

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research
DNR /DOC Compound
March 24, 2009
Notes**

Attendees	Representing
*Almond, Lyle (v)	Makah Tribe, RSAG Co-Chair
*Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
Black, Jenelle	CMER Staff, NWIFC
Black, Tami	NOAA Fisheries
Cramer, Darin	DNR, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Ehinger, Bill	Ecology
Forsgaard, Karl	WFLC
Graves, Gary	DNR, FPD Manager
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	UCUT
*MacCracken, Jim	Longview Timber Company, LWAG Chair
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	WFFA Contractor
Miller, Ken	WFFA
Moon, Teresa	DNR, Project Manager
O'Sullivan, Alison	Suquamish Tribe
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, NWIFC
Stewart, Greg	CMER Geomorphologist, NWIFC
*Sturhan, Nancy	NWIFC
Veldhuisen, Curt (v)	Skagit Systems Cooperative
Whipple, David	WDFW

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

Science Session

A presentation was given by Danny C. Lee, USFS, (Director, Eastern Forest Environmental Threat Assessment Center) on monitoring, decision-making, and Adaptive Management. This presentation tied into Policy and CMER efforts associated with improving the Adaptive Management Strategy. Several members of the Policy Group were present, and some good discussion occurred afterwards. The publication "Making Monitoring Work for Managers" was part of the meeting materials.

Business Section of the CMER Meeting:

Agenda

The agenda items for the business section of the meeting were re-prioritized: January Minutes, CMER Work Plan 2010, SAG responses to CWA, Budget for 2010 & Soft rock scoping document.

Meeting Minutes

January minutes were approved with three changes. These changes will be incorporated, and the minutes will be loaded on the CMER website.

CMER 2010 Work Plan

Co-chair Jackson went through the recent changes to the CMER FY10 Work Plan. One of the main changes is the redefinition of the FFR. The introduction of the work plan provides some of the historical context and all references to FFR have been changed to Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan or Forest Practices Rules, as appropriate. This change was illustrated and showcased on page 28 of the CMER FY10 Work Plan. Co-chair Jackson stated that in this version of the work plan, the editor's comments were left and that they will be addressed and answered when the CMER approved version is sent back to the editor.

Points of Discussion on the CMER 2010 Work Plan

T. Baldwin asked about the ranking of projects in Table 3 on page 15; where, for example, the *Eastside Type F Desired Future Range and Target* program holds the second place in priority for CMER, but this has changed with the recent direction of Policy. The work plan will be one of the agenda items for Policy's Budget Retreat in April. The work plan, the strategic planning effort, Policy's prioritization, and the synthesis report will be folded into the Budget Retreat discussions. The Policy step is supplemental and does not replace this ranking process. The Policy-approved CMER work plan and budget will be taken to the Forest Practices Board for approval at the May Board meeting.

D. Miller asked for a review of the process steps for the work plan. If CMER approves this version of the work plan, it will go back to the editor for final editing by Friday, March 27th. The editor will return the work plan by April 3, 2009. The work plan will then be sent to Policy before the Budget Retreat on April 15 & 16, 2009.

D. Cramer stated that the intent is to continue progress on the work plan throughout the year, especially after the recommendations are received from the consultant working on the synthesis report and the strategic planning effort is complete.

Action Item

CMER approved to forward to Policy the CMER 2010 Work Plan.

SAGs Response to Policy Committee on Clean Water Act Assurances

Background-

Ecology is conducting a review of the Clean Water Act (CWA) assurances. The review is focused on determining if waters of the state are on a positive trend toward meeting state water quality standards as a result of Forest Practices Program implementation. Water quality data from effectiveness monitoring projects are a high priority need for Ecology.

Policy concurs with this need and is in the process of re-prioritizing CMER research and monitoring to focus on obtaining these data. Policy requested feedback from CMER and the SAGs about the implications of this re-prioritization. SAGs were asked to provide comments on the potential resource implications, inter-project implications, consider different approaches for proceeding with these new projects in order to maximize efficiency or any other information

Policy should consider before finalizing the fiscal year 2010 priorities at the April 15-16 budget retreat.

See Memo from Darin Cramer to Policy (dated April 1, 2009) for CMER/SAG response to preliminary Policy reprioritization of the FY10 CMER projects.

CMER Budget – 2010

The purpose of today's conversation is to get feedback from the SAGs about the status of projects and the Tier One funding levels, in order to insert this information into the CMER FY10 work plan. This is what will be sent to the Forest Practices Board. The budget spreadsheet was shared with CMER based on Policy's input about prioritization of projects and the projection of costs out three years. Policy walked through each Rule Group, each project was discussed, and projects were prioritized according to the Clean Water Act:

The convergence of timing, capacity and funding issues contributed to the re-prioritization discussion. The immediate need is that the project managers need to know their project's cost balances for the budget retreat in April. CMER discussed the funding of the web site support, contract specialist & coordinator positions. CMER has not paid the coordinator's position for the past few years. This may change next year. CMER discussed maintaining the Information Management System pilot project; this is an avenue for archiving spatial data and other CMER funded data.

The AMPA will revise the budget spreadsheet to incorporate updated carryover from FY09, the Forests and Fish Support Account, and the State General Funds, due to the state forecast. It appears that we have enough to cover what we want to do in 2010; although, it is not sustainable. CMER will need to establish a time table & develop a plan.

SAG /CMER Items

CMER - Co-chair Mendoza asked for CMER approval of a pre-scoping document on the Type N Experimental Buffer Study for Incompetent Lithologies (Soft Rock). This is due to Policy in April. A major concern was expressed that this was not sent until late Friday and that CMER is not following the protocol for the review process. The main purpose is to get this identified before the Budget meeting in April; allows for a place holder. CMER agreed to have this presented as an update on the soft rock study as requested by Policy and return it back to CMER for a full scoping document.

CMER Synthesis Report - CMER members were asked to have comments on the Stillwater Sciences report into the AMPA by Monday the March 30th.

The CMER Report to Policy at its April 2, 2009 meeting will include:

- ❖ SAG response to CWA re-prioritization
- ❖ Landowner Data Sharing Memo Update

Meeting Adjourned.