

# Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**November 15, 2011  
DNR/DOC Compound**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe
chesney, charles (ph)	Dept. of Natural Resources, SAGE Co-chair
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-chair
Gauthier, Mark (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
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
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
*Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
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**

### ➤ CMER Science Topics (Monthly Meetings)

CMER members discussed the purpose of having monthly science sessions.

There seemed to be general agreement that CMER can do a better job by ensuring the topics are selected to better apply to ongoing work and decisions. There was also general support for taking time after the presentations to discuss how the information gained may be used to support our own research program or decision making process.

Co-chair Hicks reminded the group that he is organizing a presentation of three speakers (from EPA, Utah, and Oregon) on extensive monitoring methods with a focus on rotating panel designs for the February 28<sup>th</sup> meeting. CMER can use this information on how to describe the general use and limitations of rotating panels in a follow up discussion with Policy.

### ➤ CMER Task List – *Prioritization of tasks and identification of work groups*

The CMER task list was thoroughly reviewed item by item, leads were identified and dates were slated for each work task. The updated task list will be sent out to CMER. The following tasks were highlighted as action items for the Protocols and Standards Manual update discussion:

Literature Syntheses: Develop potential PSM language defining how literature reviews/syntheses will be used within the CMER Process. A special subcommittee will be formed and this issue addressed in general PSM update.

Findings Report: Define what goes to Policy. The AMPA and CMER co-Chairs will draft an approach and bring to CMER when this section of PSM is being addressed. This will be brought to CMER in December (note: delayed until January).

Dispute Resolution Process: Review and revise as needed. Ensure consistency with current rules and the board manual. A special subcommittee has been formed and this issue will be addressed in general PSM update. January 2012 is projected date for having this completed.

The use of non-CMER science will be addressed by a CMER sub-committee. This sub-committee will be formed by the December 20<sup>th</sup> CMER meeting.

CMER Lessons Learned – develop a strategy for gathering data every year from the projects and provide a synthesis of this for CMER. Amy Kurtenbach, Jim Hotvedt and Nancy Sturhan will work on developing a strategy.

ISPR: Reviews that are unclear need to be resolved in a timely manner before contracts expire. Chris Mendoza will organize a TAG.

➤ *CMER Science Conference – Update on Date, Logistics, Timeline & Guidelines*

Nancy Sturhan reported she made contact with Kira Furman who is willing to present her thesis at the science conference. Nancy Sturhan prepared a key findings matrix based on Furman's master thesis; a social scientist perspective of the FP HCP's adaptive management program. This matrix and report will be shared with CMER and used to make a decision on whether or not to invite her to present her findings at one of CMER's monthly science sessions or at a Policy meeting.

The CMER coordinator reviewed logistics of the CMER science conference. The confirmed date is Tuesday, March 27, 2012 and will replace CMER's regularly scheduled March meeting. The location is the auditorium at the Department of Social and Health Services Office Building 2. The CMER December 20<sup>th</sup> meeting is the first deadline for SAGs to confirm with CMER their presenters and topics.

The morning session will include:

- Presentation on the Adaptive Management Program (framework & structure) by Jim Hotvedt & Chris Mendoza.
- Project presentations (each program will identify the critical question they are answering):
  - ❖ RSAG - Hardwood Conversion case studies & Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity & Function Project (Westside)
  - ❖ LWAG –Jim McCracken's first full draft
  - ❖ CMER Information Management System Project
  - ❖ WETSAG – Wetlands Literature Synthesis Review
  - ❖ SAGE - Site Selection by Greg Stewart

The afternoon session will be devoted to the Adaptive Management Program:

- Practical applications of the Adaptive Management Program by Mark Hicks & Chris Mendoza.
- Other Habitat Conservation Plans – Plum Creek, Port Blakely & West fork.

CMER co-chairs reminded SAGs to develop & submit a formal request for costs of science conference presenters to be approved by CMER.

➤ Policy & FP Board Briefing – CMER Co-chair Hicks provided an update.

- SFLO low impact thinning template was brought before the Forest Practices Board by DNR staff without consensus. The Forest Practices Board failed to adopt it based on a 5/5 vote.
- The issue of prioritization and capacity for the SAG and CMER staff to start the Type F project was brought up with policy. Policy agreed to talk about this in the context of the budget meeting.
- Policy was trying to finalize the Type N & Type F water typing strategy to work within their work plan for next year. There was no agreement within Policy and it went to the Forest Practices Board. The Forest Practices Board replied the highest priority is Type N as this falls in line with the CWA, while adding a friendly amendment (FP Board member Anna Jackson) that both may occur simultaneously under the condition that work on Type F waters would not preclude or postpone work being done on Type N waters.
- Policy is trying to put together a package of short-term and long-term funding options for the Adaptive management Program. The short term approach is to use the fund balance in the Forest and Fish Support Account for the Adaptive Management Program at \$1M. Use the FFSA fund balance to gradually reinvest in core functions over the next three years. The understanding from the Principals is that you cannot start new projects and look at a revamping of the program. They agreed to use the \$50,000 that was ear marked for a grant writer to be used for the LEAN process. LEAN evaluates efficiencies of decision making, processes and develops recommendations. There was an issue raised at Policy with the Conservation Caucus concerning the lack of an independent programmatic review of the Adaptive Management Program that was supposed to happen via the State's independent Auditor's office. Since funding for such a review has been eliminated, the Forest Practices Board gave direction for funding and revamping the Adaptive Management Program using the LEAN process instead. The Conservation Caucus has concerns that the LEAN process will not accomplish the same thing as an independent programmatic review by the State Auditor's office, and therefore may not address key structural problems with the AMP.

Mark Mobbs asked if it was mentioned that there is a level of inefficiencies built in as part of the consensus building process. Mark Hicks replied the LEAN evaluation will look at the consensus building decision making process.

➤ CMER Co-chairs have been informed two SAGs need a co-chair.

WETSAG & RSAG need another co-chair. The co-chair duties can be split up and rotated among members.

➤ Stillwater Report Recommendations –*Draft Response Table*

Chris Mendoza has received one set of comments about the matrix shared at the last CMER meeting. The sub-group plans to have CMER approve the response matrix at the December 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

➤ CMER Protocol & Standard Manual (PSM) – Chapters 1 & 2 updates – ***CMER provided conditional approval***

Nancy Struhan reported the SAG request format will be used in the future for decisions to be made. CMER requested to approve the changes to chapters 1 & 2 or go back to the original. CMER members have approved documents before with minor clarifications. There are no new changes in the two chapters since the last CMER meeting.

Mark Hicks suggested CMER provide conditional approval of PSM Chapters 1 & 2 and have the work group bring back a clean copy of the comment matrix. This will allow time for the two CMER members (Dick Miller & Terry Jackson) comments to be included.

CMER members agreed to conditionally approve the PSM Chapters 1 & 2.

➤ Process to Revise the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual – *Update*

Jim Hotvedt reviewed the memo outlining the process for making revisions to the CMER PSM. This is a status update of the changes made after CMER approved this last month. The PSM flow chart has been designed to be generic so it can be applied more consistently through time.

One of the main tenants in the revision process revolves around disagreement. If there is disagreement on the proposed updates, the PSM work group and CMER will default to using the original language in the PSM from the 2005 version previously approved by CMER.

Suggested changes to be made to the revision process diagram are: correct typos, insert dispute language in the last step and add box 10. Box 10 will identify defaulting back to original language in the PSM.

➤ SAG Updates:

WETSAG:

Debbie Kay reported the first meeting with Dr. Adamus went well and the contractor is on track. CMER members were encouraged to share research papers with Amy Kurtenbach for the collection of literature.

UPSAG:

Julie Dieu shared they held a two day meeting out on Weyerhaeuser land. This field trip assisted UPSAG members' thinking about the criterion interpretation project. UPSAG is still working on a scoping design for the criterion project. They are close to having a project charter for Policy.

Julie Dieu reported UPSAG has a semi complete draft of ISPR matrix for responses on the post mortem report. The review schedule is: draft out next Monday for 10 days review (November 18<sup>th</sup>). December 1<sup>st</sup> UPSAG meets for the review process; this includes CMER reviewers at this meeting. December 6<sup>th</sup> will have final draft of the matrix for CMER reviewers to review. December 20<sup>th</sup> CMER meeting for CMER approval.

### RSAG:

BCIF: Dave Schuett-Hammes reported the report has been reviewed by ISPR. RSAG will take comments on addressing the ISPR comments. Nancy Struhan and Chris Mendoza are reviewers. Comments are due by November 23<sup>rd</sup>. They will have it ready by December 7<sup>th</sup> along with the six questions by December 14th.

Hardwood Conversion: Dick Miller and Ash Roorbach have provided minor changes to the report.

Type N Extensive Temperature Report: Bill Ehinger reports this will be out in two weeks.

Solar/Shade & Temperature project: the draft final report is expected by the end of November (note: did not arrive until January).

Leslie Lingley and Julie Dieu are CMER reviewers. Todd Baldwin volunteered to be a CMER reviewer.

RSAG parsed out the updates and strategy reviews among RSAG members for the work plan revisions.

### LWAG:

Mark Mobbs shared he has approached his supervisor for recruiting another LWAG member.

Amy Kurtenbach reported Scott Pearson has worked on bird data and found pre data and not post data.

Marc Hayes is starting to look at the Van Dyke salamanders data.

Chris Mendoza reported that the TAG of LWAG for the Type N Experimental Hard Rock study met with Weyerhaeuser statisticians. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss how to deal with data from a 3<sup>rd</sup> year of sampling from the 2007 wind storm. The TAG is working on how to resolve potential problems associated with amphibian data collection methods and results from the 2007 windstorm with the tailed frog portion of the project.

### SAGE:

Forest Hydrology Study: Charles Chesney reported SAGE held a telephone conference call yesterday to look over data structure strategies. SAGE is working on the request for a proposal to hire a consultant for the field collection process. SAGE has found ample number of sites that represent water and basin types to continue to the next steps in the Forest Hydrology study.

EWRAP: Ash Roorbach and Dave Schuett-Hammes are continuing their work on the MB&G study. Ash is in Oregon for training on FES.

- CMER Report to Policy: *Discussion on Items to take to Policy*
  - CMER Co-chairs will take the SAG co-chairs issue to Policy and try to get a commitment to appoint co-chairs.
- CMER/SAG *Recap of Assignments*
  - PSM - Findings Report: Define what goes to Policy and implement the format in CMER. The AMPA and CMER co-Chairs will draft approach and bring to CMER in December.

- PSM Task List - Use of non-CMER science: A CMER sub-committee will be formed at the CMER meeting on December 20, 2011.
- PSM CMER Lessons Learned: Amy Kurtenbach, Nancy Sturhan & Jim Hotvedt will develop a strategy.
- Nancy Sturhan will share her matrix of finding she developed to interpret Kira Furman's master thesis. She will send this to the CMER Coordinator for sending out to CMER.
- Stillwater Report Recommendations: this will be completed for CMER approval at the December 20<sup>th</sup> meeting.

***Meeting Adjourned.***