

# Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**December 20, 2011  
DNR/DOC Compound**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
*Baldwin, Todd (ph)	Kalispel Tribe
*Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Gauthier, Mark (ph)	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Hayes, Marc	Department of Fish & Wildlife
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept. of Natural Resources, AMPA
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
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.

## **Agenda:**

Leslie Lingley asked about the order of the agenda items. She talked to Charles Chesney about how SAGE items are consistently at the end of the agenda. Chris Mendoza stated the agenda is developed based on decisions that need to be made by vote and the SAGs are listed in alpha order. SAG & CMER members need to attend the CMER meetings and if they need to leave early they need to state that at the start of the meeting time and the agenda can be re-arranged.

## **Business Session**

➤ Policy Meeting – Report from December 1, 2011 Meeting

Mark Hicks reported on the directive from the Forest Practices Board to run a LEAN process for the Adaptive Management Program. Policy members are optimistic in having a consultant review the multi layers of the Adaptive Management Program. This is connected to the long-term strategy for funding the Adaptive Management Program. The projected timeline includes a step one where the consultant will evaluate where the opportunities exist for conducting a LEAN process and develop a recommendation; step two will be to conduct the LEAN process and evaluate the effectiveness of AMP processes.

Policy received directive from the Forest Practices Board to work on a Type N Water Typing Strategy. Policy approved developing a charter for the Type N Water Typing Strategy. This has both Policy & TAG sub-groups working on this. TAG Members are: Mark Hicks, Marc Engel, Doug Hooks, Chris Mendoza, Terry Jackson, and potentially Jim Mathews. If CMER members are interested there is still time to step forward and participate.

Policy agreed to try to start identifying issues for fish habitat and work on this along with the Type N Water Typing Strategy. A sub-group has been organized to meet with all the caucuses to understand the issues connected to fish habitat.

➤ Forest Practices Board Meeting – Direction to conduct LEAN on Adaptive Management Program

Jim Hotvedt informed CMER members that LEAN is an improvement process adopted from an industrial process improvement model. The \$50,000 allocated in the CMER budget in the line item for the grant writer will be used for this evaluation. The Department of Enterprise Services, who has a master contract for LEAN services, recommended two steps:

- 1) Opportunity assessment – figure out what to do LEAN on.
- 2) Pick out part of the process and implement a LEAN event on it.

He shared with CMER the competitive solicitation process steps completed to date. The competitive solicitation process is connected to the route for the master contracts with the state of Washington. The work request is out on Washington's Electronic Business Solution (WEBS). This is the pathway for competitive procurement and contracting in the state of Washington. This is open to January 6, 2012. He expects to have a contract by January 18, 2012 and have the consultant start on January 19, 2012. The consultant is expected to have a recommendation in time for the February Forest Practices Board meeting. By March 2012 the LEAN consultant will work with CMER on recommended processes. He will send CMER members information on LEAN.

Jim Hotvedt highlighted the conversation with Policy regarding the queuing up of CMER projects. Specifically, Dave Schuett-Hames will be ready to work on other projects as the Westside Type N BCIF Study will be completed. Dave Schuett-Hames looked at the CMER budget and the CWA milestones and both have the Type F Effectiveness study, but neither identified an emphasis on the eastside or westside. This went to Policy to get direction. Policy formed a sub group and discussion between Mark Hicks and Pete Heide evolved to the point where NCASI was identified as interested in this study. Policy discussed this and directed CMER to have Dave Schuett-Hames investigate working with NCASI on roads prescriptions and best management practices, as time allows. Both Dave Schuett-Hames and UPSAG leadership have been informed of Policy's discussion and decision.

Related to the above, Policy directed CMER to devote human resources to completing unfinished projects prior to starting new projects. Policy used the EWRAP as an example.

➤ 2013 Work Plan – Review SAG assignments & Timeline

Chris Mendoza urged SAG co-chairs to send in their 2013 CMER work plan revisions to Terry Jackson. She will merge SAG revisions into one document. CMER will walk through each revision at the January 2012 meeting. For any new projects where budgets have changed, we need to have that included as well. Decisions will be made at the January meeting so CMER will be able to approve a final 2013 CMER work plan at the February 2012 meeting. The work plan will be shared with Policy and Policy approves the budget at its annual budget retreat. This is traditionally held in April so as to pass along the budget information to the Forest Practices Board for approval at their May meeting.

These SAGs reported out the status of where they are in the work plan revision process:

SAGE – edits have been completed and sent out the SAGE members. SAGE expects to have their work completed in time.

WETSAG – revisions have been agreed upon by two of the three active members; one declined from participating due to the work with the consultant.

UPSAG – revisions have been reviewed by UPSAG members. The strategy changes for the characterization project will be included. This will take more time from the UPSAG members.

SAGs agreed to have their work plan revisions (in redline strike out) into Terry Jackson by January 6, 2012. This draft of the 2013 CMER work plan and budget will be reviewed by CMER at the January 24<sup>th</sup> meeting.

➤ *CMER Task List – Review Updates*

Leslie Lingley questioned the PSM information in line #8 (Review and revise as needed the Dispute Resolution Process; consistent with current rules and Board Manual). This was supposed to happen by December 11<sup>th</sup>. Has that happened? Mark Hicks clarified that Ash and Nancy are working on the PSM. Chapter 3 is expected to be done by February 2012. The CMER task list has the February date identified.

➤ *CMER Monthly Science Topics – Review Topics*

As the schedule stands now, CMER does not have presentations confirmed after February 2012.

AJ Kroll requested to have his presentation pushed out to April 2012.

Jim Hotvedt asked if CMER members were interested in having the Puget Sound Partnership (PSP) present. He also inquired if CMER was interested in having the Pacific Northwest Aquatic Monitoring Partnership (PNAMP) present as they are monitoring fish and habitat projects.

Discussion Points on CMER monthly meeting science sessions:

CMER needs to make sure the presentations are aimed at a specific purpose.

CMER has the dynamic of Policy members asking if CMER is current with these adaptive management and monitoring partnerships. They are using some of CMER's protocols. CMER needs to stay current with what others are doing.

The suggestion of having a sequential approach to these presentations was made.

CMER has hosted CMER-science presentations which seem too narrow for the purpose of increasing our understanding and knowledge in effectiveness and monitoring research.

CMER will host the Status and Trends Monitoring workshop on February 28<sup>th</sup>. The partnerships are invited to attend this workshop.

CMER's July meeting was tentatively suggested for the PSP presentation.

➤ *2011 CMER Accomplishments*

Jim Hotvedt reminded CMER members of the accomplishments list pulled together by Amy and Teresa last year. This was shared with CMER. A Policy person asked for it again this year. The draft shared with CMER at this meeting allows CMER members time to identify other

accomplishments. He encouraged members to celebrate the work and the fact CMER is making progress. This reflects work accomplished for the calendar year.

Marc Hayes has some additions to make to this list and will send them to Jim Hotvedt.

## **Decisions:**

### LWAG:

➤ **Jim McCracken Expenses for 2012 CMER Science Conference - *CMER Approved***

Marc Hayes requested CMER approval to use the CMER contingency fund to cover the cost of airfare (Approximately \$600.00) for Jim McCracken (PI) to present project results at the 2012 CMER Science Conference. He will present on the Buffer Integrity-Shade Effectiveness Project.

Mark Hicks motioned to approve this.

Chris Mendoza seconded the motion.

CMER members agreed.

➤ **Buffer Integrity-Shade Effectiveness Study - *CMER Reviewers Assigned***

Marc Hayes shared the draft of the final Buffer Integrity-Shade Effectiveness is due by January 16<sup>th</sup>. This is a request for CMER Reviewers. Mark Hicks, Dick Miller and Doug Martin agreed to be CMER reviewers. Marc Hayes will send the report out in time for the January 24<sup>th</sup> CMER meeting. January 10<sup>th</sup> is the deadline for the CMER reviewers' comments on the Buffer Integrity-Shade Effectiveness Study (two weeks from January 24<sup>th</sup>).

➤ **Request for initial RMZ bird data (1994-1996) - *Update***

Marc Hayes reported the contractor is conducting a public disclosure request for bird data from 1994-1996 and demonstration stage (TFW project). The data is at the USFWS.

AJ Kroll stated LWAG has the same issue with the RMZ data; original 2 years is missing.

Marc Hayes shared this was a separate issue and DFW is working on it.

➤ **Tailed Frog Literature Review – *CMER Reviewers Assigned***

Marc Hayes reported the tailed frog literature review is completed. LWAG is reviewing it now. This will return to CMER in January. He requested CMER reviewers for this study: Leslie Lingley, Chris Mendoza and Doug Martin agreed to be CMER reviewers.

➤ **Type N Experimental: Hard Rock Study – *Update***

Amy Kurtenbach reported several pieces are completed in the contracted deliverables. Chapter 1 segments of the amphibian data have been analyzed and submitted to DNR. There are 13 chapters; the introduction and subsequent pieces attributed to Dave Schuett-Hames and Bill Ehinger are completed. There is a suite of deliverables connected to the analyses and chapters and sub-chapters. The target date for a final report is 2014. The CMER review process is targeted for 2013. The field work is completed. The non-amphibian field work is going through the analyses.

Amy Kurtenbach added the extension for another year of sampling was approved, but not at the expense of completing the study on time.

Leslie Lingley pointed out that the history and context table below in the SAG request form is not being used consistently. She asked why it is there to begin with as it is not being filled out. She suggested to get rid of it.

Nancy Sturhan stated the reason it was there was to track what stage the project is in.

Mark Hicks shared the date for approval is difficult to track down. It is not done consistently. The SAGs should fill these out.

Amy Kurtenbach added the SAG co-chairs rarely fill these out as it takes a lot of time. She suggested CMER could write it out as narrative and fold this into the updates through the PSM process.

Mark Hicks suggested adding this as a PSM issue.

Chris Mendoza pointed out this is a SAG co-chair responsibility. He discourages the PM to take on the tasks of the SAG co-chairs without prior approval of the SAG.

Marc Hayes added CMER was asked to do this for other reasons; do not twist it around based on what happened in the past.

Chris Mendoza emphasized what is in the PSM now is what CMER already agreed to for the process of conducting business at meetings. He is concerned that if the PMs continue to take on more work for the SAGs, whose duties are clearly spelled out in the CMER PSM, this will discourage the SAG co-chairs from doing their jobs; this is a workload issue.

Mar Hayes added the CMER PSM is a set of guidelines; this needs to be clearly conveyed.

Chris Mendoza disagreed and cautioned CMER about selecting when and when not to follow the PSM. His interpretation of the CMER process is that CMER members need to follow the PSM as previously agreed; it is not merely a set of guidelines to be dismissed without prior agreement from CMER. Some CMER members have selectively cited the PSM verbatim as reason to prevent a project from moving forward and then later dismissed language as “guidance” when they don’t like it.

Amy Kurtenbach added the PMs worked closely with the SAG Co-chairs to fill out the SAG request. CMER should make the history & context optional as it is a time sink.

WETSAG:

- Expenses for Dr. Adamus to present at the 2012 CMER Science Conference - ***CMER Approved***

Amy Kurtenbach requested CMER approval to spend \$1700.00 of the CMER contingency fund to pay for preparation, attendance, and expenses for Dr. Paul Adamus to present at the 2012 CMER Science Conference. He will present on where he is in the process of the literature review.

Chris Mendoza motioned to approve.

Dick Miller seconded the motion.

CMER members agreed.

CMER Coordinator's Corner:

➤ CMER Meeting Notes – September & October 2011– *CMER Approved with changes*

➤ CMER Science Conference – Confirm Presentations – *CMER Approved*

CMER coordinator facilitated discussion on the presentations outlined by the SAGs last month. The one day conference will highlight the Adaptive Management Program, some CMER studies and three other habitat conservation plans.

The morning session will cover the following:

- ❖ Adaptive Management Program Structure & Framework – Jim Hotvedt
- ❖ CMER Information Management System Project – Bruce Jones
- ❖ Hardwood Conversion Case Studies – Ash Roorbach
- ❖ Stream-Associated Amphibian Response to Manipulation of Forest Canopy Shading – Jim McCracken
- ❖ Site Selection Challenges in CMER Research – Greg Stewart
- ❖ Type N Buffer Characteristics, Integrity & Function Project – Westside – Dave Schuett-Hames
- ❖ Wetlands Literature Synthesis Review – Dr. Adamus

The afternoon session will be devoted to:

- ❖ Adaptive Management Program Practical Applications – CMER Co-chairs Hicks & Mendoza
- ❖ Plum Creek Habitat Conservation Plan
- ❖ Port Blakely Habitat Conservation Plan
- ❖ Westfork Habitat Conservation Plan

The CMER coordinator will finalize the agenda of the conference program. She reminded the SAGs of the upcoming deadlines associated with the science conference as follows:

<b>Abstracts, Due Date, Format</b>	<b>Thursday, March 1, 2012</b>
<b>Poster Guidelines</b>	<b>Thursday, March 1, 2012</b>
<b>PPT, Preview of Conference Presentations</b>	<b>Friday, March 2, 2012</b>
<b>Preview of the conference presentations scheduled</b>	<b>Friday, March 9, 2012</b>
<b>Final PowerPoint Presentations</b>	<b>Friday, March 16, 2012</b>

UPSAG:

➤ Mass Wasting Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project (Post-Mortem) - *CMER Approved the ISPR Response Matrix*

Julie Dieu reported UPSAG has completed the ISPR comment matrix. UPSAG had good conversation at the November meeting; UPSAG and CMER reviewers met in December. The CMER Reviewers were: Doug Martin, Dick Miller, Terry Jackson, Nancy Sturhan, Mark Hicks, AJ Kroll, Paul Kennard (Environmental Caucus Representative). Leslie Lingley had one comment that showed up in redline strike out in the mailed out version. UPSAG is requesting CMER review and approval of the Post Mortem ISPR Response Matrix. UPSAG believes that the approach for revisions to the final report as identified in the matrix is appropriate.

Chris Mendoza reported that he talked to Paul Kennard and he is okay with the ISPR comment response matrix at this stage.

Chris Mendoza motioned to approve the Post-Mortem ISPR Response Matrix.  
Dick Miller seconded the motion.

CMER members were in agreement.

RSAG:

➤ Results of the Westside Type N BCIF Study – *CMER Approved*

Amy Kurtenbach reported Dave Schuett-Hames sent the updated version from the RSAG meeting that occurred after the CMER mailing. This is the final report for Buffer Characteristic Integrity and Function Study (BCIF Type N Study). RSAG requests CMER approval of the final report.

Chris Mendoza suggested a change to page 65 of the report – insert a sentence that references schedule L1 in the first paragraph which gives context to the performance targets that are different from functional objectives.

Jim Hotvedt commended Dave Schuett-Hames for including the findings summary; this report was complimented on by the ISPR reviewers.

Chris Mendoza identified next steps for the review process of this report. This report goes to Policy with the answers to the six questions. If Policy has further questions about the results, CMER will need to answer these questions.

Jim Hotvedt added the report goes to Policy with the findings summary. Policy has to make a decision; take action or not. That decision is shared with the Forest Practices Board. If the Board chose to take an action; this is a signal to start the calendar of 6 months to resolve. Policy will then organize a sub-group & develop a course of action.

Nancy Sturhan added Policy took action on the PIP and DFC studies.

Chris Mendoza elaborated the DFC & PIP studies provided technical recommendations; CMER made recommendations on basal area and other stand metrics for consideration consistent with the Adaptive Management Board Manual and CMER PSM. However, Policy does not want CMER to make decisions related to Policy. Policy requested more information from CMER as a result of completing the CMER and Tribal PIP studies. He clarified Policy has 45 days to decide whether to take action or no action in accordance with the AM Board Manual.

Leslie Lingley added CMER does not make a recommendation to Policy about the research; CMER provides the research results and it is up to Policy to develop a recommendation.

Jim Hotvedt shared the example of the roads sub-basin effectiveness study where Policy did not act on the first sample. Later CMER provided a technical recommendation to add to the Board Manual.

Leslie Lingley asked if these actions are memorialized somewhere.

Jim Hotvedt replied they are in the Policy meeting minutes.

Chris Mendoza added if there is action shared with the Forest Practices Board; those are recorded in the Board's meeting minutes.

Leslie Lingley asked is there somewhere in CMER that we have documentation to keep track of completed projects. How do we know if we have outcomes?

Chris Mendoza replied this question is premised with the assumption that every project requires Policy action; that is not the case. The CMER finish line is the ISPR step before finalizing reports. The CMER Information Management System will be the place where we have documentation.

Dick Miller added in part the outcomes are documented in the CMER work plan; that is one type of memorialized documentation. He added there are two technical recommendations made to Policy; the report itself and the six questions. The PSM points out that fact that the six questions are indeed providing recommendations.

Dave Schuett-Hames added this might be an additional change for the PSM. He suggested one thing to think about in the CMER report to Policy is to have the AMPA write up a paragraph so people can see where the information comes from & decisions made by Policy.

Ash Roorbach replied he thinks it is important to have information about how is the information used.

Leslie Lingley added she disagreed with Chris; she thought CMER needed to take the ball to the end of the field. She thought CMER needed to do something about documenting the impact CMER has made with the 37 projects and \$25M expended.

Mark Hicks added this is in the work plan and he did not want to create an imbalance in our work load. He agreed tracking the results of the work is important. Policy does not memorialize anything besides their meeting notes.

Nancy Sturhan added we cannot tell Policy what to do. How do we get Policy to track it?

Ash Roorbach added if CMER does make a recommendation as part of the findings report or identifies the research has implications then CMER has a level of responsibility. There is some utility in CMER tracking how Policy responded to that.

Amy Kurtenbach replied this is what the lessons learned process will point out; look at what CMER does not want to repeat and identify those processes that are not helpful.

AJ Kroll stated it seems like the same issue will come up in the findings report; he congratulated RSAG for getting the report completed.

Chris Mendoza – motioned to accept the final BCIF report subject to suggested changes.

Mark Hicks seconded the motion.

CMER members were in agreement.

➤ Stillwater Report Recommendations: CMER's Comment Matrix – ***Tabled to January 2012***  
Chris Mendoza reported that this will come to CMER next month with the table and cover letter for CMER approval.

➤ Recommendations from Furman Report – ***CMER decided not to have Furman present***  
Jim Hotvedt reported Nancy Sturhan sent out the table about the observations from Kira's master thesis. CMER had a conversation about having Kira present at our science conference; since then folks have decided against the science conference and have her present at one of our monthly meetings.

AJ Kroll replied he would like to have her present and have a dialog with her.

Nancy Sturhan added she was not eager to have her present; she got her information from interviewing people and CMER directed who she interviewed. The premise of the research was to determine if social learning was going on in the adaptive management environment. The researcher interpreted it and wrote up the information in the social science context. It would be valid for CMER to discuss this among ourselves.

Dick Miller agreed with Nancy Sturhan and suggested CMER have a discussion on it and develop a list that reflects what CMER would want to change.

Nancy Sturhan disagreed with CMER creating another list; CMER has a lot of lists of what is wrong.

Mark Hicks added CMER will have the updates in PSM and the LEAN process will help point out areas for improvement. CMER can use Nancy's matrix for the LEAN process if warranted.

Chris Mendoza added the Policy co-chairs have this matrix as well.

Mark Hicks concluded CMER will not invite Kira Furman to present and will fold the matrix developed by Nancy Sturhan into the LEAN process.

#### **SAG Updates:**

Chris Mendoza announced RSAG and WETSAG still need a co-chair.

Jim Hotvedt announced the Eastside Type F Extensive Temperature Study, by Bill Ehinger has gone thru ISPR; need a final report.

#### **SAGE:**

Todd Baldwin reported SAGE went through the corrections in RFP for the Type N Forest Hydrology project. Those went to Amy & Patti.

Amy Kurtenbach reported the RFP was finalized; she and Greg Stewart worked on it after the SAGE meeting. The RFP was posted December 19<sup>th</sup>. The deadline for proposals to be submitted is February 10, 2012. The reason why it is RFP is to rely on the potential consultant to provide an approach for field collection and type of data collected. This is an important evaluation criterion for how the consultant will be picked.

Chris Mendoza stated this was really the SAG's job; to identify the field collection and type of data. This could be considered a conflict of interest if not specified beforehand.

Dave Schuett-Hames replied that in some situations CMER does ask in an RFP process to do design work for CMER and he understood in this case SAGE was purposefully asking for the contractor to do a specific step that was not in the study design. CMER does not have a process in place to give that design work a rigorous review. This approach will provide CMER the statistical design and data needed for the project. This will help CMER develop the conclusions. He suggested bringing in our statistical experts to be a part of the evaluation review of the proposals submitted in response to the RFP; this will build in the scrutiny needed for the project.

Chris Mendoza stated if there are substantial add-ons in the study design that have the potential to change the outcome; these changes need to go back through CMER.

Ash Roorbach added this reminded him of the HWC study, where the contractor designed the data collection and this is where the project ran into problems. He thought this was lesson learned, as this is where projects tend to problems.

Mark Hicks added these issues were thoroughly discussed at SAGE. The RFP is already out. How does CMER make the most out of moving ahead? He agreed with Dave Schuett-Hames suggestion to make sure we have the reviewers representing the expertise we need on the review stage.

Jim Hotvedt reminded CMER members this study design went thru ISPR and CMER approvals. The study design included a set of recommendations; they are part of the RFP and it is up to the proposer to identify which to use and this will be evaluated based on the RFP criteria.

Chris Mendoza added the RFP is out, the SAG is already committed to this process, so CMER will be informed of the results of this competitive solicitation process.

Ash Roorbach asked what happens if the RFP evaluation committee decides to return to CMER with the recommendation of awarding the contract?

Todd Baldwin added SAGE agreed with the recommendation of Dave Schuett-Hames around the statistical design. The confusion is around Dan Miller's model. The model falls short in which variables to collect. SAGE has done this more than once now.

Mark Hicks stated this conversation should have happened before the RFP went out.

Chris Mendoza thought this was the reason why we had Greg Stewart to sort out the statistical issues.

Todd Baldwin shared he was not at the meeting where Greg proposed approaches and SAGE could not agree. He proposed going through an RFP where we get an approach from the consultant.

Amy Kurtenbach added SAGE is open to what is proposed from a variety of consultants and will figure out which approach is best to take. The 117 sites identified through SAGE went out with the RFP. The proposals submitted will have site selection information.

Mark Hicks added one good thing about this is the consultant will have to invest heavily in completing and submitting a proposal, so the approaches will be based from experience. If CMER members are concerned, he suggested members to volunteer to be a part of the RFP evaluation panel.

Jim Hotvedt added SAGE should have input into the readers selected for reviewing proposals.

Chris Mendoza added CMER has two projects on hold pending completion of this project. CMER needs to ensure this project is completed sooner rather than later. This has implications for meeting the CWA assurances and milestones.

➤ CMER Protocols & Standards Manual: Findings Report – *Discussion*

Jim Hotvedt reported CMER has not had a clear definition or direction on what is considered a findings report. The PSM has *synthesized research results identified* with no direction on how to do it. This proposed document has recommendations for what to include in a findings report and how to go about doing one.

The findings report work group has developed an approach on how to address the six questions. The work group decided not to change the six questions, as they are in the Board Manual. These are questions leading to a Policy adaptive management recommendation to the Forest Practices Board (Board Manual M22-28). The content in parenthesis after each question is intended to stir thoughts, is supposed to be generic in nature without changing the six questions, and is intended to improve the information given to Policy that they need to make decisions. The shaded areas in the document were the recommended edits and changes.

Dave Schuett-Hames asked if this process today is to provide recommendations on the six questions themselves or to partition the document and make recommendations on those. He suggested the six questions themselves could be tightened up to be more helpful for the authors in responding. For example #6: What is the scientific basis that underlies the rule, numeric target, performance target, or resource objective that the study informs? How much of an incremental gain in understanding do the study results represent?

Jim Hotvedt replied CMER can approach this in segments to have the opportunity in how to address them.

Dave Schuett-Hames added he was confused and questioned for example if CMER could suggest we need to develop basal area criteria for PIPs based on the following:

- 1) As needed in answering the six questions, provide technical implications /recommendations resulting from the study if not already done so within the answers to the six questions. Examples of areas on which to comment include:

New rule tools that should be developed

Dick Miller suggested using the numeric system parallel to the Board Manual for assigning priority. Pull that numeric system into the findings report; the CMER work plan ranked it as 3 but from this report it is ranked as 2.

Jim Hotvedt suggested using high, medium or low ranking system.

Mark Hicks suggested a narrative way of reflecting the ranking system.

Dick Miller asked about the last bullet in #3 Evaluation of whether key aquatic resource objectives (Schedule L-1) are being met. Why not performance targets?

Chris Mendoza replied Policy asks for this.

Dick Miller answered CMER's role is to inquire about scientific uniqueness. He questioned CMER's role in answering about performance targets.

Chris Mendoza replied this is a discussion item. The purpose is to share with CMER.

Jim Hotvedt added his preference for today's meeting is to share information, have discussion on it, give time to mull it over and then decide on it at the next CMER meeting. Comments are due to Jim Hotvedt by January 10<sup>th</sup>.

➤ **Protocols & Standards Manual – Update**

Ash Roorbach reported chapters 1 & 2 changes were approved by CMER. The chapter 3 changes have been revised and will be shared with CMER at the January meeting.

**Use of Non-CMER Science** –Subcommittee has been formed: Chris Mendoza, Leslie Lingley, Mark Hicks, Mark Mobbs & Jim Hotvedt.

**ISPR review process** –Subcommittee has been formed: Julie Dieu, Leslie Lingley, Amy Kurtenbach & Chris Mendoza.

➤ **CMER Report to Policy – Items to take to January 5, 2012 Policy Meeting**

- Type N BCIF Final Report & 6 Questions
- Extensive Workshop in February
- Science Conference
- Stillwater CMER Matrix

➤ **CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments:**

- SAG Co-chairs need to get their 2013 CMER Work Plan revisions into Terry Jackson by January 6<sup>th</sup>.
- The PSM work group will add reviewing the SAG Request History and Context.
- Chapter 3 changes have been revised and will be shared with CMER in January.
- CMER's Comment Matrix on the Stillwater Report Recommendations & Cover letter will be a decision item for the January CMER meeting.
- CMER Protocols & Standards Manual: Findings Report - Comments on are due to Jim Hotvedt by January 10<sup>th</sup>.