

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**April 24, 2012
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe
Beach, Eric	Green Diamond
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-chair
*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
Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG Co-chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager
*Kroll, AJ	Weyerhaeuser, LWAG Co-chair
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
McCrea, Chad	Spokane Tribe of Indians, SAGE co-chair
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Phillips, Jeff	Skagit River System Cooperative
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

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

Business Session

- Policy Meeting – Report from April 5, 2012 meeting
Policy approved the FY13 CMER work plan and budget.
Policy approved the extended monitoring proposal with the stipulation this will be subject to an annual review.
- CMER Monthly Science Topics – Update list of speakers
The suggestion was made to have industry present on their monitoring programs from a science perspective. The presentations could be on what they are sampling and why; buffer schemes; or sampling habitat in-streams. Co-chair Hicks will try to get the Utah person present at CMER (via telephone) to continue exploring Type N work. The suggestion was made to bring in some of CMER’s Principal Investigators for presentations. Doug Martin suggested Marc Hayes present on Buffer Shade.

CMER members were encouraged to send in topic suggestions to the CMER co-chairs.
- CMER Co-chair position – Potential candidates
Chris Mendoza is leaving the co-chair position. This will be the end of his second term. It is time to have someone else work in the co-chair position. The process for CMER to follow is to develop a list of nominations and submit the list to Policy for approval. CMER needs to avoid two people from the same caucus as co-chairs.

CMER will need a list of co-chair nominations for the May CMER meeting.

Decisions:

RSAG –

- Evaluation of the Effectiveness of the Current TFW Shade Methodology for Measuring Attenuation of Solar Radiation of the Stream (Type N Solar Report) – ***CMER Approved the Final Report***

Amy Kurtenbach reported RSAG is requesting final approval of the Type N Solar Report. RSAG approved the last revisions on February 8, 2012. The next step will be for RSAG to complete the six questions that will be submitted to Policy for review.

Miller asked for clarification in the executive summary – last paragraph - *Based on the average response at 16 sites, forest harvest conducted in accordance with the all available shade rule does not significantly alter the amount of solar radiation reaching the stream. The average increase in solar radiation was $+3.0 \text{ W m}^{-2}$, which is within the instrument measurement error. Canopy attenuation decreased by an average of 0.43%, which was not statistically significant and was also within the instrument measurement error. Individual site responses were highly variable about the mean response, with 56% of sites having a reduction in solar energy after harvesting, and 44% of sites having an increase in solar energy.*

He thought this paragraph was very carefully couched, with the exception of the last sentence. He asked if this was considered a measurement error. The last sentence remains unqualified.

Amy Kurtenbach replied it was unfortunate he did not share this with her earlier. The contractor is on performance-based contract, which means she is withholding payment until this product is approved by CMER. The information from this report will be assimilated in various ways with Terrapin's report; RSAG may have this clarified at that level.

Mark Hicks added this report was approved by RSAG and Miller is an active member in RSAG. This is a contracted report and opening this up now provides complications for the contract. We followed our decisions and process to get this far.

RSAG and CMER members suggested identifying site factors in the six questions (Findings Report) that will accompany the final report to Policy. Dick Miller agreed to this approach as long as this is addressed before it goes to Policy.

Todd Baldwin motioned to approve the Type N Solar Final Report.

Mark Hicks seconded the motion.

CMER members were in agreement of the motion.

Dick Miller abstained.

CMER –

- CMER Protocols & Standards Manual: Findings Report – ***CMER Approved with changes***

Jim Hotvedt provided an overview for CMER members: In the back of the adaptive management board manual there is a framework document that contains the six questions CMER responds to and sends to Policy with a final report. Over time there has been criticism of the six questions as many thought there was not enough information to help Policy understand the work. Ash Roorbach reviewed the six questions and went to the PSM to see if there were guidelines and found two references of what was expected in terms of a synthesis. Based on this ground work, a TAG was formed and developed recommendations of what to add to the six questions. The six questions are derived from the board manual which cannot be revised. Some areas that can be revised in a findings report are in shaded areas of the guidance document. This was brought up to CMER last November for the first time. This has been within CMER for 4 months. The TAG received comments from Chris M., Dick

M. and Mark H. They have been addressed in this document. Dave Schuett-Hames used this template for the BCIF report to Policy who found it very helpful informing their decision making process.

Hotvedt recommended CMER approve this as it is a guidance document. This will not change the AM board manual but it will change the guidance in the PSM. CMER is requested to approve pages 2 & 3.

The following suggestions were added to the guidance document:

- Separate #4 into 4a and 4b.
- Technical implications and recommendations should also be considered in the study report.
- L2 should be continued to be reviewed in answering this question.

Mark Hicks moved to accept the findings report as discussed and changed.

Julie Dieu seconded the motion.

CMER members agreed.

UPSAG –

- UPSAG Request regarding Non-Consensus of the Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project Report – ***CMER Members were in Non-Consensus & did not make a decision***

UPSAG reached non-consensus on v8a of the Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project Report. UPSAG requested a CMER decision concerning the non-consensus vote. The co-authors of the Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Report believe that they have appropriately addressed the ISPR comments in accordance with the ISPR matrix approved by UPSAG (01 Dec 2011) and CMER (20 Dec 2011) – final matrix document titled *Post-Mortem ISPR Response Matrix 12-6-11.xls*. Two members of UPSAG contend that their comments submitted during the UPSAG review of the current draft of the report have not been addressed. The CMER reviewers did not vote at the UPSAG meeting as they agreed to vote at the CMER meeting level. Today's meeting is for the CMER level discussion and to attempt to work out the non-consensus issues. If CMER cannot reach consensus at this level then CMER may invoke dispute resolution or defer to Policy consistent with the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual.

CMER members were requested to entertain and make a decision on the SAG request regarding the non-consensus before voting on approval of the Post Mortem report.

Discussion Points:

Leslie Lingley asked if CMER reviewers who are also authors are allowed to vote on their report. She asked this of Chris Mendoza when this question came up in UPSAG. There is nothing in the PSM to provide guidance. She asked if CMER allows authors in the SAG to vote on their reports.

Mark Hicks responded the SAGs are allowed to set up voluntary decisions; and added he could not understand why CMER would want to have the authors give up their vote. CMER works in a cooperative process; do not know why they would voluntarily toss out their vote. If the SAG did not set up a procedure to exclude the authors, then the standard rules apply and they are voting members.

Chris Mendoza added UPSAG has a non-consensus issue, and unless the SAG agrees to a specific rule that diverges from the PSM, CMER follows section 5.3 *SAG Meeting Management & Decision Making* in the PSM. There are comments related to the report that are reflected in the previously approved ISPR comment matrix. There are other comments not related to the ISPR matrix, those will not be dealt with here at CMER, as they have been raised and addressed at the SAG level. The CMER co-chairs are expected to facilitate support and coordination for SAGs in non-consensus and one co-chair (Chris M.) has attended and been involved in all of the UPSAG meetings dealing with Post Mortem. The CMER

co-chairs also have a role in communicating issues of concern to Policy. If CMER reaches non-consensus, the CMER co-chairs can take the issue to Policy to expedite the process.

Mark Hicks added it seems CMER needed to break this up so as to understand the process to date. UPSAG had a study design, it was approved by ISPR, and CMER implemented it. UPSAG completed a draft report (v8) and this was reviewed by ISPR. UPSAG revised the draft report (v8a) and approved the ISPR comment matrix. CMER is at the comment matrix review stage. As SAGs move something forward and approve it at each step, then CMER is required to follow the process. SAGs cannot go back and disapprove what was approved. Were the agreed upon comments identified at the ISPR level addressed in the comment matrix? It seems like CMER is in the position to agree to this or take it into dispute resolution. It is CMER's responsibility to go into dispute resolution if there is a fatal flaw.

Todd Baldwin added he was unsure how CMER was going to be able to accomplish this. He asked if it was truly the CMER co-chairs responsibility to draw the line. It seems as if CMER is continually battling with this; where there are CMER/SAG members that do not read the PSM. It seems like this is a pre-requisite of CMER membership. He questioned how CMER will implement a LEAN process when CMER creates barriers in the approval process for a report. He suggested CMER approve the fact the authors addressed the comment matrix and move forward.

Dick Miller identified one of the failings of CMER was how to deal with the differences in technical questions; these should have been identified and dealt with earlier. When there are technical differences at the SAG level it gets bumped up to CMER, where technical competency in specific fields is questionable. This is the reason for having SAGs. CMER needs to create a dictionary and use it for these struggles.

Todd Baldwin stated his caucus will not let him continue to spend his time this way.

Leslie Lingley stated she tried to go through the process. When differences arose at UPSAG, she wrote to the UPSAG co-chairs about some of the unresolved questions related to the ISPR step. She suggested supplemental questions for UPSAG to review. UPSAG decided not to forward her questions when she was on vacation for that UPSAG meeting. Leslie added she did try to resolve the complexities and rule effectiveness at the UPSAG level from the beginning and found the process did not work. If UPSAG co-chairs bring this to CMER they cannot bring the full conversations to CMER. The only comments that have been brought to CMER were hers and Ted Turner's comments. The other comments were not brought forward and they have been filtered.

Chris Mendoza shared that when UPSAG and CMER reviewers attempted to develop questions for ISPR they could not agree to what the questions would be and expressed concern about "baiting" the reviewers. UPSAG acknowledged they could not agree on the questions so CMER agreed to default to the standard questions from PSM to ISPR. UPSAG could not agree to the request for potential technical reviewers so UPSAG agreed to leave it up to the AMPA to work with UW. This entire process was previously agreed to by consensus at CMER.

Julie Dieu reported UPSAG went through the standard and supplemental questions for two hours at the meeting Leslie missed. UPSAG took a great deal of trouble to talk it all through and identified what could be addressed and what could not be addressed.

AJ Kroll asked if a list of those comments were compiled. As he understood the agenda item, UPSAG is asking for guidance in the process. As it stands this is the second review of ISPR comments. This is not being clearly stated in the conversation around process.

Chris Mendoza replied that UPSAG did address the comments that were binned; there are comments related to the ISPR matrix CMER approved last December and there are comments not related to the ISPR matrix. The bin of comments not related to the matrix is what CMER is discussing. According to the PSM, comments not related to the matrix do not need to be addressed by the authors. Doing so would create an endless feedback loop.

Mark Hicks clarified CMER is discussing comments not properly responding to ISPR or comments not related to ISPR.

Doug Martin stated it was clear to him there is a dispute at the UPSAG level and it is CMER's job to resolve the dispute. CMER needs to discuss how to resolve it in the dispute resolution process and appears incapable of doing that today. He suggested CMER move forward on how to resolve this with a neutral third party.

Chris Mendoza disagreed with Doug Martin's assessment and suggestion. He views CMER's role as first deciding if the report has followed the CMER process as laid out in the PSM. Once CMER reaches that point, then CMER needs to review the merits of the comments which may or may not trigger dispute resolution. UPSAG has the report here and CMER has approved the process steps along the way. The question remains - does the report accurately reflect the ISPR response matrix that both UPSAG and CMER previously approved? The only issues left are related to the bin of comments that are not related to the ISPR matrix. From his perspective he did not see value in dusting those off. Chris emphasized that when CMER members abstain from approving a motion by vote, that means allowance for the process to move forward, and it does not mean CMER members get to go back and disagree to what's already been approved.

AJ Kroll asked about how the outstanding technical questions get addressed; does CMER issue a direction for UPSAG?

Julie Dieu shared Jeff Phillips did a nice job of separating the comments of what was and was not related to the ISPR comments. UPSAG went through them and made changes at their last meeting. The UPSAG co-chairs did not hear that anyone disagreed with or was unhappy with the separation of the comments not related to the ISPR matrix. When the UPSAG co-chairs asked Leslie Lingley and Ted Turner if they wanted to comment on the ISPR comments, they did not state their comments. Instead each submitted a full suite of comments where the co-authors responded for this CMER meeting.

Mark Hicks added he did not think CMER could go back and do dispute resolution on the study design; this is not CMER's process of going back and conducting dispute resolution on everything. CMER needs to answer the question - did CMER fail to properly respond to ISPR or are there new things that have been added? From his perspective it looked like there was an honest attempt to address the ISPR.

Chris Mendoza reiterated once again that the PM Report is at a stage in our process where there are CMER reviewers present that should vote here as they did not vote at UPSAG. CMER needs to first determine whether UPSAG's process was followed for addressing comments related to the ISPR matrix. If so, CMER should then vote on approving the PM final report. If not, then identify why the PM report does not reflect the ISPR comment matrix, which was already approved by CMER. Since according to the CMER PSM, comments not related to the matrix do not have to be addressed by the authors, they should not be used as a reason not to approve the final PM Report.

AJ Kroll responded it looks like CMER needs to answer #1 in the UPSAG request: *It is the UPSAG co-chairs' request that CMER can: 1) determine the process for comments that are not related to ISPR.* Then CMER holds a discussion on the comments & it looks like Leslie Lingley has some comments. If there are comments not related to ISPR, then they are non comments as they are not related. So, what is the avenue then for Leslie Lingley since she has asked for guidance? Does she get to issue a non-consensus statement?

Chris Mendoza replied yes, she can take it up with Policy. She can go to her Policy person and request for them to get this on the agenda for Policy and then present her issues at their next meeting. Any CMER member can do this under similar circumstances.

Ash Roorbach reiterated it sounded like there were 3 bins the comments fell in:

- 1) comments that were related to responses to ISPR comments;
- 2) additional analysis which were done (something brand new); and
- 3) comments related to elements of the study design that were already dealt with.

Mark Hicks replied the third bin is out, even though this is not clearly spelled out in PSM, CMER needed to continue with completing this process.

Chris Mendoza proposed that CMER reviewers discuss the comments related to responses to the ISPR comments in the matrix; and additional analysis which were done (something brand new).

Leslie Lingley asked what about going thru the comments/issues; she identified riparian buffers were added in version 8 and 8.a. These were new sentences added throughout the report. The executive summary and the rest of the report reflect statements made about combining riparian management buffers with slope stability buffers. Riparian buffers are not designed to address mass wasting. Buffers need to be identified as Rule Identified Landforms or riparian buffers. This is her main issue with the new version of the report. There needs to be consistency.

Julie Dieu replied UPSAG was asked specifically by CMER reviewers to be very transparent to explain all buffers as this was unclear in version 6. Version 7 went to ISPR and this issue was not raised by ISPR. AJ Kroll asked the co-authors to put that in more places in the document in v8 and v8.a. UPSAG did not think this changed the meaning of the study.

Chris Mendoza added CMER will address:

- 1) comments that were related to responses to ISPR comments;
- 2) additional analysis which were done (something brand new);

AJ Kroll asked if CMER will issue separate direction on how we are to handle those comments that do not fit in the two bins. He shared Ted Turner had some issues that the ISPR did not address that was new material (post ISPR) and may need to go to ISPR. Both Leslie and Ted have said that was not resolved.

Chris Mendoza clarified that according to the PSM, if there is something substantially new in the report, it may need to go back to ISPR depending on the nature of the change from the initial ISPR version it represents. However, UPSAG already discussed this and decided if it was a big issue, it can go back to ISPR, and agreed by consensus there were no major issues warranting returning the report to ISPR.

Mark Hicks added all of that should have been addressed before this CMER meeting.

Jeff Phillips shared UPSAG had the sense that issues were resolved; if there were issues that have not been resolved then it needs to be addressed here at CMER. In order for CMER to make an informed decision, the discussion needs to occur.

Chris Mendoza added in the absence of having the comments addressed in a minority report; CMER was attempting to tease these out. This is the first time a minority report has not been completed prior to coming to CMER.

Dave Schuett-Hames added one of the things CMER needed to do is to figure out if there are questions for UPSAG to deal with. Is there something more for UPSAG to do or will CMER pick up the process and move forward.

Mark Hicks noted that CMER was winnowing through the issues; when in fact UPSAG needed to deliver the issues to CMER. CMER needs to be careful not to have this happen in the future.

Julie Dieu added there were three comments that UPSAG agreed that were related to changes between version 7 and version 8. These were discussed at UPSAG. UPSAG considered them resolved. When the UPSAG co-chairs asked Ted if he wanted them documented, he declined.

Leslie Lingley added she talked to Ted who shared he did not have the time to do the documentation.

Mark Hicks replied he did not see anything that warranted dispute resolution. This discussion of binned comments is really difficult for CMER to hold. In his mind there was nothing here to go to DR.

Leslie Lingley asked a process related question. There have been three years of conversations about sediment delivery items and just because the ISPR people don't say anything about that, does that mean they go away?

Both CMER co-chairs responded yes. CMER does not go back to ISPR about the level of appropriateness of their comments, which would defeat the purpose of an independent review. That is not allowed for in the CMER process.

Jim Hotvedt emphasized CMER needed to talk about the report and not the process. CMER needed to focus on - Is there something currently in the report that is flawed and is there something not in the report that should be?

Chris Mendoza replied if there is non-consensus at CMER on finalizing the report, the CMER co-chairs have the option to move this issue to Policy. He was aligned with the other co-chair in sending the report and related issues to Policy. Based on the history of this project and the nature of the comments in dispute he did not think dispute resolution would assist CMER. He urged CMER members to weigh in.

Mark Hicks and Chris Mendoza requested CMER to vote on approving Version 8a of the Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project with the understanding Version 8a is the latest report revision in response to the ISPR and it adequately addresses the ISPR comment matrix.

Yes = Julie Dieu, Todd Baldwin, Mark Mobbs, Nancy Sturhan, Mark Hicks and Chris Mendoza

No = Doug Martin, AJ Kroll and Leslie Lingley

1 abstained = Dick Miller

CMER members were in non-consensus

Doug Martin added the comments in ISPR are not adequately addressed, especially the associate editor's comments. They had several concerns about the findings, the interpretations and how they are presented.

Jeff Phillips added Ted Turner had similar concerns.

AJ Kroll concurred with Doug Martin's comments and added the new material did not deal with sediment delivery. The data has problems.

Leslie Lingley agreed with AJ Kroll about how the revision did not address sediment delivery. The last minute changes include a map. Some of the figures do not have labels in the map; the executive summary was presented at 11th hour at UPSAG; the additions do not deal with sediment delivery; difficult to read the six-page executive summary; and it is difficult figure out the changes and the statistical descriptions. There are some clean up areas in the maps that need to be done.

Mark Hicks shared he thought these were general statements and do not specify issues/concerns. There have been a lot of years of work on this and these comments do not address that level of work.

Chris Mendoza added Greg Stewart made the changes on screen to the executive summary based on the members in attendance at last months UPSAG meeting, which he attended. Doug, Leslie and AJ were all present and approved those changes. Have those changed?

Doug Martin answered yes and the revisions have not taken care of the comments.

Jeff Phillips shared the report reflects new analysis; compared critical treatments only, whereas originally the report compared five. Is AJ Kroll uncomfortable with the critical treatments?

Nancy Sturhan reported she was satisfied with the changes up to version 7. This is the version handed into ISPR. She questioned the value added to continue on with another iteration of the report. If there is something critical, than hold it up, but she did not see anything critical at this point.

Mark Hicks asked UPSAG if it was worth sending back to UPSAG for room to work this out.

Julie Dieu shared she was puzzled with Doug Martin's comments. The co-authors separated descriptive and statistical chapters; and the discussion and executive summary are in response to ISPR. What is there to do in terms on word smithing? The issues raised by Leslie, AJ and Ted go back to the study design; these cannot be resolved. The co-authors agreed not to exclude data from the subset and yet this is what Ted requested. The request from AJ was to include a clear statement that treatments are potentially confounded by unequal distribution of landslide prone terrain. These have been addressed. The sediment data comment was addressed in the executive summary that referenced this variability in the delivered sediment; and again addressed in detail in sections 5.1 and 6.2. There were CMER reviewers that said you need to have it in there and yet UPSAG is still taking hits.

Mark Hicks shared he did not see the value of UPSAG continuing to wrestle this.

Chris Mendoza asserted the CMER co-chairs will take this to Policy in accordance with the PSM.

Ash Roorbach added he was hearing disagreement about assignment of comments in bin 1, 2 or 3.

Jeff Phillips stated Ash made a good comment; if it was true there was concern about which bin the comments should be in, this needed to be stated, as he could have made mistakes in organizing them.

Jim Hotvedt remarked if CMER could not resolve this, then it was the CMER co-chairs choice to go to Policy or dispute resolution. CMER needs to answer if they wanted a technical document like this to going to Policy. Policy could decide to send it to Forest Practices Board. Did CMER want this going to FPB?

Dick Miller asked if there was another option; using a 3rd party?

Jim Hotvedt responded that could be a part of the dispute resolution.

Doug Martin motioned to have CMER send this to CMER dispute resolution with a professional scientific/technical facilitator to help mediate and adjudicate the conflict.

Leslie Lingley seconded the motion.

Chris Mendoza responded he appreciated the motion but disagreed with the course of action. The decision rested with the CMER co-chairs.

Chris Mendoza shared the AMPA and CMER co-chairs reviewed the PSM regarding non-consensus. He recited page 4-3:

3. No consensus, with one of the following results at the discretion of the co-chairs:

a. The action is blocked.

b. The issue is submitted for CMER internal scientific dispute resolution.

c. Differing opinions are documented and forwarded to Policy for action.

The co-chairs and AMPA agreed to implement Option C. He requested the three CMER members who voted no to document why the current version of the post-mortem report (v.8a) does not respond to the ISPR comment matrix. As co-chairs they will report to Policy the vote with all accompanying materials. The burden of documentation rests on the dissenting parties. This will go to Policy next month, for the June 7th Policy meeting. The three dissenters will need to submit their documentation within two weeks to the AMPA, and co-chairs. It will be up to Policy to decide what they want to do next.

Doug Martin stated the co-chairs have not acted on his motion. He added he had never been at a CMER meeting where a vote has not been made. The science body of CMER is in this room the issue of dispute is science based. He requested action on his motion.

Jim Hotvedt added the PSM is the CMER document that CMER has agreed to use for guidance. In this case the PSM is clear it rests at the discretion of the co-chairs.

AJ Kroll added there is recognition there is disagreement at the UPSAG level of the technical contents of the report and at the CMER level. Are we going to send serious technical issues to Policy for them to adjudicate?

Chris Mendoza answered he can take his comments to Policy along with the report. If there is a major fatal flaw, he needed to write it up, but that he did not expect Policy to resolve a technical dispute. He views this as a procedural issue that Policy is capable of dealing with.

Dick Miller disagreed and stated the fact remained CMER had questions not addressed by ISPR. CMER had a suggestion on the table that these are science issues that have not been addressed by ISPR, as suggested by Doug, use some of the discretionary funds to work through the conflict. Why would we buck up to Policy a science issue?

Chris Mendoza answered CMER was not in agreement. When this goes to Policy it goes with a majority and minority report. This was the next step CMER will implement in accordance with the PSM.

Todd Baldwin wanted to address a couple of issues. He agreed with Chris, Mark and Jim. The PSM makes it clear who makes the decision at this point. He also agreed with Doug about science issues bumped up to Policy may not be the best route. He asked CMER how CMER would agree to a third party for dispute resolution when there is disagreement. The option CMER had was to take this to Policy. This is consistent with the PSM. If disagreements remain, CMER members can relay them to Policy.

Mark Hicks added perhaps when the comments are re-written the fatal flaws may emerge. At this point it is not clear what the issues are. UPSAG has done its job and it won't get worked out there. CMER has disagreement and it will not be worked out here. The next logical step is to take this to Policy.

Doug Martin clarified he wanted to have CMER send this to CMER dispute resolution with a professional scientific/technical dispute resolution facilitator to help mediate and adjudicate the conflict.

Chris Mendoza suggested he include this in his minority report.

AJ Kroll asked how much time CMER may receive at the Forest Practices Board level. Fifteen minutes was not enough time. He added he was dissatisfied with the co-chair decision per the PSM and urged to make sure this was on record.

Mark Hicks shared the co-chairs did talk about where Policy could send it right back to CMER. However, he added if CMER had followed our process all the way we would not be here right now.

Chris Mendoza reiterated CMER voted, CMER is in disagreement, so this will go to Policy. The CMER co-chairs will collect the material from UPSAG and CMER to share with policy. The minority reports are due within three weeks; May 15th.

Jim Hotvedt stressed the importance to think about how the comments were phrased in the past; why this is not an adequate document as the majority think it is. This will be important so as not to add to confusion at the Policy level.

➤ *LEAN Event – Update*

Jim Hotvedt reported a contractor was hired to provide an opportunity assessment last quarter with Policy & CMER. Both CMER & Policy decided to conduct an event on the scoping document and study design. All CMER voting members, CMER staff and representative, Policy co-chairs, CMER co-chairs and past co-chairs are participating in this process. This group spent last week reviewing the current process. This group reviewed every single task to see what is value-added. The contractor took this and will share with this group tomorrow the weighted average of both. The homework given was - if you were going to change the process, what radical change would you change? There may be two alternatives; the current process and tweaks or current process with radical changes. In the next two weeks, the group will continue to LEAN processes. This was shared with Policy at their April meeting.

➤ *CMER Coordinator's Corner:*

Dawn Hitchens gave a debrief of the science conference; 75 registered and 70 attended. The RTI videographer preferred the half day of presentations. The taped science conference is loaded on the CMER website as of April 10th.

➤ *CMER Report to Policy – Items to take to May 3, 2012 Meeting*

- Post-mortem report.
 - RSAG's final Solar Report & six questions.
- CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments:
- CMER members are encouraged to send an email to Chris and Mark for CMER science topics/presentations suggestions.
 - RSAG needs to complete the six questions for the final Solar Report to send to Policy.
 - CMER needs to develop a list of co-chair nominations & send them to the current co-chairs. CMER will need to review this list at least week prior to (May 15th) CMER meeting, so Policy receives the recommendations at their June 7th meeting.
 - Submit PM report comments to CMER Co-chairs in three weeks (May 15th) as this will be on the agenda for the June 7th Policy meeting.

Meeting Adjourned