

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**October 23, 2012
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
chesney, charles	Dept. of Natural Resources
Gauthier, Mark (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Hayes, Marc	Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Wirtz, Emily	Skokomish Tribe
Whilhere, George	Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife

* Indicates official CMER members and alternates; ph indicates attended via phone.

Agenda –

Chris Mendoza requested to add an update on the Policy work with the settlement agreement. He shared that Policy is preparing to send the CMER Master Schedule to CMER to provide input on how it compares to the CMER work plan and CMER's prioritization process. Policy is forming questions with assistance from the CMER co-chairs requesting input from CMER. CMER will use the November meeting to work on answering these questions.

Amy Kurtenbach requested to add under the RSAG update a review of a proposal from Dick Miller.

Doug Martin suggested to prepare questions for the roads presentation with Kathy Dube' to maximize her time.

Chris Mendoza suggested the TWIG should develop questions to share with Kathy Dube' so she can craft her talk around them.

Business Session

Decisions:

♦ CMER – Non-CMER Science – Re-form a sub-group

Chris Mendoza reported the Forest Practices Board has discretion to review all research and monitoring results, not just CMER reports. The Adaptive Management Board Manual is somewhat ambiguous in addressing how non-CMER research is used within the Adaptive Management Program. SAGs already include non-CMER science throughout their process

in literature reviews, scoping and report writing. The CMER co-chairs and the AMPA drafted a guidance document to flesh this out further for Policy. This needs to be revitalized at the CMER level for Policy as a priority. The following CMER members volunteered: Marc Hayes, Doug Martin, Leslie Lingley, Charles Chesney, AJ Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Mark Hicks and Jim Hotvedt. Chris Mendoza will send out a scheduler this week to these volunteers and organize a meeting.

♦ LWAG – Tailed Frog Literature Review

The CMER reviewers were Terry Jackson, Chris Mendoza, AJ Kroll and Doug Martin. LWAG has integrated all the comments into the draft report. LWAG requested CMER approval to send the draft literature review to ISPR.

Leslie Lingley motioned to accept the literature review to send to ISPR.

Dick Miller seconded the motion.

CMER members reached consensus.

The next step in this process is the AMPA will work on a cover letter for UW. The authors have opportunity to add questions to the standard ISPR questions that are sent along with the report. If there are additional questions, those questions need to be reviewed and approved by CMER reviewers prior to being sent to ISPR, and this would occur next month. If there are no additional questions, then the authors deal directly with the AMPA and the AMPA sends off the standard eight questions along with the report to ISPR. CMER approved to send the report along with the standard questions for ISPR. Chris Mendoza will send the standard questions from the CMER PSM to Marc Hayes.

♦ RSAG – Request for CMER Review of the BTO Shade/ Temperature

Amy Kurtenbach, project manager, has coordinated the reviews to maximize the schedule and budget within the contract. RSAG has reviewed the document; there are a few remaining comments from the RSAG reviewers for clarity and presentation of the document. The RSAG reviewers were Mark Hicks, Doug Martin, Terry Jackson and Bill Ehinger. RSAG has approved to move this draft to CMER for review. RSAG requested CMER review of the BTO Shade/Temperature Report with an anticipated deadline for comments by November 9, 2012. This will allow the contractor to be prepared to address those comments at the December CMER meeting presentation. The CMER reviewers were Dick Miller, Chris Mendoza, Leslie Lingley, Julie Dieu, AJ Kroll, Todd Baldwin and Alice Shelly.

♦ TWIG – Unstable Slopes Criteria

CMER co-chairs Mendoza and Hicks provided a status update of the TWIG formation process. There are two stages to the TWIG formation. The first step is to get a small group together and form a charter. The small group for Unstable Slopes Criteria is comprised of Ted Turner, Greg Stewart and Amy Kurtenbach to develop a draft charter. A skeleton charter has been developed to date. The second step will be to recommend TWIG members for scoping and writing the study design. The CMER co-chairs requested CMER approval for Greg, Ted & Amy to write the charter for the Unstable Slopes Criteria (approval to launch the TWIG).

Mark Hicks moved to support launching the TWIG.

Dick Miller seconded the motion.

CMER members approved to launch the TWIG for the Unstable Slopes Criteria project.

- ♦ CMER Science Conference – SAG Feedback /Decision

CMER coordinator reminded CMER members of last month's conversation around a science conference. The CMER co-chairs sent out an email September 29th asking for input on potential science presentations and whether or not to host a science conference.

SAG feedback:

RSAG supports not hosting a conference next year (2013). There are a number of topics on the cusp of being completed and the results of those projects can be presented at the conference the following year (2014). RSAG suggested a two-day conference in 2014.

LWAG agreed there was a lack of ripeness among the projects for 2013. LWAG suggested they could have quite a lengthy presentation of amphibian results ready for 2014.

SAGE reported that they could do an update, but that the FHS project results would not be ready by this upcoming March 2013 to present at the science conference. SAGE agreed to defer to host a science conference in 2014.

WETSAG reported they were in the same boat; the literature review will not be done in time for a presentation next March 2013. WETSAG supported hosting a science conference in 2014.

Chris Mendoza moved for CMER not to host a science conference in 2013 and have one in 2014.

CMER members approved this decision.

- ♦ CMER schedules for November & December 2012

Amy Kurtenbach provided a schedule of SAG and Policy meetings for next two months. CMER members were reminded the next 2 meetings were scheduled earlier due to the holidays. The November CMER meeting creates a bit of a dynamic for the mailing to occur one week before. CMER members were cautioned there may be a day late for the mailing due to the SAG meetings that week.

- ♦ CMER Work plan & Budget – Timelines

CMER co-chairs Hicks and Mendoza requested SAGs to schedule agenda time over the next couple meetings to begin their work on the FY14 CMER work plan. SAGs were reminded they were in charge of organizing this work and suggested it might help to have project leads responsible for making a first cut to updating the material associated with their projects. SAGs were reminded to address the links to adaptive management and to make sure all the tables related to their projects were updated. CMER will review all proposed changes at the January 2013 meeting and will vote on the full work plan at the February 2013 meeting.

Updates:

Report from Policy – October 4th Meeting - Chris Mendoza provided an update on the following:

- ♦ Post Mortem Final Study – Dispute Resolution

Policy settled on working through the dispute by having the AMPA review the following: version 8a of the Post Mortem study, the ISPR response matrix, the minority reports, the authors' response to the minority reports, the CMER co-chairs' transmittal memo, and

CMER's response to the Six Questions with a memo that summarizes the unresolved issues categorized according to whether they are ISPR-related, whether the study authors responded, how the authors responded, and why author responses were deemed inadequate by dissenters. This memo will include a discussion of the forest practice rule and/or guidance implications. Policy will take all this information and begin its process to determine how to respond to Questions 7, 8, and 9 in the *Policy/CMER Framework Interaction* document as referenced in the Adaptive Management Board Manual. CMER is expected to have the answers to the six questions and the disputes outlined on the Post-Mortem Report by the CMER November meeting. This is a product due to Policy.

Mark Hicks added he clarified for Policy if the work completed to date met the qualifications as reflected in the board manual for a synthesis. Policy responded CMER was not supposed to do a synthesis outside of what has already been done.

Greg Stewart reported Julie Dieu and Curt Veldhuisen are responding to questions one through three; and Greg is responding to question four.

Mark Hicks clarified the authors are to respond to all six questions and hand them off to the minority reviewers and the minority reviewers answer the same set of six questions. If there are disagreements, those are documented and handed off to the AMPA.

- ♦ Policy Facilitation
Policy interviewed the final candidates for a contract this month. The contractor will provide facilitation/mediation with the potential for arbitration if needed. A decision will be made next month.
- ♦ Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan Settlement Agreement (SA)
The work meeting on October 18th focused on the part of the SA where the Forest Practices Board appoints Policy members. The tribes were not in agreement with this due to their interpretation of how Board appointed Policy members could impact their sovereignty. The Policy committee will operate with one vote from each of the following nine caucuses: 1) WDFW and Ecology; 2) DNR; 3) Eastside Tribes; 4) Westside Tribes; 5) Conservation Caucus; 6) Industrial Forest Landowners; 7) Small Forest Landowners; 8), Federal Resource Protection Agencies, and; 9) Counties.

Policy also worked on dispute resolution; they agreed to mediation and non-binding arbitration. The Forest Practices Board will have final approval on whether or not to adopt the settlement agreement. Policy also agreed to extend the proposed five month dispute resolution timeline in the SA if everyone agrees that substantial progress is being made in resolving the dispute. Policy agreed to have CMER utilize stage two of the dispute resolution process outlined in the SA.

The next SA meeting is scheduled for November 6th. This meeting will focus on the CMER master schedule. The CMER co-chairs will work with Policy to get guidance on what kind of input they are seeking and this will be shared with CMER. This will be the main topic for CMER's November meeting.

- ♦ CMER Protocols and Standards Manual (PSM) -
Ash Roorbach reported that CMER approved changes for Chapters 1-3. The PSM TAG thought it would be good to bring this back to CMER to see the modifications. The

language of the dispute resolution mirrors the PSM nomenclature. This is a living document and these chapters will be loaded on the website.

Ash identified Chapters 4, 5 & 6 were open for CMER review and comment. The big item highlighted was section 4.4.2; the TAG wanted a consistent table for documentation purposes. The timeline for review and comment was two weeks. Comments were to be submitted to Ash by November 6th. Ash will compile the comments and Amy will capture the SAG comments to align this up for the CMER November meeting.

Mark Hicks reminded CMER members to send in changes, to be prepared next month to make a decision and reinforced this is the established process for the PSM review.

LWAG – Marc Hayes provided an update on the following:

- ♦ RMZ-Resample (Bird Data) – Weyerhaeuser Company & Scott Pearson held three meetings. They have developed the preliminary model and are in the process of developing the analysis. LWAG should have preliminary results by end of March 2103.

- ♦ Stream-Associated Amphibian Response to Manipulation of Forest Canopy Shading – LWAG sent the reviewer revised draft back to the reviewers for a second round of comment. Marc received comments back from Dick Miller and he is waiting for the balance. LWAG anticipates bringing this to the CMER November meeting. There may be some deviation from what was exactly laid out in the study plan. There may be potential issues with side bar analysis based on the original study design. The hierarchical material method was applied to this report.

SAGE – Marc Gauthier reported on the following:

- ♦ EWRAP – A TAG meeting was held after the SAGE meeting; the TAG will develop specific steps. This will be reported on in more detail at the CMER November meeting.

- ♦ Discussion on Content for Initial Charter Development for Eastside Effectiveness – SAGE worked on the charter and the SAG is at a point where clarity from CMER is required. Mark Hicks responded he will work with Greg Stewart and Amy Kurtenbach based on his comments about the charter.

Discussion Points:

Amy Kurtenbach responded CMER needed to talk about the pilot approach, specifically the role of the initial charter and content. This issue was also identified for the Unstable Slopes Criteria project.

Greg Stewart added it was important to tell the TWIG at the outset of what the true guidelines /options are for the initial development of a charter.

Doug Martin shared that at this stage this is something to inform Policy what the study is all about; at this stage it is really generic. One issue centers on really long dry streams; what are they doing and how much of that is true. This needs to be framed up for understanding. Another issue had to do with what Dave & Ash found; Type N streams were not being harvested. Policy does not know these streams are not being harvested- that is another issue or context statement that needs to be framed up for Policy. What is the effectiveness of the rule and the performance targets? In reality they do not have performance targets.

Dick Miller asked what the fundamental question was in CMER terminology; are we talking about a study or project or are they the same? What is the purpose of a charter? How much

effort do we put in charter? This is an evolving document and process; CMER needed to settle some of these issues especially since the SAG was working within a 30-day turn around.

Dave Schuett-Hames added the TWIG process seems to have mashed together several CMER steps: charter, scoping design and study design. The TWIG is an outcome from the LEAN process and CMER mashed three steps into two steps. CMER needs to answer how much scoping do we do with the charter and with the writing team? The LEAN idea was do the initial charter step with interested people; then go into scoping and study design with experts that have the skills for this work. It appears it is good to have the information front loaded as the SAG may not have the expertise at the initial step for the scoping work. At the point of implementation, CMER has the opportunity to take the results of the scoping step to Policy to weigh in before going into the study design step.

Mark Hicks responded that when we worked with the contractor for LEAN, the work group envisioned that we would have key people in the initial work groups. Under the initial model we assumed we would have very qualified people to begin with who understand our research needs and who can adjust the critical questions as needed. He added the CMER approval step as laid out in the pilot approach does not make sense to him if all we are doing is taking to Policy the same language that is already in the work plan. CMER needs to make sure we have the knowledge and experience available to start the TWIG process. This is was as a foundation step in the initial process, which did not have a separate CMER review step.

Leslie Lingley asked which step was most important in the LEAN process.

Dave Schuett-Hames clarified this proposal eliminated the first step with Policy; the TWIG goes right into the writing phase; CMER brings in the experts at that phase to implement that step.

Chris Mendoza emphasized CMER has been given the green light to pilot the TWIG process. The TWIG is formed to start phase one for developing the charter; this step lays out scheduling, timelines, roles and responsibilities. The charter is the project management tool to identify what needs to get done and by whom. The next step is to develop the scoping document with a set of qualified people. CMER needs to remember that forming and implementing the TWIG is a pilot approach; the purpose behind forming the TWIG was to cut down on the time and effort needed for the CMER review process. CMER will learn what works best after doing this a few times.

Amy Kurtenbach added she extracted the information from the TWIG Formation document that CMER approved and set up a task table to show the steps and timeline. The purpose of the initial TWIG document is to define the problem and set up the TWIG.

The CMER approved Pilot approach includes three steps:

- 1) Develop an initial charter and identify the Technical Writing and Implementation Group (TWIG);
- 2) Review and approve the scoping recommendations developed by the TWIG; and
- 3) Review and approve the resulting literature review and/or study design.

The areas where CMER is involved are reflected in steps:

- 1.1.2 CMER approves initial writing team;

- 1.2.2 CMER review and approval; and
- 1.6 Approve Charter (30 days).

The confusing step was:

2.5.2 Where Policy makes a determination to continue (or not to continue) with the study (move to step 3.5).

Dave Schuett-Hames added he thought the pilot has been successful in identifying the stages and suggested before launching any more TWIGs, for CMER to provide clear guidance, so other TWIGs do not have conflicting direction.

The CMER co-chairs agreed with this suggestion. They along with the AMPA and project manager will develop a guidance document to provide clarity and ensure productivity.

CMER – Items to take to November 1, 2012 Policy Meeting

- ♦ Update on Post-Mortem Report Six Questions/Findings Report
- ♦ Invite Policy to December 18th meeting for the Bull Trout Overlay Study presentation

CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments

- ♦ Chris Mendoza will send out a scheduler this week to organize a meeting with Marc Hayes, Doug Martin, Leslie Lingley, Charles Chesney, AJ Kroll, Mark Hicks and Jim Hotvedt for revitalizing the sub-group work around non-CMER science.
- ♦ Chris Mendoza will send the standard ISPR questions to Marc Hayes for review and to accompany the Tailed Frog Literature Review report to UW/ISPR.
- ♦ Mark Hicks will send out the memo and the CMER Protocols & Standards Manual (PSM) revision process to remind SAGs about the agreed upon process.
- ♦ Chris Mendoza will organize a work group comprised of Jim Hotvedt, Mark Hicks, Amy Kurtenbach, Dave Schuett-Hames, & Dick Miller to develop guidance and clarity on the steps involved in the TWIG processes. This will be accomplished before the end of October.

Meeting Adjourned.