

# Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)

**September 25, 2012  
DNR/DOC Compound**

Attendees	Representing
*Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
*Hicks, Mark	Department of Ecology, CMER Co-chair
Hitchens, Dawn	Dept. of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
Hotvedt, Jim	Dept. of Natural Resources, AMPA
*Kroll, AJ	Weyerhaeuser, LWAG Co-chair
Kurtenbach, Amy	Dept. of Natural Resources
McCrea, Chad	Spokane Tribe of Indians, SAGE co-chair
*Martin, Doug	Washington Forestry Protection Association
*Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair
*Miller, Dick	Washington Farm Forestry Association
*Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Tribe
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
Sturhan, Nancy	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Whilhere, George	Washington Dept. of Fish & Wildlife

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

## Agenda – Review for Updates

Nancy Sturhan announced the CMER Information Management System TAG will meet after the CMER meeting to talk about projects for next year.

**CMER Monthly Science Session** – Continue Discussion on Updating Current Topics List  
Mark Hicks facilitated the updated discussion on planning to have presentations for every month up to February 2013. February is the month devoted to the CMER work plan. The following commitments for presentations were made at the meeting:

- ♦ Road prescription monitoring – Doug Martin will contact Kathy Dube’ for the December or January CMER meeting.
- ♦ State of knowledge on amphibians – Mark Hicks will contact Marc Hayes to set this up.
- ♦ Hypothesis testing – AJ Kroll agreed to present in November 2012.
- ♦ BT Overlay – Invite Eddie Cupp to present before the end of the year.
- ♦ Trends in monitoring efforts – spring time.

## CMER Work Plan

Mark Hicks encouraged SAGs to start working on updating their sections of the CMER work plan. The CMER co-chairs will send out an email to the SAG co-chairs reminding them of the timeline.

## **CMER Science Conference**

Mark Hicks suggested not holding a science conference next year. This is primarily due to three major studies coming to finalization: bull trout, hard rock, and post-mortem. CMER will have more information to share in 2014. It might be best to have a really good conference every two years rather than a mediocre one every year. This September meeting is when CMER request the SAGs to identify topics and start planning for a conference at the end of March. This is the typical time for hosting the conference.

Jim Hovedt asked to hold this discussion and decision for next month's CMER meeting. Mark Hicks asked CMER members to work within their SAGs to make recommendation to bring to the next CMER meeting. He noted we would need to inform Policy prior to actually cancelling this year's science conference.

## **Business Session:**

### **Decisions:**

#### **RSAG – Request to Hire Statistician**

Amy Kurtenbach reported this was brought to CMER last month in narrative format and CMER asked for the formal request using the SAG request. This is here today to get approval to hire TerraStat to conduct the statistical analysis on the Bull Trout temperature database. This would cost \$2,000 to \$3,000 using the existing contract. RSAG is completing its review of the final draft of the BTO shade temperature report. The statistical analysis used in the draft report is complex and the study results fall within or near the bounds of the method's ability to detect change. RSAG therefore believes it would be particularly valuable for this project to obtain an outside review of the statistical methods and the results. The CMER reviewers are AJ Kroll, Leslie Lingley, Todd Baldwin and Julie Dieu.

Todd Baldwin motioned to approve request.

Chris Mendoza seconded the motion.

***CMER members approved the request.***

#### **Coordinator's Corner:**

The 2013 CMER Meeting Schedule was shared with CMER members. It was noted to change the January meeting to the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

The meeting notes for April, May and June 2012 were approved with one change in the June notes. Chris Mendoza motioned to approve the three months of meeting notes with the one change. Todd Baldwin seconded the motion. ***CMER members reached consensus.***

### **Updates:**

#### **Report from Policy – September 6 & 11 Meetings**

Chris Mendoza provided the update:

- ♦ Post Mortem Final Study – Dispute Resolution  
Policy is crafting a solution they can agree on for moving the post-mortem study forward. They made a consensus decision to have CMER draft and respond to the six questions for the final report. Policy wants the disagreement documented to help them understand the non-consensus. Chris provided an overview of the normal six questions process: the report authors answer the six questions and submit these for the SAG to review. The SAG

approved answers to the six questions are submitted to CMER. CMER then approves the six questions and forwards them to Policy. Policy was clear that if there are divergent opinions in this case, they are to be documented, and this will be part of the package that will be submitted along with the Post Mortem report and minority opinion reports. No consensus on the answers to the six questions is therefore required from the minority report authors for the Post Mortem report since they will be given the opportunity to provide their own answers. The report authors are Julie Dieu, Greg Stewart, Jeff Phillips, Matt O'Connor, and Curt Veldhuisen.

Julie Dieu stated her concern about sending materials to Policy with two review levels. She suggested having the responses collapsed into main themes and suggested the full CMER committee to identify main themes. She added the most important piece of this is to identify what has been learned and to pull that together in a document. This sets up a CMER review process rather than two processes. This provides Policy with a document where the agreements and disagreements are in transparent format.

Mark Hicks disagreed with this suggestion; this puts CMER in the mediator position, which he considered to be inappropriate.

Julie Dieu responded no one is suggesting CMER to mediate; the suggestion was to have a clearly articulated document.

Jim Hotvedt added Policy is requesting the interaction document that typically accompanies the final report. This is the six questions with supplemental questions to answer. CMER has revised how the six questions fit in the findings document. Policy is requesting this document to help them decide on the policy ramifications of the report. This is the typical process.

Dave Schuett-Hames asked what goes on the website when CMER has a non-consensus report.

Jim Hotvedt stated that it would go on the Web as a non-consensus report. On the inside cover of each report is a disclaimer that identifies the type of report and whether or not the report was approved by CMER; this is where CMER would identify the report as a non-consensus report. Policy is trying to decide if they can approve an adaptive management report.

Dave Schuett-Hames responded this seemed unsatisfactory given CMER outlined potential avenues for resolution on the technical issues; very unacceptable for Policy to state they are interested in the policy ramifications and not willing to help resolve the technical disagreements.

Mark Hicks replied Policy is operating in the dispute resolution realm as the caucuses cannot agree with one another on alternative routes. The clock is ticking. Once it was found out that they did not have access to the suggested solution of using the UW associate editor, they chose this alternate path.

Doug Martin shared Policy also requested a synthesis along with this request.

Jim Hotvedt shared that he argued against a synthesis report and he heard Policy state for CMER to start answering the 6 questions.

Chris Mendoza reiterated they have a list of other things they want that they cannot agree on; they did agree to CMER starting on the 6 questions. To be clear, they have a process document on CMER's process from a CMER co-chair, all three minority reports, the Post Mortem study authors' response to the minority reports, and the Post Mortem report. Now they are asking for the six questions where we have the divergent points documented. He added, what Julie suggested seemed reasonable.

Doug Martin answered this was the reason why he asked this question; he agreed this was a process step for Policy. Part of question six will answer the scientific credibility of the report; this is where CMER can help to answer the science. How much is enough, where does it go, do landslides happen where the harvest occurs, how is this connected to the landslide rule, did the best management practices work or not. This is where science can step in, to state where the results can inform the rule, and this helps Policy to understand where the science is, this is CMER's job.

Todd Baldwin added everyone at CMER has a Policy member and part of your CMER role is to inform your Policy member. He added CMER has several studies coming to the finalization and raised concerns about the CMER process and the current experience with the post-mortem report.

The CMER co-chairs Hicks summarized this was more of an update for CMER; the task has been handed out by Policy; the report authors need answer the six questions and follow the CMER process.

♦ Facilitation

Jim Hotvedt summarized his assignment has been to hire a facilitator for Policy. The Request for Proposal (RFP) went out and the Policy sub-group he is working with has five interviews scheduled for October 4 & 5. They expect to have an apparent successful bidder (ASB) by October 5<sup>th</sup>.

♦ Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan Settlement Agreement

Chris Mendoza shared that Policy has been meeting on this topic separate from their regular monthly meetings. The Policy Committee is working with the three other caucuses that were not party to the agreement to weigh in and modify sections of the agreement where needed. They have started on the first of the three main topics in the settlement agreement.

**LWAG –**

♦ RMZ-Resample (Bird Data)

AJ Kroll reported LWAG met last Monday with Scott Pearson to discuss the final results. Scott Pearson indicated he finalized the contract. On October 1<sup>st</sup> he will start writing the manuscript.

♦ Stream-Associated Amphibian Response to Manipulation of Forest Canopy Shading

AJ Kroll reported this report is in the CMER review. The contractor will incorporate the comments, once this is finished. This will come before CMER to give the go ahead to send it off to ISPR. LWAG anticipates closing this out by end of the year.

## **RSAG –**

### ♦ Bull Trout Overlay Temperature

Amy Kurtenbach reported CMER discussed and approved the use of a statistician this morning. She is reviewing the RSAG comments at this point.

### ♦ Eastside Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring (Bull Trout Add On)

Dave Schuett-Hames reported there are six sites scheduled for 5-year post harvest; five sites are completed and the sixth is under way. There are a total of 17 sites scheduled over time.

### ♦ Extensive Temp Monitoring Westside Type F/Westside Type N

Mark Hicks reported Ecology's is in a bad position to finish the study report given Jack Janisch<sup>1</sup> is still on extended sick leave. He found out Jack was working with Phil Larsen (formally with EPA) and an outside statistician (who was also the ISPR reviewer who suggested the need to weight the sample) to determine how to weight the samples to account for the low number of small forest landowners that participated in the study. There is no one else at Ecology that can readily pick up where Jack left off and complete the data analysis. He is reviewing ways to potentially enlist Phil Larsen to help completed this study. This project completion has contract issues.

## **SAGE –**

### ♦ Eastside Type N Characteristics Forest Hydrology Project

Chad McCrea reported he talked with Neil from Westfork. They completed the field work on the 120 basins three weeks ago. They reported they will work on 20 basins in the following week. They completed the QA/QC on the 40 basins last week. They will send the data to Dan Miller for analysis. This project is on schedule.

### ♦ EWRAP

Ash Roorbach reported he and Dave Schuett-Hames have produced an interim report and this is in review with SAGE. They expect a good discussion with SAGE and will start on report writing.

## **SOFT ROCK –**

### ♦ Field work

Mark Hicks reported the sites were prepped for the flumes; they may go in this week. They are currently working through Ecology's competitive purchasing process; the project needs the temperature turbidity equipment.

## **TWIG –**

### ♦ Eastside Type N Buffer Effectiveness Study Design

Greg Stewart and Marc Gauthier are the initial team and they have cleared their calendars to start on this project.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Notation about the September minutes from Jack Janisch:*

In reality, I returned to the agency part time June 4, 2012 and, beginning June 6, set a series of deadlines for completing the ERST Westside reports. A draft of the combined Westside Type F / Type N report was circulated for initial internal comments on August 31, 2012. A revised draft of the Eastside Type F report was circulated October 3, 2012.

Also, the minutes indicate that I was working with an outside statistician to determine how to weight the samples, and that this statistician was also an ISPR reviewer. I don't recall such a conversation with an outside statistician. I had an exchange with Don Stevens in January 2012, but that exchange was brief and, if I remember correctly, the subject was the GRTS randomization generally. At the time, I believe I was working on the Eastside reports, not the Westside reports. I have, however, had a long, on-going conversation with Phil Larson to determine how to correct the ERST study's implementation errors.

## **UPSAG –**

- ♦ Co-chairs needed - Mark Hicks reported this SAG is in need of co-chairs.

### ♦ Unstable Slope Criteria & Road Prescriptions Monitoring Projects

Chris Mendoza reported the unstable slopes criteria has been half way scoped. This project stopped when UPSAG stopped meeting. This project has been picked up as a TWIG. He requested three UPSAG members to be on the TWIG to complete this project. Once the TWIG members have been confirmed, this will come to CMER for approval.

- ♦ The Roads Prescriptions project has not started due to lack of staff.

## **WETSAG –**

### ♦ Wetlands Systematic Literature Review

Chris Mendoza reported the contractor is behind a month. WETSAG will review the results of the literature review to determine if the contractor met his obligations in completing that tasks they laid out for him. There has been some discussion on sampling design; which may require Policy guidance.

### ♦ Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study

Dick Miller asked who approved this study.

Chris Mendoza replied WETSAG decided to change direction after conducting a field trip with Dr. Hruby (Ecology) and received approval from CMER and Policy. WETSAG, CMER and Policy decided this was a better path to follow. The literature review precedes the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Study; to help refine the critical question.

### Discussion Points:

Mark Hicks acknowledged Dr. Hruby will help WETSAG in reviewing the draft literature synthesis document once completed by the contractor.

Ash Roorbach clarified once the contractor is complete with the document it becomes a WETSAG document. The contractor will deal with substantial comments and Ash will deal with grammatical comments. The contract has funds for this level of work.

Julie Dieu added CMER did not close the conversation about the authors taking on the responsibility for answering the six questions. She reported it will take more than a month for the authors to complete their work. They may be ready for November CMER meeting.

## **CMER – Items to take to October 4, 2012 Policy Meeting**

- The Post-Mortem six questions answered by authors: ready for November CMER meeting.

### **CMER/SAG Recap of Assignments:**

- CMER co-chairs will send out a reminder to SAG Co-chairs about updating the CMER work plan; tasks and timeline to follow for the work plan to be approved at the CMER February 2013 meeting.

- CMER co-chairs will send out a request to SAG co-chairs to develop topics for the science conference and to be prepared to make a decision at the CMER October meeting.

- CMER Science session invitations will be followed up with the following:

- Road prescription monitoring – Doug Martin will contact Kathy Dube’ for December or January CMER meeting.
  - State of knowledge on amphibians - Mark Hicks will contact Marc Hayes for a CMER presentation.
  - Hypothesis testing presentation – AJ Kroll agreed to present at the CMER November meeting.
  - BT Overlay presentation by Eddie Cupp before the end of the calendar year.
  - Monitoring Trends – CMER spring meeting.
- CMER Coordinator will send out the approved revised findings document (6 questions).
  - Mark Hicks will work on breaking the jam at Ecology for the Extensive Temperature Study.

***Meeting Adjourned.***