

Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**April 26, 2011
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
Acker, Marty	NOAA
Almond, Lyle (ph)	Makah Tribe
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe, SAGE Co-Chair
chesney, Charles (ph)	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Entz, Ray	Kalispel Tribe
Heide, Pete	WFPA
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, SRSAG Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept. of Natural Resources, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Ice, George	NCASI
*Jackson, Terry	Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife, CMER Co-Chair
Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager
*Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser, LWAG Co-Chair
*Lingley, Leslie	Dept. of Natural Resources
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
Maroney, Joe	Kalispel Tribe
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Dept. of Natural Resources, Project Manager
*Miller, Dick	Washington Family Forestry Association
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Phillips, Jeff	Skagit River Systems Coop.
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
*Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

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

Agenda

Terry Jackson identified that the Soft Rock request needed to be added to the business section of the agenda.

Teresa Miskovic added that the WETSAG request is an action item and that Debbie Kay will not present this for WETSAG.

Science Session

George Ice, NCASI presented on the Alsea Watershed Study in Oregon. This study tested the Oregon Forest Practices Rules as of 1972 and focused on the Hinkle, Trask & Alsea Watersheds.

Business Session

➤ CMER Budget – *Update from Policy Budget Retreat*

Jim Hotvedt reported that Policy held their budget meeting on April 7th and reached non-consensus on the CMER budget. The tribes & tribal organizations, along with the conservation caucus, voted “no” on the budget. NWIFC stated that Forests and Fish Support Account funding dedicated \$2.5M each year for the tribes and changing this was considered a violation of a commitment by the state. UCUT shared that they have not seen progress in development of a long-term funding strategy for the adaptive management program. The conservation caucus voted “no”, because they consider (1) the adaptive management program budget, as a whole, is decreasing over time (e.g. CWA related studies only); (2) a long-term funding strategy has not been developed; and (3) participation grant funding was developed for just that, not to fund CMER projects - DNR is solely responsible for funding the FP HCP. Overall, the Policy representatives agreed with CMER projects and priorities; what was at issue was the legislature taking money from FF support account funds and reallocating the \$ which has never been done before. As the AMPA, Jim will recommend to the Forest Practices Board to adopt the budget and he will explain the non-consensus.

➤ CMER Co-Chair Nominations – *Discussion*

Jim Hotvedt asked for nominations for the CMER co-chair position. Terry Jackson is leaving the co-chair position as of June 30th this year. If more than one person is nominated when we ask for nominations for the CMER co-chair positions, then a committee is formed. The committee meets and develops recommendations to forward to CMER. CMER forwards the recommendations to Policy.

Chris Mendoza nominated Mark Hicks. He emphasized that CMER needed to consider rotation of the two positions and cycling through all CMER voting members for representation of all stakeholders.

Nancy Sturhan nominated Todd Baldwin for co-chair and eastside representation. Nancy stated that Todd has done a good job with SAGE and that he would do a good job with co-chair.

Ray Entz of the Kalispel Tribe weighed in on the nomination of Todd Baldwin. He stated that the Kalispel were currently in an assessment process of personnel within the organization. He shared that he performed the duties as chair in the Columbia Basin. As chair, he made sure meetings were held in remote locations so that the committee members understood the nature and scope of attending and participating in a committee. He stated that if Todd were to be the co-chair, they would need to see a commitment within other organizational structures to be more understanding of the fact there are two sides to the state and treat them equally. He suggested that CMER consider the change of meeting venue on some level, even if an eastside person is not picked for co-chair.

Todd Baldwin added that if this program is going to grow, CMER needs to schedule meetings on the eastside. There are options available in Spokane and Ellensburg for CMER meetings.

Mark Hicks added that he has not yet asked his employer for support of this nomination.

Jim Hotvedt summarized that CMER has two nominations. There were no reservations expressed by CMER members about the two nominations.

CMER/SAG Items:

- UPSAG Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project (Post-Mortem) Report to go to ISPR – ***CMER Approved to forward the draft Post-Mortem report to Independent Scientific Peer Review (IPSR)***

Julie Dieu reviewed the comments submitted by Martin, Miller and Kroll. UPSAG sent out the revision two weeks in advance with the complete comment matrix. UPSAG is requesting a vote of approval to forward the Post Mortem Report to ISPR.

Chris Mendoza made the motion to approve the recent version of the Post-Mortem Report and to forward this version to ISPR.

Mark Hicks seconded the motion.

CMER members approved the recent version of the Post-Mortem Report and reached consensus to forward this to ISPR.

Reservations Noted:

Doug Martin stated he gave consent to forward the report with reservations. He noted that not all the changes UPSAG made reflect his suggested changes. The executive summary remains inconsistent with the findings.

AJ Kroll shared that his “yes” vote is for the process to proceed but that it is not a statement of satisfaction that his comments were addressed. This process has gone long enough that the report needs to move forward to the next stage.

- CMER Member - Post-Mortem Report ISPR Questions – ***CMER did not approve the Post-Mortem report ISPR questions as developed by Leslie Lingley. CMER approved to send the standard eight questions with the post-mortem study to ISPR***

UPSAG held a meeting to thoroughly review the ISPR questions to accompany the Post-Mortem report, including the questions submitted by CMER members. From this UPSAG meeting, three focus questions emerged to accompany the eight standard questions. One CMER member (Leslie Lingley), who submitted questions to UPSAG, was unable to attend the UPSAG meeting where the three focus questions were developed. Because Leslie was not satisfied that the three focus questions adequately addressed her concerns, she brought her proposed questions to CMER for consideration.

Discussion Points:

AJ Kroll asked why there is a need to have additional focused questions beyond the standard questions for ISPR.

Chris Mendoza replied that if there is a technical issue not resolved by the time of the ISPR review, that sometimes, but not always, CMER has developed additional questions to assist with a specific technical issue. However, CMER needs to be cautious of potentially biasing the independent review by attempting to micromanage the review process. UPSAG pulled the first focus question from the Roads Sub-Basin report ISPR questions.

Mark Hicks cautioned CMER that additional questions can help or prevent a thorough review. CMER needs to be careful not to use ISPR for dispute resolution. CMER can use the dispute resolution process for unresolved issues.

Terry Jackson stated that one advantage we have with the ISPR process in the adaptive management program, over the peer review process for scientific journals, is that we can submit specific questions to address our uncertainties over scientific credibility. This process provides a mechanism for the various FFR stakeholders to ensure that our research and monitoring is scientifically credible and to help avoid calling foul at the end of the process. She agreed that ISPR is not for dispute resolution and that CMER needs to make sure that questions are not written in a way that would bait the reviewers to obtain a desired outcome.

A concern was expressed over the fact that most of UPSAG is made up of the authors of the report, and these authors are also the ones that have written the ISPR questions and have made the decision over whether or not to include the questions submitted by other CMER members. Julie Dieu responded that Doug Martin, Terry Jackson, Jim Hotvedt, Chris Mendoza, & Jeff Phillips were also at the UPSAG meeting and helped to work on the three focus questions. Jeff Phillips mentioned that UPSAG doesn't have a lot of alternatives; they lost the contractor and the SAG members have worked together as authors of the report.

Amy Kurtenbach commented on the process question about including the authors; CMER has often consulted with the authors and they have contributed to the process of developing questions. This is not unique to the Post-Mortem study.

Jim Hotvedt added that every journal has a set of questions that are given to reviewers to use. He reviewed a set of journals to compare with the CMER questions and they are very similar.

AJ Kroll replied that since the standard eight questions have been used – use the eight standard questions. The notion to include more questions that are unclear creates confusion.

Jim Hotvedt added that these eight questions are different from what is included in the protocols and standards manual (PSM) questions. CMER will need to revise the PSM.

Chris Mendoza motioned to send the Post-Mortem report with the standard eight questions without the focus questions to ISPR.

Terry Jackson seconded the motion.

CMER members approved this motion and reached consensus to send the standard eight questions to ISPR.

CMER also agreed that a list of the names of potential reviewers would not be included with the letter to UW's managing editor (as was done with the ISPR review of the Study Design), and instead would only come with a recommendation for at least one statistician.

➤ **RSAG – Extensive Type F Eastside – *CMER Approved to pull out the rotating panel design from the Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Eastside Type F final report***

Lyle Almond stated that this report was sent to ISPR along with an addendum to allow the rotating panel monitoring effort to go forward. Several ISPR comments associated with the

rotating panel design will take some time to address. RSAG's request is for CMER to approve removing the rotating panel sampling design from the Extensive Riparian Status and Trends Monitoring Eastside Type F final report. This will allow the report to be completed without further delays. A subgroup of RSAG will continue to work on the rotating panel design for future implementation (if approved by Policy and the Board).

Todd Baldwin motioned to approve the request.

Miller seconded the motion.

CMER members approved and reached consensus.

➤ *UPSAG Roads Sub-Basin Report Results to Update Board Manual – CMER Review of the Concepts*

Julie Dieu provided an overview of text edits to the Roads Board Manual in response to results from the Roads Sub-Basin Scale Effectiveness Monitoring, First Sampling Event (2006-2008) Report. The edits are non-regulatory and remind readers about the existence of FFR performance targets for roads and how to identify RMAP work that will help meet them.

Jim Hotvedt cautioned that although UPSAG is asking for CMER approval, the specific language may be further modified during the stakeholder process for board manual revisions.

Chris Mendoza asked for CMER approval to support language to go into the board manual.

Leslie Lingley seconded the motion.

CMER members approved this and reached consensus.

➤ *SRSAG - Type N Experimental Buffer Study in Incompetent Lithologies in Western Washington (Soft Rock Study)*

Mark Hicks reported that the QAPP format is being used in conformance with the requirements for funding under the EPA grant received by Ecology to assist CMER in funding this project. By prior agreement, the QAPP is serving in place of the standard CMER study design for this project (project charter). SRSAG requests three CMER reviewers, who are not part of the current SAG, to review the QAPP (concurrent review). This is a two-week comment period and comments are to be submitted by May 10th.

The following are the three CMER reviewers:

Leslie Lingley

Todd Baldwin

Julie Dieu

➤ *WETSAG – Wetlands Charter – Update*

Teresa Miskovic reported that WETSAG has reviewed and approved the Wetlands Systematic Literature Review Project Charter and is requesting CMER review. It is requested that CMER comments be submitted to the Project Manager by May 4th.

➤ *CMER Charter Development - Discussion*

Dick Miller reviewed his drafted outline including the main elements (17) included within existing charters, along with a scoring chart for the respective stakeholders. Project managers spent a lot of time putting these charters together. Dick is concerned about the work load this represents for project managers, as CMER currently only has two of the original three. He

would like to form a group to discuss how to streamline charters. This outline can be a starting point for a discussion with the group. Other issues needing to be worked out are the reasons behind the signatures and the link to an RFQQ.

Chris Mendoza stated that he supports charters as they add accountability to projects that are essentially run by volunteers. However, CMER still needs to decide what type of information should be included in the Charters to make them affective, and what level of detail is really necessary to do so. He also expressed concerns about linking Charters to the RFQQ process, which has never been done before. Policy directors and Department Program leads ultimately decides how to allocate resources across CMER projects, and makes recommendations to the FP Board, who then approves the budget.

Jim Hotvedt added that one of the decisions CMER can make is that the charter document does not require CMER approval. A charter should come before the scoping document. It is an evolving document that starts out with the basics to get the SAG focused and then it is added upon when the project evolves. What is a charter, how does it evolve and when to use it are important conversations to have. A charter is an informal agreement of what will be done and who will be involved.

Ash Roorbach added that it seems the charter is a collection of different pieces of a project and located in one place. What is unique to the charter is the clarity of the roles and the levels of responsibilities. If a signature is needed on a charter it should be those people responsible for supervising the staff from the difference agencies.

Amy Kurtenbach stated that there is a science behind managing projects and it is common to use charters. Two main reasons why projects fail are 1) they do not have sponsor support and 2) they do not have a charter. The issue of signatures comes up a lot. In many cases it is the organization that supports time dedicated to the project. The purpose of a signed charter is to have clearly identified the expectations and roles of the different players. The EPA QAPP is an example where the signature of two CMER members is reflected in that document. The chart is a good tool for the project managers and is a good communications tool for CMER. The protocol and standards manual has identified the importance of an implementation plan for CMER projects, but Amy could not find a single example of an implementation plan. We are making a cultural shift using charters, so they are a bit robust. Amy is a big proponent of starting slow and finishing fast.

Chris Mendoza recommended that CMER deal with the issues one-at-a-time to meet the needs of CMER. He motioned to form a sub-group to meet with the project managers to come up with a charter to bring to CMER for review (like the Information Management Systems). The following volunteered to work on the charter sub-group:

Chris Mendoza	Dick Miller
Amy Kurtenbach	Teresa Miskovic
Ash Roorbach	

➤ LWAG – Type N Genetics – *Update on Revised Report*

Teresa Miskovic reported that the WSU paper went through ISPR, and the ISPR comments have been addressed by WSU. LWAG is okay with them. The ISPR recommended re-analysis which took some time. Comments were due April 25th.

➤ *RSAG – Solar Report -Bull Trout Overlay – Update on Matrix and Contract Status*

Terry Jackson reported that she and Greg Stewart have worked on filling in the comment matrix prior to sending it to Mason Bruce & Girard (MB&G), the contractor. RSAG has reviewed and approved the input provided by Greg and Terry, and will soon be sending the matrix to MB&G for their response. After RSAG has reviewed and approved MB&G's response, the matrix will come to CMER for approval prior to incorporation of comments into the report.

Chris Mendoza cited the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual where it does state that CMER has to approve it.

➤ *SAGE – Eastern Washington Riparian Assessment Project – Update*

Todd Baldwin reported that SAGE is working towards getting another contractor to finish the work. He has a prospective replacement that he will confer with after the CMER meeting. .

➤ *SAGE – Forest Hydrology Charter – Update*

Amy Kurtenbach explained that SAGE requested CMER approval of the project charter at the CMER meeting last month. CMER requested more time for review and time to submit comments. CMER members approved the SAGE Type N Characterization Project: Forest Hydrology Charter, contingent upon Mark Hicks, Terry Jackson, and Chris Mendoza's changes so long as they are not conflicting. Those changes were incorporated into the document. The next step will be to have it signed and sent to Policy.

CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments:

- UPSAG Roads Sub-Basin Report – Incorporation of results into Roads Board Manual – Share suggested language to Policy & the Board Manual work group.
- SRSAG Type N Experimental Buffer Study in Incompetent Lithologies in Western Washington (Soft Rock Study) - CMER Reviewers' comments due to co-chair by **May 10th**.
- WETSAG - Wetlands Systematic Literature Review - Requesting CMER review & comments on the Project Charter. Comments should be sent to Teresa Miskovic by **May 4th**.
- Sub-group to meet with the PMs to work out issues associated with charter development.
- CMER nominations for co-chair that were made today will be sent to Policy.

Meeting Adjourned.