

2009 Annual CEMP Partnership Meeting Minutes

February 6, 2009; noon – 2 pm
Kaladi Brother's on 6th Ave
Anchorage, AK

Present:

Rachel Lord, Cook Inletkeeper
Sue Mauger, Cook Inletkeeper
Catherine Inman, Wasilla Soil & Water Conservation District
Kate Malloy, Anchorage Waterways Council
Greg Collins, Anchorage Waterways Council
Matt Gray, Resurrection Bay Conservation Alliance
Ami Wright, Resurrection Bay Conservation Alliance
Dan Bogan, UAA ENRI
Joel Cooper, CEMP Coordinator emeritus

Agenda Items:

DQO Table
Funding – RBC Blue Water Leadership Grant

Minutes

Catherine noted that Rick Ernst at the Upper Su Soil and Water Conservation District was interested in restarting their CEMP. She volunteered to get in touch with him and minutes will be forwarded to him.

DQO table was finalized after a lot of input from everyone over the course of the last 6 months. Thanks to Tala (not present) for putting in a great amount of effort on this. Sue pointed out some formatting changes to make that were agreed upon. Dan suggested changing the water thermometer precision to encourage more stringent data collection in the field, and everyone agreed on changing the water thermometer precision to ± 0.5 from $\pm 1.0C$. Specific conductance accuracy is relative to the standard and was changed from 2 units to 2%. Joel noted that not everyone has a LaMotte DO meter for calibrating DO, and this was changed to a generic DO meter for more flexibility around the Partnership.

Rachel agreed to make these changes in the table and send out a finalized and approved DQO table to all the partners.

Joel made the point that the DQO table is for the entire Partnership, but not all parameters apply to all partners. Need to be specific, and only take the pertinent pieces of the table for your organizations QAPP.

Joel also gave the reminder to go through and make sure the updated DQO table values are all reflected correctly in your field SOPs, QAPPs, and data sheets.

The discussion on funding began with the question of defining the geographic scope of the Partnership. Should it to broaden from the Cook Inlet (CI) watershed especially given

the new CEMP in Seward from the Resurrection Bay Conservation Alliance. Does the CI CEMP need to be CI only?

What is the difference between a “partner” and an “affiliate”?

Could the Partnership be Southcentral instead of Cook Inlet? Sue expressed concern that we don’t actually cover the Southcentral region well. Not clear what the status is of Prince William Soundkeeper, but they are not currently a Partner.

CI Regional CEMP – or Joel suggested just keeping it as the “CEMP Partnership”, leaving membership open. This seemed to sit well with the Partners, and we will move forward as the CEMP Partnership unless further concerns come up.

Cook Inletkeeper has biannual audits and is able to take the lead on the RBC Blue Water Leadership Grant application for the Partnership.

Dan expressed the need for there to be money for the CEMP Partnership Coordinator (currently provided by Cook Inletkeeper), and money for each Partner’s CEMP program.

What are the **main goals** of the CEMP Partnership? (Top 3 for the purposes of the RBC grant)

Catherine: basic program and capacity building. This was echoed by Kate.

Matt: volunteer development

Baseline data collection for X # of sites. Sue suggested that the number of sites should be driven by the needs in the watershed, not the number of volunteers and mentioned the tier system CIK has employed with its monitored streams. WSWCD has a goal of 2 sites on each priority stream. AWC has been good at keeping the volunteers monitoring streams of need, not necessarily streams that they are drawn towards for personal reasons.

So all Partners need to maintain capacity for monitoring. Joel and Dan stressed the need for coordinators at all Partner CEMP programs and enough funding for consumables needed for monitoring. Joel suggested quantifying this by sites – how much money per site per sampling event do you need for consumables? Kate said AWC has these numbers.

Goal: Fully funded coordinator in each Partner program. Included in this goal is having a specific number of sites monitored for a year, having enough money for consumables and volunteer recruitment/retention.

Databases were brought up and agreed that this is a huge undertaking that all Partners are working on. Having a working and up-to-date database falls under the ‘Coordinator’ goal. AWC just finished revamping their database and got it fixed – Kate has found issues with phosphorus data and has to go back through it all. They would be a ways out of being able to coordinate any efforts for Partnership-wide database management. Joel took us back to when the database was originally developed by AWC/HDR for the Partnership, and since it has been fixed and modified by all users individually. It was agreed that this is a project for a later date, and for now all Partners need to get their individual databases in working order. Matt asked about blank databases for starting up at RBCA – possibly getting a blank database template from AWC? CIK could also

provide their version. Rachel was also interested in seeing a blank copy of the AWC database to look at how far they have diverged from one another.

Outreach was discussed as another goal of the Partnership.

Sue pointed out that coordinator's salary is not a fund-able goal. Data collection is a goal and outreach is a goal.

Dan noted that we have a lot going on that would fall under 'stewardship', mentioned as a desirable project component in the RBC grant application.

Joel mentioned the CEMP Partnership report, and its potential to pull together the data collection efforts across the Partnership.

Sue asked what are the issues that the CEMP Partnership has identified as concerns?

Catherine agreed that having common issues to rally behind would be a good idea.

Matt supported outreach/education goals and monitoring as a goal.

Sue pointed out that the CEMP Partnership reports have described the work we are doing but has never synthesized the issues we have in common. These common issues can help define our stewardship messages.

Dan stressed the need to strengthen the data quality and that this is a major goal of his.

This requires money to do well, and should be a primary goal of the Partnership.

Joel suggested an annual site visit to all Partners to go over QA/QC (this is also recommended by EPA). Doing this is a cost issue, but can really improve data quality.

An independent (i.e. not done by Dan) annual technical systems review may seem threatening to some programs, but will only strengthen them through tightened data quality.

Rachel supported these ideas, also wants to see more outreach and context for the Partnerships monitoring goals – coming back to the main issues we're trying to address that Sue had mentioned.

Kate replied that AWC has a lot of outreach and education programs, and they keep these very separate from CEMP. Keeping the CEMP program going is hard enough as it is. A goal could be to monitor all anadromous streams.

Sue hesitatingly mentioned the 2002 CIK CEMP effectiveness report (she doesn't want to do it again!), but felt that this sort of critical look at the CIK CEMP program was really useful in making sure that we aren't just chugging along, but doing something useful.

Catherine mentioned an annual program effectiveness review, an evaluation of what we did.

Dan reiterated that we could all use an external technical review. Kate brought up a MS student who did a thesis study along these lines. Catherine asked who would do such a review. Dan suggested Gina from EPA coming up.

Joel was suggested as a good option for an independent auditor.

Summary of potential goals:

Capacity

Outreach

Effectiveness review. This would add to our transferability – if we are being effective, we can give good recommendations to other organizations. Dan noted that there are groups setting up all over.

Sue brought up budget issues for this grant.

The grant will only fund 20% of someone's salary.

[Rachel has an amendment to this, 2/09/09: it isn't clear to me that this is the case! The example was indicating that if someone in your office only worked on this project one day per week, then that salary would be recorded as only 20% of their total salary.]

CIAP is another funding source that the Partnership should apply for. All were in favor of applying for the \$100,000 maximum amount under the RBC Leadership Grant. How much does each group reasonably need for one year?

Letters of support:

Dan

WSWCD

RBCA

Catherine will talk to Rick at the Upper SU SWCD

Gina @ EPA/Roy Araki

Tim Stevens

Rusty with UAA

Mat-Su Borough

Kenai Watershed Forum

Catherine said that George would be willing to help out with grant writing.

The official collaborating Partners for this grant were agreed to be:

CIK

AWC

ENRI

WSWCD

RBCA

KWF

HWSCD