

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee
Regular Meeting**

MEETING MINUTES

July 28th, 2020 // 9:00 am – 1:00 pm
Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Prepared For CMER by Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Secretary Senior

Motions July 28, 2020	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
Approve the June 23 rd Meeting Minutes.	Julie Dieu/Aimee McIntyre (Up: Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, AJ Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin; abstained: Doug Martin)
Approve the PSM Chapter 8 document.	Chris Mendoza/Debbie Kay (Up: Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, AJ Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin, Doug Martin)
Approve the Deep-Seated Landslide (DSL) Charter	Aimee McIntyre/Harry Bell (Up: Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, AJ Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin, Todd Baldwin, Doug Martin)

Action Items July 28, 2020	
Action Item	Responsibility
Harry Bell, Debbie Kay/Ash Roorbach (co-reviewers), and AJ Kroll volunteered to be 3 designated CMER reviewers for the answers to the 6 questions document regarding the SFL Template Science Review.	Harry Bell, Debbie Kay/Ash Roorbach, AJ Kroll.
There should be a future discussion on how CMER should evaluate outside science.	Hibbeln/CMER Co-chairs Mendoza and Knoth
William Ehinger will present data on Soft Rock Extended Monitoring to CMER next Spring (April or May), after which CMER will send the updated information to Policy.	William Ehinger
William Ehinger will give a presentation on Hard Rock data sometime in the Fall.	William Ehinger

Introductions

Knoth

Roll call was taken and Jenny Knoth, co-chair, went through introductions, reviewed the agenda and asked voting members if anything should be added.

Roads Project Implementation Plan Presentations

Flint, Manaster, Black

Ben Flint, DNR, first gave a brief summary of the Roads Project before Amanda Manaster, University of Washington, gave a presentation on experiments that she would be overseeing.

Jenelle Black, CMER staff, then gave another presentation on the experiment she would be overseeing. The opportunity for questions was then given and several members asked experiment specific questions.

June 23rd Meeting Minutes

Mendoza

Knoth asked for a motion to approve the minutes, after which a discussion could be held. Julie Dieu, Rayonier, moved to approve the June minutes. The floor was then opened for discussion and Chris Mendoza, co-chair, provided edits. A vote was taken and the meeting minutes were approved. Motion #1 passed.

Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM), Chapter 8

Miskovic

Teresa Miskovic, DNR, stated that this came to CMER in September for review. Herself and Ash Roorbach, NWIFC, reviewed the comments and stated that their willingness to address any concerns. Knoth asked for a motion and Mendoza made motion #2 to approve the document as it was presented. Mendoza suggested that earlier chapters of the Protocol and Standards Manual should also be revised since enough time has passed since they have been last reviewed. Miskovic agreed with Mendoza and a vote was taken. Motion #2 was passed.

SFL Template Proposal Initiation Scientific Justification

Knoth

Knoth read the motion that was passed by the TFW Policy committee on July 14th, recapping exactly what Policy is asking for. Mendoza expressed concern that there is not a process for reviewing outside science for the purpose of answering CMER's 6 question documents, which has always been used for publicly funded CMER studies. He briefly covered the Policy and Science tracks for Proposal Initiation and how the AMPA can provide answers to the 6 questions for outside science, as stated in the Forest Practices Board Manual Section 22, emphasizing that Policy skipped a step in the review process by passing this on to CMER.

Hicks agreed that a process error had happened, but emphasized that Policy is now trying to clean this up and get this document through review. While the 6 questions are not the ideal format for reviewing the document in question, there is room within the 6 questions framework to appropriately review the document. Hicks also stated that it would be better for CMER to review this document as opposed to Policy, even though the process for review is not ideal.

Mendoza again expressed his concern that this process did not follow the FPB Manual and that CMER does not have a way to review outside science for the purpose of answering CMER's 6 questions to Policy. Hicks acknowledged that this is a different process than normal, but that doesn't necessarily mean that CMER cannot do what Policy is requesting.

Knoth commented that the role of CMER is to help Policy move along with their process and understand the science they were given even though the normal process was not followed. She emphasized Shared goals of the Forest and Fish agreement and that the goal for today is to provide reviewers.

Roorbach inquired about exactly what reviewers would be doing. Hicks responded that the author's task is to answer the 6 questions, after which CMER reviewers would modify the 6 questions. There should first be an attempt to review the document within the 6 questions format. If that is not possible, that conversation can be had later. Hicks made it clear that this must be a consensus document and that it should be held to the same standards as a CMER study. Even if there are differences in opinions within the review, it is CMER's responsibility to iron these out.

Joe Murray, WFPA, asked who would pull together the document that comes to CMER to approve and send to Policy. Knoth responded that a sub-committee or a SAG should do this. Mendoza thought that Policy's motion implied that CMER voting members should. Hicks stated that he assumed the author would be the one to adjust the document based on comments/questions received, but that CMER could choose a different approach.

Harry Bell, WFPA, Debbie Kay, Suquamish/Roorbach (co-reviewers), and A.J. Kroll, Weyerhaeuser, all agreed to review the SFL Template Proposal Initiation.

A.J. Kroll, Weyerhaeuser, asked for clarification about what exactly should be reviewed and how the documentation should be used. Knoth stated that what is being reviewed is the 6 questions document which will put together by the author, with the ISPR documentation as supporting materials. The review is not of the report itself, rather the answer to the 6 questions.

Hicks thanked those who volunteered to review, but commented that this review potentially carries a lot of weight and will be used by the Forest Practices Board to make decisions. He hopes that people are thinking this through when choosing not to review. William Ehinger, Ecology, and Mendoza stated their reluctance was also due to time constraints already present on internal CMER projects.

Kroll commented that, as he understands it, this study is similar to the eDNA project because they are both outside sciences. Hicks responded that not everything has to be put in bins of inside or outside science. Mendoza disagreed with Kroll, stating that the difference is the eDNA project was a pilot developed and funded by CMER, and the SFLO was not.

Doug Martin, WFPA, reminded the reviewers that the 6 questions is a CMER document requested by Policy and that the author will provide the answers to the 6 questions while reviewers will revise/edit the document, after which it will be passed to CMER for approval. Mendoza responded by stating that all CMER members are encouraged to provide feedback on the 6 questions since they will ultimately have to vote on approval – review is not solely limited to the 3 volunteers, that's the minimum needed to follow CMER's protocols and standards manual.

Knoth then suggested that there be a discussion regarding CMER's role in evaluating outside science.

Deep-Seated Landslide Charter

Flint

Flint first stated that the charter developed for the overarching deep seated landslide strategy is overly broad and general and UPSAG decided that, developing a charter for each project completed under the strategy would be a more effective way to proceed. The scoping and 6 questions documents are not yet ready for approval, and will be presented as a package once review is completed.

Flint went through the main points of the charter and pointing out that costs are kept relatively low because of the work by CMER staff and cooperators. After Knoth asked for a motion, McIntyre moved to approve the charter. There was no discussion and motion #3 passed.

RSAG Soft Rock Extended Monitoring Data

Mendoza, Munes

The question at hand is what to do with the data. There is not necessarily a decision required today. Murray stated that what was covered in the SAG reports was adequate. He feels it is appropriate to consider the recommendation about how to deal with the data, even though there should not be a decision today.

Ehinger stated that what is currently in ISPR covers from 2012, when the study began, to summer of 2017. Data collection will stop in fall of 2020. He asked what format the data between 2017 and 2020 should be reported in. He also inquired if CMER wanted to run it through ISPR or just through CMER, which might be faster. In response, Knoth asked if Ehinger could present the data to CMER, after which a decision could be made. Ehinger confirmed that he could report on the data in spring 2021. After this, CMER would make a formal recommendation to be sent to Policy.

Murray commented that communication from SAGs to CMER through updates is good – there does not necessarily have to be a formal CMER request. Roorbach asked if RSAG has a role in providing technical input into a project once it's out of the SAG and into CMER. He commented that this seems different because it is dealing with extended monitoring. Black responded that even though the SAG is not responsible for providing an opinion to CMER, it is still allowed.

Regarding the process of how the data should be brought to Policy, Mendoza stated the process should not go through multiple reviews between SAGs once the main report as already been approved by CMER and sent to ISPR. Mendoza stated that CMER went through the Lean process to eliminate “non-value added” reviews like this. This is extra data, but it's not necessarily a change because it was collected using the same methods. Several members agreed that it is the SAGs role to make recommendations to CMER.

Roorbach stated the two different perspectives – one, that SAGs should not re-do work and the other that SAGs should provide recommendations. For extended monitoring, when a project is extended and goes through the formal process there could be a discussion of what entity should shepherd it through – a SAG or CMER. Bell contributed that because extended monitoring is a quest to get more information, it needs to be discussed at a more technical level; therefore, a SAG should discuss this and then pass a recommendation on to CMER.

Hicks commented that SAGs should be able to make recommendations to CMER, but this is more case specific and the amount of data should be taken into account. The issue at hand is the direction that should be taken with this project.

AMP Budget Update

Hicks

Hicks stated that the TFW Policy committee drafted a Master Project Schedule (MPS) that will be presented to the FPB in August. Policy chose an option that added Phase III of the Hard Rock study so that there would be extended monitoring. This option hires one CMER science staff in 2022 and the other in 2026. The Westside Type F project would be moved out 3 years, and the Wetlands Migration Zone Project would be moved out 4 years. Hicks emphasized that there are still unresolved questions about funding.

July Policy Meeting

Hicks

Hicks announced Marc Engel, DNR, as the new Policy co-chair and then recapped the main decisions made at the July Policy meeting. This included the decision regarding transmitting the SFL Proposal Initiation to CMER and agreeing on language for the SFL Dispute Resolution.

CMER SAG Updates

Flint

Miskovic first stated that the Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP) is on track and will soon be passed to SAGE. Heather Gibbs, DNR, then stated that the Eastside Modeling and Effectiveness Project (EMEP) is still on track despite COVID and will soon be going back to ISPR.

CMER Work Plan Workgroup

Mendoza

Mendoza stated that the workgroup has fallen behind due to a heavy workloads and state furloughs and that revisions will probably not happen until next fall, and that CMER workplan updates will follow the process used in the prior biennium where SAGs update their respective programs and projects that are brought to CMER for approval. Gibbs mentioned that improving the work plan would be an in depth project and it might be better if the work group proposed changes to CMER as they worked through it.

Smart Buffer Proposal Initiation (PI) Review

Flint

Flint reported that over 700 comments/revisions were received on the PI and it will take an undetermined amount of time to work through the comments and address the fundamental questions. September is a realistic target.

Water Typing Update

Munes

Eszter Munes, DNR, stated that ISAG is continuing work on the relevant projects. The subgroup has made good progress on identifying the primary concerns and decided that they would like to provide the FPB with updates on the subgroup. She stated that the subgroup would be asking Mendoza or Knoth to deliver a verbal update at the August FPB Meeting.

Public Comment

charles chesney commented on how his name was punctuated in previous minutes and also inquired about why his comments were not included in the June minutes.

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
Austin, Brandon	Department of Ecology
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispell Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER
chesney, charles	Member of Public
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Flint, Ben	Department of Natural Resources
Hicks, Mark	Department of Natural Resources – AMPA
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ WSAC, CMER co-chair
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
Luce, Charlie	US Forest Service, Rocky Mountain. Research Station
Manaster, Amanda	University of Washington
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Munes, Eszter	Washington Department of Natural Resources
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER
Thomas, Cody	Spokane Tribe
Volke, Malia	CMER

