

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research
DNR /DOC Compound
August 25, 2009
Notes**

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Black, Jenelle (ph)	CMER Staff, NWIFC
Cahill, Candace	Rayonier, WETSAG Chair
Cramer, Darin	DNR, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Gilrein, Bob	Spokane Tribe of Indians, SAGE Co-Chair
Hayes, Marc	WDFW
*Hicks, Mark	Ecology
Hitchens, Dawn	DNR, CMER Coordinator
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, Project Manager
* Lingley, Leslie	DNR
*Martin, Doug	WFPA Contractor
*McConnell, Steve	UCUT
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	WFFA Contractor
Moon, Teresa	DNR, Project Manager
O'Sullivan, Alison	Suquamish Tribe
*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

The Stillwater Report and the Type N Feasibility study were added to the agenda.

Announcement

Darin Cramer is promoting into the Forest Practices Division Manager position. The intent is to recruit for the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) position. This is a priority for him as division manager and CMER is welcome to provide input about potential people or thoughts about the position. It may be possible to have an interim.

Darin Cramer stated that this is a DNR position and that the recruitment for this position does not require Policy approval. The recruitment process is set up by executive management at DNR.

Meeting Minutes

CMER approved the March and May 2009 meeting notes, with three changes made to the May 2009 meeting notes. These changes will be incorporated and the finalized minutes will be loaded on the CMER website.

Science Session

CMER Co-chairs requested SAG involvement for identifying potential science sessions for future CMER meeting.

Adaptive Management WAC & Manual Training

Nancy Sturhan facilitated the second training on the Adaptive Management Program WAC and Board Manual. The session covered the Adaptive Management process, the role and function of the Independent Scientific Peer Review and dispute resolution. Ideas, comments and suggestions continue to be tracked by the CMER coordinator as parking lot issues.

SAG /CMER Items

UPSAG

➤ Roads Sub Basin Effectiveness Project Report – *Update*

Jenelle Black provided an overview of the comments after the presentation from the Watershed Professional Network last month. CMER members wanted to see the comments that came in from the reviewers. These comments were sent out yesterday. The comment matrix will be completed within two weeks for the UPSAG review. This will be on the CMER agenda for next month.

Chris Mendoza stated that the responses were very well laid out and clearly articulated.

SAGE

➤ Type N Forest Hydrology Study – CMER Approval for SAGE Request to extend the contract and add \$5,000 from the program development funds

Bob Gilrein reported that SAGE is requesting CMER approval to extend the contract for the contractor to complete the responses to the ISPR matrix and to modify the final draft of the study design. A total of \$5,000 from the Project Development Funds will be needed. The original funding for this contract has been expended. SAGE will be extending the Type N Characterization Study Design Contract expiration date to June 30, 2010. The current expiration date for this contract is August 31, 2009. This extension is required to give the contractor sufficient time to respond to ISPR comments and to complete the final draft of the study design for this project.

Dick Miller motioned to approve the SAGE request to extend the contract & add \$5,000.

Chris Mendoza seconded the motion.

CMER members approved the SAGE request.

CMER

➤ Soft Rock Scoping Documents - *Update*

Chris Mendoza reported that this work has been put on hold. Julie Dieu, Nancy Sturhan, Curt Veldhuesin, Jenelle Black, Dave Schuett-Hames, Greg Stewart, Bill Ehinger, Doug Martin & Chris Mendoza are all active members of this work group.

Darin Cramer added that Policy is expecting to review the scoping document for soft rock.

Chris Mendoza replied that the working group is close to having a draft completed and planning of having it ready by November for Policy approval.

➤ Land Owner Data Sharing Memo – *CMER Approved the Landowner Access to CMER Data Prior to the Completion of Final Reports to share for Policy approval*

Chris Mendoza stated that he sent out a marked up and clean copy of the memo to CMER. CMER is still working through this issue due to the recent request from private and public forestland owners to access CMER data from projects that have not been finalized by CMER and delivered to Policy. CMER has developed a process for responding to data requests in the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual (PSM, 2005). This memo outlines the memorandum of understanding as an avenue for sharing data that is “not yet completed”. For situations that fall outside of this situation, CMER recommends adopting an official disclaimer that could be attached to a MOU or CMER Access Agreement.

The disclaimer will be added to the existing access agreement used with landowners. A one-page addendum will be used to resolve issues. If Policy approves the MOU, then this will be identified up front with landowners prior to or coincident with the CMER Access Agreement.

Chris Mendoza asked for CMER approval of the landowner data sharing memo to send to Policy for their approval.

There was no opposition from CMER members.

➤ Work Breakdown Structure for Report Completion & ISPR – *Update*

Amy Kurtenbach gave an update on the project plan structure she is developing with the other project managers. She emphasized that a project plan should be designed to allow the identification of possible opportunities, both within the Adaptive Management Program and outside of the CMER committee, to integrate the science with other work that is being completed in the field. This process of project planning encourages a systematic process, reduces the possibility of the omission of key project steps, and simplifies the process by breaking the project down into manageable steps. If this process is used systematically in the program, a common system will facilitate communication among CMER members who are implementing projects.

Teresa Moon used the matrix from the project plan for the Type N – Amphibian Genetics study – as a way of illustrating for CMER the elements and steps involved in the SAG/CMER/ISPR review phases for a project. She shared that a total of 313 working days is required for this example for all of the stages to be completed in the review phases for a project. Teresa added that she approached this example with an aggressive schedule as this does not capture the back and forth time that may be required for a complex review.

Mark Hicks commented that the timelines are too long; CMER needs to look for ways to shorten the length of the review. It looks like the ISPR process may be the step to look for reduction.

Chris Mendoza stated that CMER used to enforce the two weeks turnaround time at the SAG and CMER review levels. CMER needs to hold to the two weeks turnaround time. The size & scope of the study makes a difference in the reviews as well. CMER needs to work on getting the commitment from the same reviewers. This may be where a concurrent review may work, where the same CMER reviewers are involved at each side of the review.

Amy Kurtenbach added that the technical advisory group (TAG) is a wonderful tool in the review process. This is a time saver where the technical review has not been passed to the full

SAG. Setting up a TAG for each project to do the heavy lifting of the SAG; get that up front and stick to it, would help out with projects.

Mark Hicks would like to see something like this for the full process. Perhaps set up a flagging system where CMER can see where the bottleneck points exist. There may be other efficiency points that CMER can implement.

Darin Cramer added that he planned on sending out a memo to CMER prior to this meeting about the roles and responsibilities of the project managers. This will be emailed out to CMER members. This project plan structure is a tool that the project managers are interested in implementing and allows them to do their jobs. The memo provides clarity about their roles and responsibilities, which will help them to do their jobs and help CMER understand their roles. The timelines on projects are continuously not being met, and depending on the project, it can take double or triple the time to complete projects.

Amy Kurtenbach added that the project plan is intentionally not called an implementation plan. The Protocols & Standards manual shows how to set up a science project in detail. The project plan will not replace that; it will supplement the manual. The plan shows the hurdles needed to get to project completion. Setting up a project charter is one piece of the puzzle. We need to get implementation plans for each project established up front and get the commitments. The charter documents this commitment and it becomes the living document for each project.

The project plan is all in one location; helps build a communication plan. It identifies the resources and people needed for the project. It also identifies the obstacles, project site, funding authority, risk response management plan, file management plan, improvement plan, assignment of the administrative authority, and lessons learned. By signing the charter, it gives credibility and shows the level of responsibility. This is also a tool to track the changes within the life of a project.

CMER members were asked to review this and provide comments to Amy Kurtenbach by September 11th.

➤ *Protocols & Standards Manual (PSM) – Update*

Chris Mendoza stated that CMER has talked about updating the PSM for some time. It would be helpful to set up a work group to work through revisions and updates to the PSM. He proposed that CMER form a work group that follows up with identified meeting updates. This work group can use every month to approach each chapter and revise them following each CMER meeting. PSM working sub-group: Chris Mendoza, Dick Miller, Teresa Moon, Amy Kurtenbach, Nancy Sturhan & Mark Hicks. The co-chairs will be Teresa Moon & Amy Kurtenbach.

Discussion Points:

Mark Hicks brought up the timing issue that every month may be too much; are we setting up a goal that we cannot meet; perhaps build it into every other science session.

Chris Mendoza responded that every other month would work so long as the sub-group gets their work done in a timely manner.

Mark Hicks suggested using the science session for the full group to go through the PSM chapters & use the PSM working group to meet afterwards and make changes to bring back to CMER for approval.

Nancy Sturhan suggested starting with Chapter 7 and that the work group does need to have a champion to assist the group to work through the updates. In the past, the manual group did go through the PSM and developed a priority list; CMER can start from there.

Chris Mendoza stated that the work group can do this on a bi-monthly basis and can use the project plan structure to organize the work. The PSM work group can start with the marked up version. He will send this out to the work group.

➤ *Stillwater Report & Synthesis – Update*

Chris Mendoza reported that CMER has not yet acted on the Stillwater Report because Policy wants to weigh in on the recommendations first. The CMER and Policy co-chairs and the AMPA have met to start identifying themes related to Policy, science, administration, rules etc. Once this work is completed, this will be shared with CMER to respond to the matrix.

➤ *Type N Feasibility Study – CMER Approved Report*

Teresa Moon shared that this is a feasibility study and is the precursor to the Type N Experimental Buffer Project. The Type N Experimental Buffer Project is well underway and LWAG has already found enough sites. LWAG requests CMER approval of this feasibility study to close out the contract. LWAG is not following the correct sequence of events but Chris Mendoza, Steve McConnell and Dick Miller reviewed the comments and agreed that they have been addressed. Teresa added that LWAG assumes that this does not need to go through ISPR, since this is a feasibility study.

Chris Mendoza motioned to approve the feasibility study.
There was no opposition from CMER members.

➤ *Forest Practices Board Update*

Chris Mendoza shared that he submitted the CMER Report and PowerPoint presentation on the DFC Alternative 3 at the August Board meeting. The FP Board decided to adopt Alternative 3.

Darin Cramer shared that the Board asked for a budget update in August - with an option to revisit the decision they made in May. He shared an updated version with them and there was very little discussion as all the principals are waiting for the outcome of the Principals meeting. The FP Board wants regular updates.

➤ *Policy Meeting - Update August meeting*

Chris Mendoza shared that there were no action items.

Policy held a budget meeting in the afternoon. Work group of Policy met last week to review funding options (Miguel Perez-Gibson, Stephen Bernath, Tom Robinson, and Darin Cramer). The options will be shared this week with the Policy leads.

The funding options explored so far are as follows:

Explore the option to increase the federal funding for the tribes/tribal organizations.

In order to explore the option of increasing the FFSA funding for the AMP, need to change the statute; Legislative action required for a statute change.

Request new dedicated state revenue – fees;

Look at restoration package.

One time funding; federal earmark over the long term.

➤ Independent Scientific Peer Review

- Eastside In-stream Channel Wood Characterization Study Design – has been in for two weeks
- RMZ Resample Final Report – Will be submitted next week
- WDFW Wolf Plan - WDFW wants to pay for this & wants to send it to ISPR. CMER was okay with this, as long as it does not interfere with other CMER projects.
- Type N – Forest Hydrology study design - ISPR – SAGE had some clarification questions for two reviewers; they have contacted UW.

➤ CMER Report to Policy for the September 3, 2009:

- Landowner Data Sharing Memo for Approval
- As part of the work plan for FY 10, start addressing the Stillwater recommendations - use the matrix for this.
- Update on Type N Forest Hydrology Project

Meeting Adjourned.