

# Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, October 26th // 9:00 am –2:00 pm

Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p><b>Meeting Minutes</b></p> <p><u>Motion</u> Joe Murray proxy for Mark Meleason-County Caucus moved to approve the September Meeting Minutes with amendments.</p> <p><b>The motion passed</b></p>	<p>Seconded: Jenny Knoth, Washington Farm Forestry Association</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Mark Mobbs, Joe Murray proxy for Mark Meleason, Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p><b>Hard Rock Phase III Project Charter</b></p> <p><u>Motion</u> Jenny Knoth, Washington Farm Forestry Association moved to approve HR Phase III Project Charter.</p> <p><b>The motion passed</b></p>	<p>Seconded: Harry Bell, Washington Farm Forestry Association</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Mark Mobbs, Joe Murray proxy for Mark Meleason, Doug Martin</p> <p>Recuse: Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p><b>Soft Rock Six Questions</b></p> <p><u>Motion</u> Aimee McIntyre, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife moved to approve the Soft Rock answers to the Six Questions.</p> <p><b>The motion failed</b></p>	<p>Seconded: Todd Baldwin, Kalispel Tribe of Indians</p> <p>Up: Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Aimee McIntyre, Debbie Kay</p> <p>Down: Harry Bell, Joe Murray proxy for Mark Meleason, Chris Mendoza, Doug Martin, Jenny Knoth</p> <p>Sideways: Julie Dieu, Mark Mobbs,</p> <p>Abstain: AJ Kroll</p>

<b>Action Items</b>	
<b>Action Items</b>	
<b>Roads Prescription Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project Presentation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Charles Luce will forward presentation to Teresa Miskovic and this will be mailed out to the CMER members.</li> </ul>
<b>CPEACE</b>  Form Workgroup of participants to review priority list rankings and create next steps of how to improve our process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workgroup to include: Joe Murray, Jenelle Black, CMER co-chairs, AMPA, AJ Kroll, Aimee McIntyre, Debbie Kay, Ash Roorbach, Lori Clark</li> </ul>
<b>CPEACE – Priority List to Review and Rank</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CMER members will send in ranking to CMER co-chairs by October 29<sup>th</sup>.</li> <li>Chris will compile the rankings and set up a meeting with the Workgroup.</li> </ul>
<b>Soft Rock Six Questions</b>  Chris Mendoza invoked a Dispute Resolution.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AMPA will set up the initial informal meeting in the Dispute Resolution Process</li> </ul>
<b>Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions</b>  AJ Kroll and Chris Mendoza called for Stage II of the Dispute Resolution Process for the HR Phase II Six Questions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Informal discussion concluded</li> <li>Position papers will be requested</li> <li>Latest draft of Six Questions with the email from the AMPA will be sent out</li> <li>14 day timeframe begins when the AMPA email is received</li> <li>Clarification on who participates on position papers will be emailed</li> <li>AMPA will meet with co-chairs to characterize the dispute</li> </ul>
<b>SAO Audit Recommendations</b>  Create Work Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work Group to include: CMER co-chairs, AMPA, Mark Meleason, Todd Baldwin, Debbie Kay, AJ Kroll, (potential members - Aimee McIntyre and Patrick Lizon)</li> <li>Two Meetings in 2021 – CMER agenda item.</li> </ul>
<b>SFLO Template Proposal Initiation - Scientific Justification</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Position papers and cover letter will be sent to Policy co-chairs by Monday Nov 1<sup>st</sup>.</li> </ul>

## MINUTES

### Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

Jenny Knoth / Chris Mendoza (managed meeting), (*CMER co-chairs*)

#### Introductions

*Chris Mendoza (CMER co-chair)*

Chris Mendoza opened the meeting and roll call was taken.

Two ground rules were read.

Teresa Miskovic (DNR Project Manager) requested that the Roads Prescription Scale Effectiveness Presentation be put on as the first item on the Science Session agenda. The co-chairs agreed to the change.

Lori Clark (DNR Project Manager) introduced an ice breaker.

---

### Updates

#### SFLO Dispute Resolution

*Chris Mendoza (CMER co-chair)*

Chris noted that the AMPA and co-chairs met to determine the next steps for dispute resolution at CMER for the Small Forest Landowner (SFLO) Template Proposal Initiation Scientific Justification. He noted that they agreed that the next step was for the disputing parties to submit position papers. He noted that the co-chairs and AMPA sent out a cover letter on October 25<sup>th</sup>. He added that both the position papers and the cover letter would be forwarded to the Policy co-chairs by November 1<sup>st</sup>. He noted that there are no CMER approvals required for any of these documents.

#### AMP Updates

*Saboor Jawad (AMPA)*

- Eszter Munes has resigned her position as Project Manager.
- Teresa Miskovic has accepted a position in the DNR Aquatics Division beginning November 1<sup>st</sup>.
- Project Manager opening positions are being advertised and interviews will begin soon.
- CMER November Agenda Item to be added: clarifying the Project Manager role to set them up for success.

---

### Meeting Minutes

Joe Murray, *proxy for Mark Meleason*, moved to approve the September Meeting Minutes with amendments. It was seconded by Jenny Knoth. **The motion passed.**

---

## Science Session

### **Presentation - Roads Prescription Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project**

*Charles Luce, U.S. Forest Service, Roads Project PI*

Charlie Luce gave a presentation on the Prescription Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project Biennial Report. Some highlights included Project Components:

- Major Experiment with preliminary results and collection of data.
- Modeling and Theory Development that included road surface model development.
- Parameterization Experiments that included progress on micro-topography, ditch hydraulics, and trap efficiency.

### Discussion

Doug Martin requested a copy of presentation.

AJ Kroll asked if they knew the amount of road traffic that would be occurring at the study sites. Charles Luce noted that some of the sites were on mainline traffic roads and some were on roads with less traffic. Julie Dieu noted that there was variability of traffic across the landscape depending on the Weyerhaeuser hauls and they were measuring the composition of the road surface following the passage of heavy vehicles. Julie added that the study design has a table that details the basic variables and makes it clear which roads they were able to control and which ones they could only measure because of traffic and rainfall.

Chris Mendoza asked how the rutting was being tracked. Charles Luce responded that the design experiment was always to have a crown road. He added that the outside line would always have correlation to the ditch and the outflow part of the road on the outside of the crown would go to the forest floor. Julie Dieu noted they take three measurements at every visit of where the crown is and how much of the road is actively being driven on. She added they also break down what percentage is being delivered down into the trough stream and into the platform.

---

## Science Session

### **CPEACE- Priority List**

Chris noted that we would like to get a priority ranking from CMER members based on the CPEACE flip chart and prioritizing sheet that was mailed last week. Chris noted that he will compile the results received from the CMER members and then the Workgroup will work on the next steps and how to use this to improve the CMER program and process.

The Workgroup will include: Joe Murray, Jenelle Black, CMER co-chairs, AMPA, AJ Kroll, Aimee McIntyre, Debbie Kay, Ash Roorbach, and Lori Clark

### Next Steps

- CMER members will send in their ranking to CMER co-chairs by October 29<sup>th</sup>.

- Chris Mendoza will compile the rankings and set up a meeting with the Workgroup.
- 

### **Hard Rock Phase III Project Charter**

Aimee McIntyre, *Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife*

Aimee McIntyre opened the discussion and noted that the Hard Rock Phase III Project Charter is up for approval today.

Todd Baldwin asked if they plan to have a new Study Design for Hard Rock Phase III to accompany the Charter. Aimee noted that the Study Design is the same as the original Hard Rock Study Design. She added that there were two types of amphibian samplings that occurred in Phase I and II that have already been approved. Todd asked if the statistical analysis would be the same for a resampling and do we need to put this in an official document. He noted that his concern was that they moved forward with a Charter but were still using a fifteen year old Study Design. Aimee noted that she felt confident in their statistical analysis and sampling analysis and added that they were working off estimates based on the original Study Design. She noted that the original Study Design allowed for this type of monitoring. She added that the methodologies have been reviewed and approved by ISPR as recently as the summer of 2021.

### **Motion**

Jenny Knoth moved to approve the Hard Rock Phase III Project Charter. **The motion passed.**

---

### **Soft Rock Six Questions**

Lori Clark (*DNR*)

Lori noted that there were some issues that some CMER members were not able to see comments in the PDF format of the Soft Rock Six Questions that was mailed to CMER last month. It was mailed out again in “Word” so that all CMER members could view the reviewer comments. She noted that they had a meeting on October 8<sup>th</sup> to discuss the unresolved comments. She added that the author had worked to incorporate changes to the document to resolve the issues and the revisions were mailed out on October 19<sup>th</sup> to CMER members and is up for approval today.

### **Discussion**

Doug Martin noted that he didn’t see the changes that were recommended on his issues and is concerned the message is not getting through.

Chris Mendoza noted that the current draft has some information that is inconsistent with the results in the report and contradictory to some of the results in the report that was already approved. He noted that since the author was not present at this meeting to address this CMER should move forward with a vote consistent with the agenda and consider the next steps.

Harry Bell noted that the two recommendations he made to include some references in the report did not show up on the document that was mailed.

AJ Kroll noted that there are two areas of technical contention, one dealing with the scope of inference and the other dealing with the seven day treatment responses.

### **Motion**

Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the Soft Rock Six Questions. **The motion failed to pass.**

### **Next Steps:**

Chris invoked the dispute resolution process. An informal meeting will be scheduled by the AMPA.

---

## **Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions**

Saboor Jawad, *AMPA*

Saboor gave an update from the “informal meeting” that was held on October 19th as part of the Dispute Resolution process that was invoked by AJ Kroll at the September CMER meeting. He noted that at the meeting they agreed to three action points to bridge the gap to resolve the issues:

- Text was added and a table to describe the variability around the mean and a graph was added from the report into the Six Questions document.
- Doug Martin and Bill Ehinger drafted some language that would condition the inferences and that text is now reflected in the Six Questions document.
- The reference to the random sampling of stream temperatures was removed.

Saboor noted that there is one main comment to be resolved concerning the stream temperature before treatment and also questions concerning the scope of inference. He asked the CMER members if they felt there was an advantage to continue the meetings to resolve the issues or if they felt this should move to Stage II in the Dispute Resolution process which would involve position papers.

Aimee McIntyre noted she understood that there was some language added to the document that Doug Martin thought was misleading relative to the seven-day average and he had suggested some alternative language but she didn’t feel she could make a comment on that before talking with the author. She noted that Doug Martin made a comment on the reference to the cooler than average stream temperatures from Ecology’s west side stream temperature evaluation in the document. She added that authors and reviewers had agreed to remove this language throughout the document but that there was an oversight and it had been missed in one location. She supported removing that language.

Chris Mendoza noted that the language in the answers to the Six Questions that came from the Hard Rock Phase I report was already approved by CMER. He added that it is appropriate to add language as long as it doesn’t conflict with what has already been approved but to take out language and graphs that were previously approved by CMER is not valid. He suggested that this should move to Stage II with position papers.

Patrick Lizon asked if this is proceeding to Stage II would the author, Bill Ehinger, be expected to write a position paper. Saboor Jawad noted that the position papers are written by CMER voting members but they can involve nonvoting members in the writing of the position papers. Saboor noted that this isn’t entirely clear and he will meet with the co-chairs to consult.

AJ Kroll noted he felt this should move to Stage II to provide clear documentation on people's concerns in writing and to provide technical papers by the people contributing to the Six Questions.

Jenny Knoth noted that this will follow the "PSM 3.3.4.2 Step 2, Categorize and Result". Saboor Jawad noted that position papers will be requested and the AMPA and co-chairs will meet to categorize the dispute after they have received the position papers. Jenny asked, in order to clarify the process, whether Chris Mendoza needed to have a defined role in the deliberation process to keep a level of neutrality because he is both a co-chair and a disputant. Mendoza responded that there is precedent for the CMER co-chair to be a disputant based on the RCS add-on dispute, and there is no neutrality clause in the CMER PSM or AM board manual. Saboor responded that the co-chairs don't decide or resolve the dispute. AMPA and co-chairs characterize the dispute jointly and he didn't see a problem but will take this as a note of caution.

#### Next Steps

- Informal discussion is concluded
- Position papers will be requested
- Clarification on who participates on position papers will be emailed
- Latest draft of Six Questions with the email from the AMPA will be sent out
- 14 day timeframe begins when the AMPA email is received
- The AMPA will meet with co-chairs to characterize the dispute after the position papers are reviewed

---

### **SAO Audit Recommendations**

- Discussion / Next Steps

Saboor noted that one of the recommendations approved by the FP Board from the SAO report was assigned to both the AMPA, Policy, and CMER "Adopt decision criteria for determining actions". He noted that their direction was to have us provide option papers to the FP Board by November of 2022. He noted that the Policy group has already been formed and had an initial meeting to discuss the topics. He added that Policy is also working on another recommendation involving the net gains model for project planning that was assigned directly to them. He added that today we will be forming the Workgroup.

#### Next Steps

- A CMER Workgroup was formed to include: CMER co-chairs, AMPA, Mark Meleason, Todd Baldwin, Debbie Kay, AJ Kroll, with Aimee McIntyre and Patrick Lizon as potential members.
- There will be two meetings to be held in 2021 and these meetings could possibly be integrated as a CMER agenda item.

---

### **Update from TFW Policy**

Marc Engel / Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chairs*)

Marc Engel noted the Policy co-chairs would like to share with CMER some items that Policy is working on:

- Policy is continuing work on developing Type Np buffer alternatives and are on schedule to complete them by the end of year. Four caucuses have given Policy proposals to consider. One

of our goals is to fulfill the full requirements called for by FP Board in their direction to us in Board Manual Section 22. It would include proposals to address Np buffers but could also include a petition for rule making.

- Policy has formed a Workgroup to address the SAO audit recommendations:
  - #6 to adopt decision criteria for determining actions (due to FP Board in November 2022).
  - #5 to work on a net gains model for project planning (due to FP Board in May 2022).

The Policy Workgroup met on October 20<sup>th</sup> and will be meeting every two weeks.

- A proposal initiation was brought to Policy requesting a Type Np buffer basin GIS analysis looking at the frequencies of FPAs in areas of basins containing Type Np waters. The PI was not accepted by Policy and a Dispute Resolution was invoked. The reason for the dispute was based on the premise that not all of the caucuses agreed with the site selection constraints for the Hard Rock Study and this is a dispute concerning the scope of inference. Policy has completed Stage I without reaching consensus and has moved into Stage II of the dispute. Policy is putting together a contract for a mediator. Policy is taking a different approach to the contract in that we are looking to hire a mediator/facilitator that will be attending Policy meetings to become familiar with our issues and processes and hopefully seek consensus at the meetings to prevent an issue from moving into a dispute. This will be a standing contract to facilitate having a mediator that is familiar with our issues and who will be able to step into a dispute immediately.
- Policy completed Stage II of the SFLO dispute related to a change in riparian buffers last spring which had the potential for an alternate plan template featuring a 75, 50, or 25-foot buffer on Type F and Np waters. Policy received a final report from the mediator documenting the results of the Stage II dispute but decided before the preparation of a caucus report was initiated based on a request from WFFA that Policy would wait until the CMER Scientific Justification (SJ) review was completed. At that time Policy will discuss how to include the CMER SJ into the conclusions of completed dispute resolution process and following that will send a minority/majority report to the FP Board with recommendations.
- The FWEP Charter was approved at the Policy October Meeting.

### Questions

Joe Murray asked about the status of Extensive Monitoring. Marc Engel responded that they have reconvened a Policy sub-committee and are meeting this afternoon. He added the sub-committee is putting together a strategy of how to incorporate Extensive Monitoring in the MPS. He noted that Policy will reach out to CMER as they develop products.

Chris Mendoza noted that the SFLO position papers and cover letter will be sent to Policy co-chairs by Monday Nov 1<sup>st</sup>.

Aimee asked if the Hard Rock Charter III that was approved today at CMER will be on the Policy November Meeting Agenda. Meghan Tuttle noted that it would be on the agenda.

## **CMER SAG Updates**

The following are the “live” updates to the CMER/SAG report that was in the mailing:

### **Wetlands Science**

A wetlands scientist position needs to be filled.

### **Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy**

UPSAG’s field trip in November has been delayed to test out the Study Design protocol.

### **Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study**

The Study Design has been sent back to ISPR to review the revision.

### **Type N Soft Rock Final Report**

A dispute resolution was invoked and an informal meeting will be scheduled.

### **Water Typing Strategy**

An updated PHB Study Design will be sent to CMER in February 2022.

### **Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions**

The Dispute Resolution has moved into Stage II.

### **Hard Rock Phase III**

The Hard Rock Phase III charter was approved at the October 26<sup>th</sup> CMER meeting.

### **Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring**

The October 26<sup>th</sup> presentation will be mailed to CMER members.

### **Unstable Slope Criteria**

The Project Report is delayed and expected to be sent to CMER in March 2022.

---

## **Public Comment**

There were no public comments.

The meeting was adjourned.

---

## **List of Attendees**

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Forest Protection Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER staff
Clark, Lori	DNR project manager
Colton, Mary	DNR administrative staff
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association

Engel, Marc	DNR, Policy co-chair
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ CMER Co-Chair
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
Jawad, Saboor	DNR AMPA
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
Luce, Charles	U.S. Forest Service, Roads Project PI
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Manaster, Amanda	University of Washington, Roads Project Team member
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	DNR project manager
Mobbs, Mark	WTC Quinalt Tribe
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER staff
Thomas, Cody	ISAG co-chair
Tuttle, Meghan	Washington Forest Protection Association, Policy co-chair
Walter, Jason	ISAG co-chair
Volke, Malia	CMER staff