

# Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**August 23, 2011  
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
Almond, Lyle	Makah, RSAG Co-chair
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Gauthier, Marc (ph)	UCUT
Heide, Pete	WFPA, Director of Forest Env Program
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Hooks, Doug	WFPA
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept. of Natural Resources, AMPA
*Jackson, Terry	Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
Janisch, Jack	Dept. of Ecology
Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager
Kroll, AJ	Weyerhaeuser
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
*Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
*Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Veldhuesin, Curt (ph)	Skagit Coop Systems

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

## **Agenda:**

There were no changes made to the agenda.

## **Business Session:**

### ➤ Forests & Fish Final RCO Report – *Informational Item*

Jim Hotvedt provided an overview of the report. This covers the ten years of funding received from the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery fund through the Washington State Salmon Recovery Board located at the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). This report reflects the adaptive management work funded through primarily contracts as administered by DNR. This final report is one of the main contractual obligations as required by RCO. The report shows 32 projects were completed, 24 projects are ongoing and 132 contracts were supported by \$25 million spanning ten years. This report covers the history of the RCO funded work done by CMER. Jim requested input from CMER members for improvements so that this is historically accurate of the work completed. Comments are due to him by October.

➤ CMER Science Topics – *Update*

Chris Mendoza shared that a September science presentation is not scheduled at this time. He suggested that CMER could use this block of time on the agenda to set timelines and establish work groups in order to accomplish tasks on CMER's work list.

Suggestions were made by CMER members to broaden advertising to a more diverse audience in order to help increase annual conference participation.

**Science Session:**

Tom Spies, Ph.D., research forester from Corvallis, Oregon presented on *Forest Structure & Succession in Riparian Areas in Western Oregon*. His presentation focused on forest management, influences of forest management on biodiversity, old growth forests, riparian stands and landscape dynamics, and integrating ecological and social science. The work he presented was done under the Coastal Oregon Program Enhancement (COPE).

**Business Session Continued:**

➤ CMER Coordinator's Corner

CMER meeting notes for June 28 & July 26, 2011 – *CMER approved with corrections.*

CMER Science Conference– *Discussion*

During their September monthly meetings, the SAG co-chairs will discuss which topics or research results the SAGs may want to present at CMER's annual science conference in March of 2012. SAGs will share their suggestions at the September 27<sup>th</sup> CMER meeting. CMER will decide whether or not to host a science conference at that time.

Discussion on CMER hosting a Mass Wasting Workshop took place and was inconclusive. The discussion focused on what form the workshop might take and when CMER would host it based on finalization of the Post Mortem report.

**CMER/SAG Items:**

➤ LWAG - RMZ Re-Sample Bird Data – *Update*

AJ Kroll reported that the contract is finalized. Weyerhaeuser has completed the analysis. LWAG is not clear about the expectation of a peer-reviewed step for this work. The costs associated with the peer-reviewed analysis were not factored into the contract agreement.

Chris Mendoza shared that Policy asked that question when this project was presented to them for approval and Marc Hays answered that it would be included. The fact that the analysis would go through the CMER peer review process was one of the reasons Policy approved the project.

Jim Hotvedt suggested that since this report does not have a rule change implication, and if LWAG intends to send the results to a high-quality research publication, the peer review may be covered through the publication's independent review. All research journals have an independent review stage before publication. In this case CMER might consider being flexible. The results will go through the SAG & CMER reviews. At the CMER review stage, CMER will need to deliberate if the results need to go to ISPR or go through the research journal's review. Chris Mendoza stated that he respectfully disagreed with the notion that if CMER reports do not have rule change implications that they do not need to go through ISPR. He further stated that

Policy and the Forest Practices Board make such decisions on rule changes, not CMER. Most CMER final reports, rule change implications or not, must go through ISPR because the Forest Practices Board's decision to act/not act are based on the best available science standard and completed consistent with the AMP.

Dick Miller added that he was under the impression from AJ that to get a statistical/analytical review – the co-authors would prefer to send it to a publication instead of ISPR. If that was not expressed at Policy, the opinions of the co-authors need to be respected. The peer review with the journal will ensure the quality CMER expects. Mark Hicks stated that he was concerned about the statement of quality of the ISPR with UW. He asked what was LWAG authorized to do.

AJ Kroll emphasized that the contract covers Scott's technical time to write the report for a peer reviewed publication. None of his time was set up for ISPR. AJ's time is set up for the CMER review steps.

Terry Jackson shared that she worked with Scott & Marc Hayes in writing up the budget for the agreement. She specifically talked to them about this going through the review processes of SAG, CMER & ISPR. There was a budgeted line item for the CMER review process and comments.

Amy Kurtenbach suggested that LWAG check back with the co-authors and review the agreement before taking this to Policy. CMER members agreed to this suggestion.

➤ RSAG - Hardwood Conversion – *Update on field trip*

Ash Roorbach reported that RSAG hosted a field trip in early August to look at a hardwood conversion site. Eleven people attended. The contractor Frank Brown attended, along with Mike Glass, the landowner representative. The site had significant shrub growth; some of the spruce seedlings that were found underneath the brush look healthy and green. The follow-up of replanting with cedar is having more trouble, and is being browsed by deer which seemed to be a surprise to the landowner. There was 8-10 feet of salmon berry that had to be cleared by field trip members to find seedlings.

➤ SAGE - Eastside Type N Characterization Forest Hydrology Study – RFQQ - *Update*

Todd Baldwin reported that SAGE met last week and reviewed the remaining sites for the Forest Hydro project. The project is still one year behind schedule because many suitable sites were not found last year. Based on this year's follow-up field effort, the last date to have all sites validated will be the September SAGE meeting. Approximately 20-30 more sites are needed to fulfill the target total of 110 sites out of the original 500 sites. Greg Stewart is doing field work and validated a handful of sites in Ferry County. He will be in Goldendale for site validation and is learning about the access and permit process with landowners. SAGE has yet to review the sites in Okanogan County. There are six weeks left in this field season.

➤ UPSAG - Project Strategy – *Update*

Julie Dieu shared that UPSAG is considering changing the title of the Accuracy and Bias study to something more suitable like steep unstable slope criterion interpretation. UPSAG is currently working on the scoping template for this study and Leslie Lingley is accepting comments. The next meeting is scheduled for August 31<sup>st</sup> at Weyerhaeuser to continue the work.

➤ WETSAG - Wetlands Systematic Literature Review Contractor - *Update*

Debbie Kay stated that the kick-off meeting with Dr. Adamus, the selected contractor, will be held early next month. Ash Roorbach shared that the information gathered from this literature synthesis will be used to help develop the scoping document before the ISPR step.

➤ CMER - Protocols & Standards Manual – *Status on Chapters 1 & 2*

Ash Roorbach scheduled the subgroup (TAG) meeting this month. The TAG discussed the first two chapters and decided to get rid of the summary section. The TAG held a solid discussion of the list of authorities, which is the memo that Amy Kurtenbach produced and has been shared with CMER.

Amy Kurtenbach stated that the purpose of the memo was to show the different levels of authority and legality pertaining to the Adaptive Management Program and CMER PSM. When the TAG reviewed schedule L1 & L2 it was unclear how they were adopted and if they are current. This memo informs CMER and helps maintain momentum in updating the PSM. The TAG agreed that when there are citations, it is important to cite the highest authority. The authorities listed are in priority of how the TAG should cite them in the PSM; the revisions will be based on a hierarchy of authority, particularly when inconsistencies in documents and authorities arise.

Jim Hotvedt added that schedule L1 is a good example as there are three versions; 1999, 2000 and 2001.

Chris Mendoza suggested that the PSM cite the Washington Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan as an authority which adopts the L1 version of 2001 & is included in the CMER's work plan from 2005.

Ash Roorbach reported that there are big changes in Chapter 2. Sections have been rearranged and go from a broad to narrow perspective. The comment matrix lists the order of sections. The TAG did not get Chapter 3 completed.

Four topics identified from the TAG that need CMER involvement:

- 1) CMER reports – should recommendations be included - (technical vs. policy)
- 2) Chart that illustrates AMP – perhaps re-work this chart
- 3) What do we mean by consensus?
- 4) Dispute resolution – how to reflect the steps of dispute resolution in the PSM language

CMER may want to pencil out a strategy for addressing these issues now.

Mark Hicks added that the TAG has done a lot of work. He is not sure about re-writing all of the chapters and that this approach may have caused more work for CMER than what was needed. Due to the fact that the edit/track the changes application was not use, it was hard to follow what changes were made. He thought the scope of work for the TAG was to identify the fatal flaws, update major areas or deal with major issues like ISPR. The TAG went above and beyond that scope and he is not sure how to address the changes. He did not agree with the changes or the new language and that the context for how this PSM evolved is important to follow.

Jim Hotvedt suggested revamping the TAG's process as he is concerned about the depth of the work at this level. He recommended that Ash take on the editorial writing of the PSM in track changes, send them out to CMER or the TAG, comments get sent back to Ash & Nancy and they become the final decision makers on the changes. They bring the final revisions to CMER with an up or down vote. This approach will prevent the work from getting bogged down.

Chris Mendoza added that he thought there were both drawbacks and benefits to having fresh eyes on PSM. The original language in the PSM took over a year of negotiations between stakeholders when it was initially contracted out. There may be some areas in PSM that seem redundant, but at the time of negotiations they were important to different stakeholders for different reasons. He agreed with fellow co-chair Mark Hicks that CMER needs to review and revise the more substantial sections only in order to make more efficient use of our time. He also agreed that it is difficult to review a word document with changes without the track edit change application which creates a lot of extra work for reviewers. He regretted missing the TAG meeting due to a scheduling conflict and stated that ultimately, CMER decides which changes to accept to the PSM, not solely CMER staff and/or DNR project managers, so CMER members who took part in production of the initial PSM (2005) should try to attend the TAG meetings.

Nancy Sturhan added that she saw merit in Jim's suggestion for a process. CMER really needs to avoid arguing over the small stuff and work on the substantial issues. She supported leaving the writing style to Ash, having the TAG do the editing and bringing the issues of substance to CMER.

Ash Roorbach asked that CMER comments on PSM chapter 1&2 are due to him by August 31<sup>st</sup>. He will return to CMER with a RLSO version and written memo identifying the substantial issues on those chapters for the September 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

➤ Stillwater Report Recommendations – *Update*

Chris Mendoza reported that the work group will meet next week to re-start this work. The work group is composed of: Chris Mendoza, Dick Miller, Mark Hicks, Leslie Lingley, Terry Jackson, Jim Hotvedt and Amy Kurtenbach. The work group will develop an outline and bring it to CMER for the September 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

➤ CMER Task List – *Update*

Mark Hicks reported that the CMER work list is being updated and that it should have some of the Stillwater recommendations. The co-chairs will review this and come back to CMER on September 27<sup>th</sup> to have a discussion on prioritizing the tasks. CMER needs to continue this work on the response to Stillwater's findings and recommendations and as co-chair he is committed to completing some of the major tasks.

➤ CMER Report to Policy – *Discussion on Items to take to Policy September 1st*

- Science Conference discussion.
- Project Charters – need Policy liaisons identified.

➤ CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments from July 26, 2011 CMER Meeting:

- Forests & Fish Final Report – October is the due date for comments to be handed into Jim Hotvedt.

- CMER Science Conference - SAG co-chairs will talk with SAG members about potential topics to present at the science conference and report at next CMER meeting for a decision (September 27th).
- Protocols & Standards Manual – Comments on Chapters 1& 2 to Ash by August 31<sup>st</sup> – he will return to CMER on September 27<sup>th</sup> with a version in RLSO. Ash will write up a memo for CMER involvement regarding the four PSM topics identified from the TAG.
- Stillwater Report recommendations sub group will meet next week and develop an outline of suggestions for the CMER September 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Add to the CMER agenda items reported back from Policy meetings

*Meeting Adjourned.*