

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
(CMER)**

**March 26, 2013
DNR/DOC Compound**

| Attendees | Representing |
|---------------------|---|
| *Mendoza, Chris | Conservation Caucus Contractor, CMER Co-Chair |
| *Hicks, Mark | Department of Ecology, CMER Co-Chair |
| Hotvedt, Jim | Department of Natural Resources, AMPA |
| * Miller, Dick | Washington Farm Forestry Association |
| *Kroll, A.J. | Weyerhaeuser |
| * Lingley, Leslie | Department of Natural Resources |
| *Martin, Doug | Washington Forest Protection Association |
| Schuett-Hames, Dave | CMER Staff, Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission |
| *Due, Julie | Rayonier |
| Wilhere, George | Department of Fish & Wildlife |
| *Sturhan, Nancy | Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission |
| Kurtenbach, Amy | Department of Natural Resources |
| *Mobbs, Mark | Quinault Indian Nation |
| Shramek, Patti | Department of Natural Resources, CMER Coordinator |
| *Baldwin, Todd (ph) | Kalispel Tribe of Indians |
| *Kay, Debbie | Suquamish Tribe, WETSAG Co-Chair |

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

Agenda – Dick Miller asked for updates on effectiveness monitoring studies - general performance standard, water temperature; and an update on the Post Mortem study.

Post Mortem: Jim Hotvedt said that he has summarized the last set of minority comments and that the whole package will be presented to Policy at the April 4th meeting.

LWAG/RSAG

Westside Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study (Hard Rock) – coordinated review process - **CMER approved assigning reviewers for the first four chapters of the report when they are ready and working on revisions to the process and continuing work on the proposal following CMER comment.**

The Hard Rock study report consists of approximately 17 chapters, 12 of which are technically specific, and is anticipated to be well over 400 pages in total length. There is concern the regular review process (SAG, CMER, and ISPR) for a CMER report is unable to support a document of this complexity and length.

Few scientists (SAG, CMER, and ISPR) have the time or expertise required to complete a multi-phased review of a report this large. Further, due to the size and scope of the document, it is likely a lower quality, less rigorous review, especially considering the range of scientific disciplines covered in the full report, would be produced if the review were conducted under the standard CMER process with limited review timelines (as outlined in the PSM).

Amy Kurtenbach gave a PowerPoint presentation on proposed coordinated CMER review for the report which would break the overall report into sections related to specific areas of expertise. The benefit of this would be that it would minimize workload constraints on CMER members who are already working on multiple projects in CMER, focus more time on completing the technical reviews, and maintain a reasonable review schedule. Equally, a limited pool of ISPR associate editor(s) and reviewers exist that would be willing to review a 400 page report. The proposed process would increase the likelihood of a rigorous, comprehensive scientific and technical review throughout both the CMER and ISPR review process.

Discussion Points:

Concerns were raised regarding Process 8 – ranking of comments. There was discussion about needing a clearer definition for what constitutes a red (not acceptable) ranking. Inaccurate, inconsistent with literature, and is the discussion an accurate description of the results, were suggestions of what might constitute a not acceptable rating.

AJ Kroll expressed concerns about changing the process right now and proposed working on getting the report through the current process. He suggested that a final technical editor review the report, once all the other aspects of the report are agreed upon, if CMER decides to use the coordinated review process for the report.

The members agreed, in principle, with the process but felt some revisions were needed. Mark Hicks suggested that they get agreement on the major component, to review the chapters separately.

Amy Kurtenbach asked the members to at least agree to assign reviewers for the first four chapters as they should be ready for review in April and are introductory chapters to provide all background information on study design and intent. The introductory chapters do not need to go through ISPR due to the lack of scientific content.

Mark Hicks moved to approve assigning reviewers for the first four chapters of the report when they are ready and for members to work on revisions to the process.

CMER approved to assign reviewers for the first four chapters of the report when they are ready and to work on revisions to the process.

Assignments: CMER members will send revision comments to Amy Kurtenbach no later than April 2, 2013.

RSAG

- ◆ Effectiveness of Riparian Management Zone Prescriptions in Protecting and Maintaining Shade and Water Temperature in Forested Streams of Eastern Washington report – **CMER approved sending the report to ISPR on the condition that the reviewers address report comments at their April 2nd meeting and the contractor accepts them.**

Amy Kurtenbach reported that the final comments on the report have been received and they are minor. She is working on merging them into the document and will meet with the reviewers on April 2nd to address the comments. Chris Mendoza will not be able to attend the meeting and asked the group to proceed without him. Once the comments have been addressed she will send the report to the contractor, Eddie Cupp, for his review and acceptance.

Amy requested CMER approval to send the report to ISPR, with the standard questions from the CMER PSM, after the reviewers have addressed the comments and the Contractor has accepted the final draft.

CMER approved sending the report to ISPR on the condition that the comments are addressed at the April 2nd meeting and the Contractor has accepted the final draft.

- ◆ Western Washington Type F and N Status and Trends Monitoring Report(s) – **CMER was in non-consensus at this time on omitting the ISPR review but agreed to assign CMER reviewers.**

Mark Hicks reported that the reports are complete and ready for review. He noted that the study could have been done in one report, but there weren't enough sites at the time to conduct the Type N Study. The Type F Extensive Temperature Study was completed and already went through the ISPR review process. Since the studies were conducted using the same parameters he requested that CMER assign CMER reviewers and omit the ISPR review.

Discussion Points:

Dick Miller expressed concern with omitting the ISPR review as there could be differences between the two studies. He commented that he was not comfortable with agreeing to omit the ISPR review for the westside Type N and F Studies until he was able

to read these two reports to see if their results and conclusions were similar to those of the Eastside Extensive study that was peer reviewed.

Chris Mendoza said he would locate the prior agreement on using ISPR for the Status and Trends Reports for Dick to review. He suggested that CMER move forward with assigning reviewers and re-visit omitting the ISPR review once Dick has had the opportunity to review the reports for similarity. The members agreed to assign reviewers and chose Nancy Sturhan, Marc Hayes and Dick Miller.

Mark Hicks said he would ask Policy if they approve omitting the ISPR review if CMER reaches consensus.

Request: Assign CMER reviewers for the Western Washington Type F and N Status and Trends Monitoring Report(s) and omit the ISPR review. CMER was non-consensus on omitting the ISPR review but agreed to assign CMER reviewers.

Assignments:

Chris Mendoza will try to locate the original report document on ISPR.

Dick Miller will review the reports to check for similarity

Mark Hicks will report to Policy and ask for their approval to omit the ISPR review if CMER reaches consensus.

TWIG

- ◆ Westside Type F Buffer Effectiveness Initial Writing Team (IWT)
Jim Hotvedt reported that he sent out an email request for nominations for the IWT. He only received self-nominations. The IWT members are: Dave Schuett-Hames, Chris Mendoza and Doug Martin.
- ◆ Eastern Washington Type N Prescription Effectiveness Technical Writing and Implementation Group (TWIG)
Amy reported that the charter is complete and is very thorough. She commented that it can be used as a boiler plate and can be revised to fit the needs of different TWIGS.

CMER

Amy Kurtenbach passed out copies of the Coordinated CMER Review master assignment spreadsheet and asked members to look it over to re-familiarize themselves with upcoming reports they are assigned to review.

Other Topics

Leslie Lingley commented that she thought CMER should follow due diligence and do water typing of potential study reaches before starting research projects, just like landowners are expected to do before a land management activity. If the water typing is not valid, the reports need to address how the data will be valid. CMER would be non-compliant if these reports did not have the appropriate water typing. The statistics can change if all the streams are not the appropriate type.

Discussion Points:

Jim Hotvedt remarked that the studies are not the same as regular forest practices applications, but to test if the Forest Practices Rules are effective. Chris Mendoza pointed out that it can be hard to get enough study sites because many landowners will not allow access and sometimes sites aren't usable. Dave Schuett-Hames commented that the question is how much a study design can fluctuate if enough study sites can't be found and Dick Miller remarked that a study design or prescription for one site may fluctuate or differ from that at another site because of differing starting conditions.

Leslie suggested addressing and explaining any deviation in the study's report. If the streams do not make the criteria in the report, these streams should be deleted from the report. Mark Hicks replied that the importance of verifying stream type needs to be decided report by report.

Recap of Assignments:

- ◆ CMER members will send revision comments for the Westside Type N Experimental Buffer Treatment Study coordinated review to Amy Kurtenbach no later than April 2, 2013.
- ◆ Chris Mendoza will try to locate the original Type F ISPR decision for Dick Miller.
- ◆ Mark Hicks will report to Policy and ask for their approval to omit the ISPR review if CMER reaches consensus.

Meeting Adjourned