

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee  
January 26, 2010  
DNR/DOC Compound – Tumwater**

**Meeting Notes**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
*Baldwin, Todd (ph & v)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Ehinger, Bill	WDOE
Hayes, Marc	WDFW, LWAG Co-Chair
*Hicks, Mark	Ecology
Hitchens, Dawn	DNR /CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	DNR/ Adaptive Management Program Administrator
*Jackson, Terry	WDFW, CMER Co-Chair
*Lingley, Leslie	DNR
Kurtenbach, Amy	DNR, Project Manager
*Martin, Doug	WFPA Contractor
*McConnell, Steve (ph)	UCUT
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	DNR, Project Manager
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, NWIFC
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

**Announcement** - Doug Martin announced that Dick Miller is recovering from a triple by-pass. He is doing well. A card for Dick was sent around to the group.

**Agenda**

T. Miskovic requested that the RMZ Resample Memo be taken off the agenda; it will be brought to the next CMER meeting.

**Science Session**

***CMER Project function table -***

CMER members agreed to remove the DNR headwaters study from Project Functions table & Work plan. The fish passage projects (Culvert Test Bed, Stream Simulation, and literature review) will also be removed from the Project Functions table. The projects will also be removed from the CMER Work Plan; however a brief explanation of their history in CMER will be included in the program strategy.

Co-chair Mendoza's approval to have the DNR's Headwater study removed from the Work Plan and Project Functions Table was contingent upon documentation indicating that DNR did not

receive and spend any CMER funds during the development and implementation of the project. This will be brought back to CMER at the February meeting for a final decision.

***CMER 2011 Work Plan Revisions and Timelines-***

CMER is behind schedule in getting revisions completed for the Work Plan. Co-chair Jackson emphasized the fact that work will need to happen in between the CMER and SAG meetings to complete this task before the end of February. CMER needs to approve the Work Plan at the February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting and submit to Policy for approval at their March meeting (March 4, 2010). Therefore, SAGs need to have all input delivered to CMER Co-Chairs by **February 9<sup>th</sup>**. Co-chair Jackson will then compile into one document and send out to CMER by Feb 12<sup>th</sup> for review and get approval at the February 23, 2010 CMER meeting.

Co-chair Jackson reviewed the Link to Adaptive Management section using the Bull Trout Habitat Identification Program as an example. It was explained that the “knowledge gained or anticipated” from projects, and the “knowledge gaps” were to be tied back to each critical question (from the table in each Program). A memo explaining this was also sent to SAG co-chairs last month. This section will be an important piece for Policy in understanding how CMER is addressing the critical questions. This section will improve over time as we finish more CMER projects and results have been finalized.

Action Item:

Co-chair Jackson stated that an email message will be sent out about the **new timeline for SAG input by February 9<sup>th</sup>**, in order to have CMER approval by the February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Co-chair Jackson emphasized the importance that each co-chair of every SAG attend the February meeting to present and review their section of the 2011 CMER Work Plan.

***2010 -2016 CMER Budget Update - J. Hotvedt, AMPA-***

He revisited last year’s request for a 10% reduction handout on CMER projects. The result of that reduction was an 8.2% cost reduction of \$130,000.

CMER reviewed last year’s budget projections for 2011 as reflected in the table & how the projects were prioritized by the Policy committee based on the Clean Water Act assurances (CWA). CMER needs to revisit the 2011 budget figures for each of their projects (both the ongoing studies and the studies that are currently being scoped or having study designs developed). CMER Co-chairs asked that SAGs get their budget figures to Jim Hotvedt, AMPA by February 19<sup>th</sup>. He will incorporate all revised budget figures into the table for approval at the February 23<sup>rd</sup> CMER meeting.

J. Hotvedt, AMPA, explained the carry over funds, their function and sources. His approach to this budget is based on all of the funds that contribute to the AMP. Among the contracts, total projected expenses of \$3.1 Million will leave a projected carry-forward of \$242,000 into 2011. This information will be shared with the FPB at their next meeting on February 10<sup>th</sup>.

Discussion Points:

D. Martin suggested a new category for budget sheet - maintenance of existing projects.

Co-chair Jackson clarified that the budget sheet already shows current projects (FY2010); if additional funding becomes available, Policy will prioritize the delayed projects accordingly.

N. Sturhan suggested that a cost estimate of continuing on-going projects be provided in addition to cost estimates for new projects.

D. Schuett-Hames suggested that CMER review the projects that we allocated money for last year, and see how much was actually spent and use this exercise for updating the SAG budgets. He requested a running total of expenses of the AMP budget on a monthly basis.

M. Hayes suggested that this is a tool for Policy to use and therefore 3 more columns should be added for 2011:

- 1) 1st column - ongoing projects
- 2) 2nd column – ongoing & next level of Policy’s priority projects
- 3) Last column - Totals the 1<sup>st</sup> two columns

D. Martin stated that Policy needs to know the total amount of funds needed to complete CMER projects.

Co-chair Mendoza reiterated the need for this work to be completed in time for Policy’s annual budget retreat this spring.

M. Hicks stressed that CMER needs to face the reality of a deficit; will need to make some hard decisions for 2011.

Co-chair Mendoza responded that final budget decisions are made by Policy, not CMER, as exemplified by Policy’s decision only to fund CWA related CMER projects last year. CMER’s role is limited to developing projects based on answering the critical questions in the Work Plan. Policy decides whether or not to fund CMER projects and provides guidance on project cost estimates like the 10% budget reduction exercise.

Action items:

CMER Co-chairs stated that the table indicating the reductions by individual project will be sent out to the SAGs again.

The SAGs will go through the projections and revise budgets for the 2011 work plan and get the revised figures to Jim Hotvedt, AMPA, by **February 19<sup>th</sup>**.

***EPA Grant Opportunity:***

J. Hotvedt stressed that at a minimum based on revenue sources CMER will have current projects funded; can survive 2011. The question exists on where to find funding for new projects. The EPA has science grants available and the Notice of Intent due date is January 29<sup>th</sup>. What does CMER have available to support the Puget Sound area (West WA; North Olympics down to Vancouver). In looking at projects, CMER does not have a completed study design and some projects are in different stages of development.

*Potential CMER Projects for EPA Notice of Intent:*

Wetlands Mitigation Pilot Project  
Accuracy Bias Study  
CMER Information Management System  
Type N Soft Rock  
Extensive Monitoring for Temperature

Discussion Points:

The Policy focus is on current projects that have a clear connection to the CWA.

Wetlands Mitigation Pilot Project is on the CMER agenda for action.

Accuracy Bias Study - questionable; already have CMER approved study design, but UPSAG wants to revise it. UPSAG Co-chair Dieu mentioned that an extensive revision of the study design is unnecessary; what is missing is a scoping design. UPSAG might be able to have it within 3 weeks.

Type N Soft Rock – Co-chair Mendoza said that the pre-scoping document was approved by CMER; the soft rock subgroup is currently working on alternatives under the scoping process for sediment & stream temperature; if the subgroup can get the scoping document done in a month, might have a chance to submit for the EPA grant funding. CMER would still need a study design by July.

Extensive Monitoring for Temperature – B. Ehinger mentioned that next sampling is currently projected for 2018; new panel design is being developed to address annual variability; it's an idea that has not gone thru CMER, Policy & FPB approval.

M. Hayes shared that the EPA grant is a \$4.5M package where the range of funding runs at \$300,000 - \$700,000. The main focus of this funding is on the Puget Sound Partnership. CMER may be able to create a linkage to estuary marine. CMER needs to make it fit for their approach and commit to a 4-year timeframe. CMER needs to look at existing projects – water quality or temperature projects might be a good fit.

M. Hicks stated that CMER needs to put some effort into creative writing to fit within the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda. CMER is a partnership that is recognized by the Puget Sound Partnership.

N. Sturhan emphasized that the EPA grant has a two year focus – CMER could get the work done for Soft Rock this year and apply next year for the grant.

D. Martin supports using the EPA funds for the Extensive Monitoring for Temperature.

M. Hicks reviewed the request for proposal (RFP) and did not see a focus on on-going monitoring.

J. Hotvedt, AMPA stressed that when the AMP received supplemental state funding a level of expectation from the Governor exists where CMER will obtain funds for taking on new projects.

CMER needs to talk about the review & decision making processes as there is a level of urgency at this point for meeting the EPA grant deadlines.

*EPA Notice of Intent & Grant deadlines:*

Notice of Intent = January 29<sup>th</sup> and this is voluntary, not required.

Application = March 2<sup>nd</sup>

Funding response = Mid-July

Co-chair Jackson requested that CMER members establish actions items as there is a level of responsibility and meeting grant timelines; lead agencies and staff need to be identified.

J. Hotvedt, AMPA, is the grant coordinator and will coordinate with the SAGs and PMs to get the applications and notices of intent processed. The two lead agencies – WDOE & WDNR - will coordinate responses and applications.

CMER agreed to remove accuracy & bias for consideration based on UPSAG concerns. CMER also agreed to remove the Extensive Monitoring as well due to the fact that some work needs to be done for sub-sample size with statistician input.

**EPA Grant Application Assignments:**

CMER Information Management System – WDNR is lead agency - Amy Kurtenbach, Nancy Sturhan, & Bruce Jones

Type N Soft Rock - WDOE is lead agency - Stephen Bernath & Mark Hicks

Wetlands Mitigation Pilot Project – WDNR is lead agency - Ash Roorbach, Teresa Miskovic & others from WETSAG

**Process Points:**

Co-chair Mendoza suggested taking this up with Policy - that if this is an ongoing expectation of CMER, CMER will need a grant coordinator.

L. Lingley – if CMER does this next year, need to avoid creating a huge CMER process, look at ways to expedite the process.

N. Sturhan – would like to see the grants & a brief statement about the process that needs to be done as an agenda item for the CMER February meeting. CMER can use this for next year so as to be better prepared.

Co-chair Mendoza agreed to write something up for next meeting.

**Business Session**

*SAG /CMER Items:*

➤ LWAG - Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study: Amphibian Genetics

T. Miskovic - CMER reviewers have reviewed the final report; LWAG has approved the response matrix. LWAG requested CMER approval of the response matrix & 6 questions.

**CMER Approved the ISPR Response Matrix & Six Questions.**

- RSAG – Eastside Type F/S Extensive Riparian Status Trend Monitoring Program Stream Temperature Final Report

B. Ehinger – RSAG requests three CMER reviewers; need CMER reviewers' comments back by 2/24/10. CMER reviewers are to send comments to Bill and Teresa.

**CMER Reviewers assigned:** Todd Baldwin, Leslie Lingley, Marc Hayes, & Chris Mendoza.

- WETSAG – Wetland Mitigation Pilot Study Design

A. Roorbach – WETSAG requests three CMER reviewers for this study plan as approved by WETSAG. CMER reviewers' comments are to be completed by 2/9/10.

**CMER Reviewers assigned:** Chris Mendoza, Nancy Sturhan, Leslie Lingley, & Mark Hicks.

- CMER - AMP Planning – Synchronized Project Reviews

**CMER approved the proposal** & agreed to have Amy Kurtenbach & Teresa Miskovic fill in the blanks in the Project Table-1 for CMER reviewers. They will also add on information about the commitment for the CMER reviewers to also be the reviewers for the ISPR comments stage.

- CMER –Cover Page and Disclaimer for CMER Reports Update

Co-chair Jackson identified that the format and text for the disclaimer and the logos should be uniform and used in all final reports. CMER agreed to use the disclaimers developed for final report in 2005. CMER needs to use the format as reflected on page 2 & 3 in example. The pictures should be chosen for each report.

**CMER agreed** to use picture appropriate (as picked by the SAG) for final reports. Leslie Lingley offered to develop a template using Word and to include the disclaimer text and DNR & CMER logos for future use and uniformity.

- CMER - 2010 Science Conference

The Conference Date is April 13<sup>th</sup>. CMER started to review proposals for presentations.

Not all SAGs were represented by a co-chair at this meeting to present SAG topics. **Co-chair Jackson reiterated the need for SAG co-chairs to attend CMER meetings or designate a person to represent the SAG.** This is not clear to all CMER/SAG members, but is clearly spelled out in the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual.

*SAG proposed science conference topics:*

**RSAG:** (presented by A. Kurtenbach)

Type N – BCIF - may have multiple presentations (2)

Type 5 – REMS – Headwater Study

Extensive Riparian temperature

Type N Experimental Amphibian

Hard Wood Conversion – silviculture – possible presentation (?)

**LWAG:**

Type N Experimental Amphibian – 1 presentation

Buffer Integrity Shade Study - 2 posters

**UPSAG:**

Post Mortem - 2 presentations

Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring - 1 presentation

**WETSAG:**

Wetland Mitigation Study Plan – 1 presentation (this was not suggested by SAG, but requested by CMER co-chair)

Maybe a Poster

**SAGE:**

Nothing at this point

**CMER Information Data Management System**

Do a poster. (List of CMER projects)

Discussion Points:

The issue of funding the contractor to present research results at the science conference emerged. CMER could use the development funds for this. It is difficult to get consultants to present at the conference without reimbursement for their time. The point was made where employees of state agencies are being paid to attend. Private consultants are different, asking for their time.

The issue of having other research presented at this science conference was discussed. Specifically the Weyerhaeuser report on landslides was brought up. Other research shared at this venue may be explored, not just CMER funded studies should be shared at this conference was the opinion of some CMER members, but there was non-consensus as other CMER members believe that the conference should be reserved for CMER funded projects only.

The point was made that CMER should fill out the agenda with CMER studies; then look at outside studies for filling in the agenda.

Co-chair Mendoza stated that CMER has considered non-CMER research projects in past years, but there has never been consensus agreement on the selection process for presentations.

The issue was raised where DFW made a request for sharing a non-CMER funded project poster at this year's conference and was denied due to the understanding that the main objective of this annual conference is to showcase CMER funded studies.

A point was brought up that CMER may have an opening to let in other research due to limited science conference topics. Outside research would have to be agreed to by CMER.

A point was suggested that if there appears to be extra conference time available that that time be given to presenters; 20 minute presentations instead of 15 minutes.

Co-chair Mendoza agreed that longer presentation times for CMER presenters would be preferable to trying to have CMER agree on non-CMER presentations.

J. Hotvedt suggested to have one theme in the afternoon where this might be an avenue where other studies can be presented. For example, last year the afternoon was dedicated to post-mortem; could recycle that this year and have the Weyerhaeuser study included.

RSAG held conversations about themes such as the Clean Water Act, Water Quality, or the link the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda for this year's science conference.

The point was raised by Co-chair Mendoza that if we identify CWA as a theme, CMER should highlight the HCP context as a backdrop for the conference since CWA assurances are linked.

The point was made that repeat CMER research information is okay if CMER is sharing new information on results; research results are more difficult to get. Perhaps CMER gives more time to the results oriented presentations as it is hard to get this information out. CMER is at a point where the focus on results would be beneficial. This would allow the presentations to last longer.

Action Item - Next steps:

CMER Co-Chairs, CMER coordinator and the AMPA will look at the agenda timeline associated with the proposed topics. This will help to determine how many presentations, which studies to include, and the time allowed for each presentation with Q/A.

**CMER will approve presentations at the February 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.**

Abstracts are due no later than March 12<sup>th</sup>.

➤ **CMER Information Management System**

N. Sturhan gave overview of this pilot project. The pilot phase is over. CMER reviewers have been asked to conduct hands-on testing of the system and then provide ideas for improvement. Nancy will set up some meetings to answer some important questions on where to go with the information system. It would be helpful to have better CMER participation at these meetings. A proposal will be coming to CMER on next steps for this project. A presentation on the CMER Information System will be provided to Policy at their March meeting.

➤ **Policy January 7<sup>th</sup> meeting update was given by co-chair Mendoza**

➤ **Topics to take to Policy in February-**

There are no CMER action items for Policy. Co-chair Jackson will provide an update only.

**Meeting Adjourned**