

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
February 24, 2009
DNR/DOC Compound - Tumwater
Notes**

| Attendees | Representing |
|------------------------|--|
| *Almond, Lyle (v) | Makah Tribe, RSAG Co-Chair |
| *Baldwin, Todd (ph) | Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair |
| Black, Jenelle | CMER Staff, NWIFC |
| Cahill, Candice | Rayonier, WETSAG Chair |
| Cramer, Darin | DNR, Adaptive Management Program Administrator |
| *Dieu, Julie | Rayonier |
| Heide, Pete | WFPA |
| *Hicks, Mark | Ecology |
| Hitchens, Dawn | DNR, CMER Coordinator |
| *Jackson, Terry | WDFW, CMER Co-Chair |
| Kurtenbach, Amy | DNR, Project Manager |
| *Martin, Doug | WFPA Contractor |
| *McConnell, Steve (ph) | UCUT |
| *James MacCracken | Longview Timber Company, LWAG Chair |
| *Mendoza, Chris | Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair |
| *Miller, Dick | WFFA Contractor |
| Moon, Teresa | DNR, Project Manager |
| Osullivan, Alison (ph) | Suquamish Tribe |
| Roorbach, Ash | CMER Staff, NWIFC |
| Schuett-Hames, Dave | CMER Staff, NWIFC |
| Stewart, Greg | CMER Geomorphologist, NWIFC |
| *Sturhan, Nancy | NWIFC |
| Veldhuisen, Curt (v) | Skagit 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.

Meeting Minutes

January minutes will be available for approval at the March meeting. The December minutes are loaded on the website.

2010 Work Plan Revisions & SAG Input – Terry

The CMER Co-chairs thanked all of the SAGs for the extra effort and work in completing their assignments for the 2010 work plan. The Executive Summary and the budget (table 4) will be added to the work plan after Policy's budget retreat scheduled for April 15 & 16.

Each SAG was asked to be prepared to present their respective substantial revisions to the 2010 draft work plan for today's morning session.

WETSAG –WETSAG attempted to address monitoring for the wetlands management zone (WMZ); not sure if this is an extensive monitoring or a status and trends project. WETSAG's understanding is that the intent of the wetland rules is to achieve no net loss of wetland function (water quality, water quantity, fish and wildlife habitat, and timber production) by avoiding, minimizing, or preventing sediment delivery and hydrologic disruption from roads, timber harvest, and timber yarding; and by providing wetland buffers.

Points of discussion: What functions are we suppose to address? This is a validation question not an extensive monitoring question. The crosswalk of L1 and L2 fits under trend monitoring; this is intensive rather than extensive. Requested WETSAG to re-label the section to intensive rather than extensive and to discard the mapping tool as this has been completed in Phase I – FPRAT. The budget information is still being worked out; once drafted, will send to Darin for inclusion in the CMER budget. WETSAG wants the budget to be reflected in Tier 1. There is a special policy group meeting with WETSAG to identify the next step and review what has been accomplished to date. Highlight when the workshop was done, literature review completion dates and the outcomes from the pilot project. In the project description section, make sure the titles are identical and consistent with the titles in the tables; use the report titles as identified on the website. It was suggested that the titles match with the budget sheets as well. Avoid changing project names throughout the document.

UPSAG - The group eliminated extra language and simplified text in the Unstable Slopes Rule Group section. The re-write included re-writing the critical question and identified the Mass Wasting Protocol as a study design. The Channel Migration Zone Rule Group section reflects the review of the channel migration zone delineation tools and repeatability of the methods. It was suggested that the Channel Migration Zone Rule Group be incorporated into the Type F Rule Group section. Within the Roads Rule Group section, the status of the roads sub-basin project was updated as well.

Points of discussion: Clarify the classification and types, where roads intersect and review table 39.

LWAG - The use of terminology – population viability – is consistent with L1 language usage. The Wildlife Rule Group seems outdated; there are no wildlife activities going on right now; the focus is on aquatic species in CMER.

Points of discussion: The discussion focused on the fact that landscape level wildlife assessment (LLWA) projects are on a different track from CMER. Some questioned why this is included in the work plan. The history has been to scope projects as identified in the Habitat

Conservation Plan (HCP) and identify this in the work plan so as not to lose the fact that there are legitimate research questions and that this may be a place for CMER to conduct research. CMER is not going to do this work, so it may be best to fit the critical question in with the LLWA track and explain the other track. Policy or the Forest Practices Board (FPB) has not given this as a direction for CMER to work on. The suggestion was to delete all projects except for the RMZ Resample Project and the Type N projects in Table 45; however, Policy should provide direction on this.

RSAG - The Type F Rule Group has multiple SAGs involved, especially as pertains to eastern and western Washington. The Bull Trout Rule Group has been folded into this Type F Rule Group.

Points of discussion: The description for the aquatic habitat biotic response needs more information. In Table 16, eastern Washington projects use both terms “study” and “project”. The use of terms needs to be consistent. Again the names of the projects need to be consistent within the rule groups. The description of effectiveness monitoring programs and the split of the projects among the east and west projects is clear; suggested to take that all the way up into the rule group. The question emerged – are we completely answering all of the critical questions within each rule group? The information about the lessons learned in the BCIF section need to be applied to all of the projects. In the same vein, if projects are completed, then the use of the six questions document can be used by the SAGs to describe outcomes. The titles for Extensive Type F projects – Status and Trend in Table 21 need to be checked for title consistency. Type N on page 20 needs to clearly spell out what year the project is in.

SAGE - Type N Forest Hydrology – Table 8 is inconsistent with what was provided in Table 7 for the Type F rule group description.

Points of discussion: The Type N Forest Hydrology study was incorporated into the Type N delineation program, because it appeared to be more of a rule tool and a precursor to effectiveness monitoring. The group felt that it should go back to where it was in the effectiveness program.

Fish Passage & Stream Typing were identified as not being connected to specific SAGs. For fish passage, it was suggested to include information about the CMER work already completed and describe the current status of the fish passage strategy being addressed within a Policy subgroup. This is an area where CMER needs to take credit for the work already performed. This section needs to be updated.

2010 Work Plan Revisions - Next steps:

The revisions will be out by Friday, 2/27/09; this will give time for the SAGs to provide input via email to the respective SAG co-chairs and Terry Jackson. The SAG co-chairs will have the changes completed and returned back to Terry Jackson **No Later Than Friday, March 13th**. The revised work plan will be sent out by March 17th for CMER to review at the March 24th meeting. The CMER science session on March 24th will be devoted to the revisions in the 2010 work plan as this is the final CMER review and approval. The editor will have this version to

revise and complete by April 3rd. Please use the doc version instead of the docx version, so as to preserve compatibility.

SAG Requests – Chris

- ❖ LWAG – Request to initiate CMER review of Type N Feasibility Draft Final Report. The final product for the contract should have come before CMER before the Type N Experimental project was implemented. This is a deliverable that needed to be cleaned up; contracted product, delayed. Design of the Type N Experimental Buffer project was launched out of this contract. LWAG is wrapping up a loose end and the contract required a final report. This may go on the CMER website after review. Dick Miller, Steve McConnell & Chris Mendoza agreed to review this report. The reviewers' comments are due back to Teresa Moon due by April 14th and submitted for CMER approval at the April 28th meeting.
- ❖ SAGE – Request to initiate CMER review of Eastside Type F Channel Wood Characterization Study Design. SAGE has approved this and needs CMER reviewers. Mark Hicks, Terry Jackson, Chris Mendoza, & Dick Miller agreed to review and get comments back to Todd Baldwin & Doug Martin by March 20th.
- ❖ SAGE - Budget request for CMER Science Conference Presentation – Eastside Type F Riparian Assessment Study (\$1,000). CMER approved this request.

Policy Meeting Update – Darin

Items from the February 5th Policy Meeting:

Policy was reminded of the Science Conference on March 18th and the progress being made on the 2010 CMER Work plan. Policy will see a scoping document of the Soft Rock Study for their March meeting. Originally policy wanted a study plan but the group is still working on the scoping document. They could use GIS work to help with the progress.

Shared the paper *Making Monitoring Work for Managers* by Danny Lee with Policy for the March 24th CMER science session.

The TFW Cultural Resources Committee generated conversation. A sub-committee will get together to deal with this request; the TFW Cultural Resources Committee is interested in the CMER research funding and they want to tie into Adaptive Management Program. Their process right now is tied to the Forest Practices Board. Policy will get feedback from the Board. The message that was relayed by CMER co-chairs was related to how CMER conducts business and their process for doing so, which may or may not fit the needs of the Cultural Resources Committee.

Provided an update to Policy about the Landowner data requests and will follow up with Policy at the March meeting. The sub-group has reviewed the CMER Protocols & Standards Manual (PSM) and current contract language. Policy and CMER will use this information to develop a procedure and/or a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to be used with the landowner as currently outlined in the CMER PSM.

The Adaptive Management Program – Strategic planning session was held in the afternoon of February 5th. Policy spent some time discussing process & identified what to do next. Policy identified the Clean Water Act (CWA) as a major priority and started the prioritization conversation for 2/19/09.

DOE shared the draft of the CWA report and held a CWA sub-group meeting on 2/23/09. The CWA sub-group went through the recommendations, item by item, except for sections pertaining to CMER. The CMER research and monitoring projects are being discussed at the Adaptive Management Strategy meetings. Two more strategic planning meetings are scheduled before the budget retreat meeting scheduled in April.

On February 19, 2009 - Adaptive Management Program Strategic planning session was held. The CWA Assurances review has forced an examination of research projects. An excel spreadsheet was developed and used to identify areas of priority at this meeting. A memo from Policy went out to CMER on 2/23/09, which identifies the outcome of this strategic planning meeting. Policy wants feedback from SAGs pertaining to the possible implications from delaying projects. This feedback is needed for the Policy Budget Retreat in April.

Discussion Points –

M. Hicks emphasized that it is important for the SAGs to give good feedback to Policy, or the work will get delayed. Policy was clear that all projects are desirable. They are not recommending that they be dropped, but delayed. The prioritization exercise was done in response to the budget and capacity issue.

D. Cramer – suggested that the SAG feedback to Policy be done by March 13th for CMER review & edit at the March 24th meeting in time for the Policy April 2nd meeting. He will compile this information so that CMER delivers one document for Policy's meeting on April 2nd.

D. Miller suggested that the CMER co-chairs follow up with the SAGs to let them know what is needed; provide an outline and a couple of paragraph headers for the SAGs to respond to as this will help to be clear and concise.

J. Black asked if there is recovery funding for water quality projects; DOE is hosting workshops for economic stimulus funding; March 19th is the deadline for funding. Hicks stated that there is no funding for CMER to tap into.

C. Mendoza stated that in the past, the only time discussion about funding occurred was when CMER was facing a reduction; this is an opportunity to identify a well thought out plan and market it for additional funding.

Forest Practices Board Meeting – Darin

February 11, 2009 Board Meeting – Update: The FPB did not make a decision on the three Desired Future Condition alternatives; the FPB supports a proposed fixed width proposal.

The Riparian Management Zone (RMZ) fixed width proposal is in the rule making stage, which means it is in the 30 day comment review stage. A workshop is scheduled for March 12th – to be hosted by CMER & Policy. The state caucus is primarily responsible for this along with Washington Farm Forestry Association (WFFA). The focus of the workshop is to have a question and answer period and to have a discussion time to develop a proposal. The desired outcome is to capture the feedback from each caucus and provide that feedback to the FPB. Stakeholders know that the adaptive management process was not followed.

Independent Scientific Peer Review – Darin

Update - The Type N Characterization study design has been submitted to ISPR. The Desktop Analysis is currently being reviewed by ISPR.

ISPR Subgroup - There has been no work, due to current workloads pertaining to the 2010 CMER Work Plan.

SAG Items – All

- ❖ CMER Information Management Pilot Update- D. Cramer received a proposal from Bruce Jones. This proposal will continue the design and development of an information management system capable of managing various types of information generated by CMER research and monitoring projects, building on a pilot project completed by the Salmon and Steelhead Habitat Inventory and Assessment Program (SSHIAP) in February 2008. More data is available from different projects. The annual seasonal variability data is straightened out; the Westside validation project does not have spatial data – a map was identified; the GIS staff do not have data sets; we have to find the maps that were given to Terrapin to go out to research those points; we need to chase down the coordinates. At this point, we have an incomplete estimate from the NWIFC. We will need to go with a staged approach with the data, and will see a revised proposal based on the data needs.

2009 Science Conference – Dawn

The abstracts were due on February 18, 2009. Draft PowerPoint presentations should be emailed to Dawn by March 2, 2009. Please label presentation files as “draft.” The CMER Co-Chairs, the Adaptive Management Program Administrator, the CMER Coordinator, and anyone else that is interested in participating in the preview is scheduled for March 4, 2009, NRB Room 172 from 9 a.m. till 4 p.m. Any suggested edits from the group will be given to the presenters following the preview in order for the suggestions to be considered and/or incorporated into the final slide presentations. SAG co-chairs requested Dawn to email the 2009 science conference outline & details.

Items Going to Policy

Items being taken to Policy for its March 5, 2009 meeting:

- ❖ Wildlife Rule Group
- ❖ Update on SAG Feedback on CWA Prioritization
- ❖ Soft Rock Meeting Update
- ❖ Land Owner Data Request Update
- ❖ CMER March meeting science session – send out research paper by Danny Lee to Policy

Meeting was adjourned.

Future Meetings

CMER 2009 Regular Meetings: March 24, April 28, May 26, June 23, July 28, August 25, September 22, October 27, November 17, and December 15