

DRAFT Monitoring Evaluation and Research Report

EMC Cover Memo to Board of Forestry

Background: This is a proposed adaptation of the Washington State Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Report (CMER) for use in California. It is a fusion of the previous draft EMC “Science to Policy” flow chart with Washington’s CMER questions. This proposed document can function as a cover memo to the BOF whenever EMC receives completed research products. These questions can also serve as a guide to the PI and EMC project liaisons when tracking research progress.

1. Fulfill requirements of funding? **If no, request revisions.**

- A. **Does the study inform a rule, numeric target, performance target, or resource objective (Yes/No)?** If Yes, go to the next question. If No, provide a short explanation on the purpose of the study.)
- B. **Does the study inform the Forest Practices Rules (Yes/No)?** (Include whether or not the study answers the critical questions) (If yes, describe briefly what rules, guidelines, key questions, critical question, resource objectives, performance targets, etc. the study informs, preferably in bulleted format. If no, provide a short explanation on the purpose of the study.)

2. Scientifically sound? **If no, request revisions.**

- A. **Was the study carried out pursuant to valid scientific protocols (i.e., study design, peer review)?**

3. Scalable?

- A. **What does the study tell us? What does the study not tell us?** (This is where the study and its relationship to rules, guidance, targets, etc. are to be described in detail. Consider technical findings; study limitations; and implications to rules, guidance, resource objectives, functional objectives, and performance targets; in addition to other information.)

4. More research needed?

- i. **Literature review sufficient?**
- ii. **Further funding needed?**
- A. **What is the relationship between this study and any others that may be planned, underway, or recently completed?** (Factors to consider in answering this question include, but are not limited to: a. Feasibility of obtaining more information to better inform Policy about resource effects. b. Are other relevant studies planned, underway, or recently completed? (If yes, what are they?) c. What are the costs associated with additional studies? d. What will additional studies help us learn? e. When will these additional studies be completed (i.e., when will we learn the information)? f. Will additional information from these other studies reduce

uncertainty? Consider recommendations on additional studies that may not be in the current EMC project list: <https://bof.fire.ca.gov/board-committees/effectiveness-monitoring-committee/>)

5. Scientific Applications

- A. Synthesis of what we learned: 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?** (The specific basis for the current program element may not be known, and in such a case, focus the discussion on the level of confidence in the results, realizing this may be somewhat subjective. Describe any reduction in uncertainty in the science behind the rules as a result of this study, or any changes in level of assessed risk to key aquatic resources processes affected by forest practices as a result of this study.)