.

Ash Roorbach, CMER staff, stated implementing a pilot project will accomplish this; can test & finalize methods. This approach will help with map accuracy, figure out if GIS maps will help in

site selection. Then compare map with field work, as the hypothesis exists today, this will help to see if the smaller wetlands are not mapped. The use of the HGM Classification is to ID factors to the extent possible that represent your region; can use the remote sensing tools and LiDAR to classify wetlands; the 60 sites is part of the objectives. WETSAG recognizes the variability inherent in wetlands; test methods as they occur in a full range of wetland conditions.

Jill Silver stated that the classification is connected to fish bearing streams. This is a tool to devise methods for classifying functions; folding in the classification system into this project as it has not been done before. Fold in a variety of variables in order to find them and study the wetlands mitigation effectiveness; mitigation means looking at net loss of function. In order to establish method, need to establish function.

Co-Chair Jackson suggested that WETSAG & CMER reviewers meet to resolve some of these issues. This needs to be done soon as possible as this is a budgeted project for this year in the CMER work plan.

Jill Silver in responding to the comments - we do not have pre-harvest data. There exists a fundamental disagreement about using a method based on best professional judgment; WETSAG needs to collect the data out there that proves others have used this approach. Looking at indicators of functional change – that can say the wetlands have been altered.

Dick Miller asked if ISPR is to review this, they need experts for this, who would WETSAG have on your team as an expert?

Some folks were identified and the issue that they still do not have experience in the forested landscape was raised as concern of WETSAG. Perhaps this expertise exists at the ISPR level.

Co-chair Mendoza stated that since WETSAG and the CMER reviewers have reviewed the response matrix, he proposed that WETSAG move forward revising the study plan to incorporate the comments and then return to CMER with this revision for approval. Though he has less than ½ time to work on this, Ash will revise the study plan, and bring it back to CMER.

Co-chair Jackson asked that WETSAG work with the CMER reviewers before it comes back to CMER.

EPA Grants - Update

Jim Hotvedt, AMPA, reported that applicants were supposed to be notified May 14th about the status of the applications. EPA has received a huge response in applications without much staff and they are not sure how to divide up the \$50 Million. The new date for notification is mid-June. EPA had planned to do another round of proposals, but this has been delayed until fall, due to the huge response of this first round.

Jim Hotvedt, AMPA, presented the CMER work plan and budget to FPB on May 11th. The FPB approved both. The FPB had one question about the CMER priorities. They asked why the wetlands mitigation project was a high priority. He explained the evolution of the CMER projects and the ranking of them over time.

Stillwater Response - Update - Set up Work Group and meeting

Co-chair Mendoza reported that CMER & Policy co-chairs are working on finishing the Stillwater response matrix work. Co-chair Mendoza will organize the CMER sub group meeting after getting this matrix completed. This will be accomplished in the next couple of months.

CMER Lessons Learned –Update

Nancy Sturhan reported that she was trying to pull together projects to show what we have learned. She is meeting with co-chair Jackson to get this worked out. CMER needs to be able to answer this type of question. She will bring something back for CMER to review next month.

CMER Work Load Capacity

Amy Kurtenbach, Project Manager, referred to the table of CMER members and staff that Nancy Sturhan put together. This table represents people as being a part of the SAGs, when in some cases employers only allow them to go to meetings. The project managers are challenged to get involvement within SAGs without funding or contractual obligations. CMER needs to come up with a realistic view of the involvement & resources required.

Amy Kurtenbach pointed out that the project plan document has a charter component in it that asks to list out the resources, staff, commitment levels, etc. Using this charter document would help CMER to understand better the staff, budget, scope and performance connected to the work needed for projects. Having a project sponsor is key to the success of a charter; clearly identifying the partnership between project managers and the project sponsors will help.

Amy Kurtenbach suggested that she will bring a charter document to next CMER meeting to discuss and show CMER the use of this tool.

Co-chair Mendoza requested that the table Amy Kurtenbach developed for the CMER reviewers get mailed out before each CMER meeting as a refresher on the status of the projects.

Policy Meeting - Update on May 6th meeting

Jim Hotvedt, AMPA, reported on Watershed Analysis, as it pertains to mass wasting. There is supposed to be a five year review after a watershed analysis has been completed. DNR does not have clear authority for conditioning mass wasting prescriptions even though the five years have elapsed. DNR needs this authority to either require landowners to conduct a five-year review or to condition mass wasting prescriptions which are determined to be inadequate. The WACs need to be reviewed for potential needed rule revisions. DNR pays for reviews and does not have the funding for this. This went to Policy and they will be setting up a work group.

Leslie Lingley added that DNR is now working on how to prioritize 52 Watersheds. She is working on setting up criteria, how many FPAs in the watershed, among other variables. DNR staff will set up a stakeholder process for how to do the reviews. The expectation is to have this set up by August. At this point it is difficult to know if this timeline will be met.

Mark Hicks reported on RMAPS. Some landowners depend on the harvesting of their timber in order to fund their road repairs. RMAP requirements are to move in an even flow/rate while

addressing the worst first to make sure landowners get their roads repaired by 2016. Due to the economic downturn, landowners have asked for a five-year extension.

There are three sub groups working on a course of action:

- 1) Policy sub group, how to deal with the extension.
- 2) Leadership, scope out the issues
- 3) Staff sub-group which provides the expertise and gather available RMAP data, conduct ad-hoc analysis, and summarize as defined by the Policy RMAP Charter.

CMER Report to Policy – Items to take to Policy for the June 3, 2010 meeting.
Jim Hotvedt, AMPA, suggested an update on Wetlands Mitigation Study.

Follow-Up

Teresa Miskovic, Project Manager, reported that at the last CMER meeting, RSAG brought the WSU amphibian genetics paper and CMER expressed concerns about contractual language regarding data sharing. She reviewed the contract language for both the personal services contracts and interagency agreements. The language in the personal service contract states clearly that the relationship is considered as “works for hire” and where DNR owns the data. The interagency agreements reflect language where the data is considered property of the state of Washington and that DNR & WSU jointly own the data. WSU is only required to give us notification of 60 days notice about use of the data and publication. They did not do anything outside the scope of their contract so a letter from CMER is inappropriate to send to WSU.

CMER thanked her for the follow up and supported this course of action.

Meeting Adjourned.