

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, March 23, 2021 // 9:00 am – 3:50 pm

Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>February Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the February 2021 CMER Meeting Minutes as amended today</p> <p>Motion: Passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Todd Baldwin</p> <p>Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay</p> <p>Absent: Mark Mobbs, Patrick Lizon</p>
<p>ETHEP</p> <p>Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the ETHEP scoping document as revised by SAGE and CMER reviewers.</p> <p>Motion: Passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Harry Bell</p> <p>Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A. J. Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay</p> <p>Absent: Mark Mobbs</p>
<p>Water Typing:</p> <p>Chris Mendoza moved to approve the PHB Water Typing Memo to FP Board</p> <p>Motion: Passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Douglas Martin</p> <p>Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A. J. Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay</p> <p>Ash Roorbach (<i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i>)</p>
<p>Smart Buffer Study Design:</p> <p>Harry Bell moved to approve Smart Buffer Design</p> <p>Motion: Failed</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie Dieu</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll</p> <p>Down: Patrick Lizon, Chris Mendoza</p> <p>Sideways: Todd Baldwin, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Debbie Kay, Ash Roorbach (<i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i>)</p>
<p>Riparian Characteristics and Shade</p> <p>Todd Baldwin moved that the study methodology of the RCS Study be approved and take request to remove the eastside from the scoping document to policy while the study design is in ISPR.</p> <p>No Second; Motion Failed</p>	<p>Seconded: none</p>

<p>Riparian Characteristics and Shade</p> <p>Chris Mendoza moved that the current version of the RCS Study design be approved and sent to ISPR.</p> <p>Motion: Passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Patrick Lizon Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin Sideways: Aimee McIntyre, Ash Roorbach, Debbie Kay Abstain: Todd Baldwin</p>
<p>Hard Rock Phase II</p> <p>Debbie Kay moved to approve Chapter 1</p> <p>Motion: Passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Ash Roorbach Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A. J. Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay Ash Roorbach (<i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i>)</p>
<p>Hard Rock Phase II</p> <p>Julie Dieu moved to approve Chapter 2</p> <p>Motion: Passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Patrick Lizon Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A. J. Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay Ash Roorbach (<i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i>)</p>
<p>Hard Rock Phase II</p> <p>Debbie Kay moved to approve Chapter 3</p> <p>Motion: Passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Ash Roorbach Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A. J. Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay Ash Roorbach (<i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i>)</p>
<p>Hard Rock Phase II</p> <p>Chris Mendoza moved to approve Chapter 4</p> <p>Motion: Passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A. J. Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay Ash Roorbach (<i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i>)</p>

Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p>Smart Buffer Study Design: Chris Mendoza will meet with Doug Martin and Patrick Lizon to discuss concerns and make revisions to bring to next month's meeting</p>	<p>Chris Mendoza, Doug Martin and Patrick Lizon</p>
<p>Water Typing Eszter Munes and ISAG will update the budget in the quarterly study design update for the Board's May meeting</p>	<p>Eszter Munes, and ISAG</p>

<p>Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP) Harry Bell suggested that the project description needs to be updated in the project summary sheet.</p>	
<p>RCS Dispute Resolution For the next step, Mark Hicks will draft a summary of the dispute resolution findings of the AMPA and co-chairs and send it out after co-chairs approve them</p>	Mark Hicks
<p>Hard Rock II Harry Bell and Bill Ehinger are going to meet to discuss the rounding off of tables.</p>	Harry Bell and Bill Ehinger

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chair

Jenny opened the meeting. She thanked everyone for coming and stated the ground rules. Chris Mendoza went over the CMER code of conduct and reminded all in attendance of the hard copies that all SAG/ CMER members signed in 2018 during the PowerPoint presentations he gave on the roles and responsibilities of SAG/ SAG co-chairs while attending all of the SAG meetings pre Covid-19.

February 2021 Meeting Minutes:

After edits from the members, Aimee McIntyre made the motion for the February minutes to be approved. *The motion passed.*

CPEACE

Mark Hicks, AMPA Presents

Mark Hicks spoke to the training (CPEACE) available to CMER and Policy and the intention to follow these up with additional principal meetings to make the program more effective. Mark hoped everyone will participate. Several have signed up for the April training.

AMP Audit

Mark Hicks, AMPA Presents

Mark Hicks gave an overview of the State Audit Performance Report that had options and suggestions. The Legislature will not take any action any time soon. The Board sent a letter to the SAO noting their intention to address the eleven suggestions within our scope of influence. It will be highlighted where we do not have the skill set in our team to move forward and where a fusion of money would accelerate meeting the SAO recommendation.

Discussion:

Harry Bell mentioned that the consensus-based decision making model was created back in the 1980's and to depart from this will be up for rigorous discussion. Mark Hicks noted that there will be further discussion on this issue and that the SAO suggestions for improvement were based on considering only the processes that exist, they did not attempt to create new processes.

Recommendations involving changes to AMP processes to be evaluated mainly through the appropriate AMP committees and brought to the Board with recommendations for action.

Recommendations that are administrative in nature will be evaluated primarily by the Board and AMP staff and brought to the Board for decisions and action. Board staff is in the process of understanding the SAO report and evaluating how to move forward with its recommendations. At the

Board's May 2021 meeting, Board and AMP staff will provide suggestions for relative priorities among the recommendations and timelines for evaluating and acting on them.

Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP)

Todd Baldwin and Theresa Miskovic PM DNR Present

Teresa Miskovic presented the ETHEP document that came to CMER last month but was not approved at that meeting. Teresa stated that the team worked on clarifying the study in terms of addressing the THT rule effectiveness and potential risks to the resources. The Project Manager's Management team met with CMER reviewers (Aimee McIntyre and Ash Roorbach) on March 15th to revise the ETHEP document according to the suggestions. Teresa noted that the ETHEP study will address the CMER question by developing alternatives to the THT system but it will not directly test the effectiveness of the current THT rules. Chris Mendoza thanked Aimee McIntyre and Todd Baldwin for their contribution.

Harry Bell suggested that the project description needs to be updated in the project summary sheet.

Aimee McIntyre moved to approve ETHEP scoping document as revised by SAGE and CMER reviewers. The motion passed.

Potential Habitat Breaks PHB

Eszter Munes, PM, DNR, Present

Eszter gave an update on revisions to the PHB budget for the Project Charter and Project Management

Plans that were approved at the CMER meeting in February. Eszter talked to the overlap between PHB charter and Project Management Plan. The primary audience for the Project Management Plan is intended to be the Project Team, but the document also serves as a helpful reference for CMER and the Forest Practice Board. Chris Mendoza requested corrections to Science Lead/PI in CMER/SAG update table of deliverables as "to be determined" to align with charter and project management plan.

Water Typing

Eszter Munes PM, DNR, Present

Eszter Munes summarized the work they have completed and progress made on the Water Typing Projects. She noted they will be presenting an updated budget and study design to the Board for the May meeting.

Chris Mendoza moved to approve the Water Typing Memo to FP Board. The motion passed.

Action Item: Eszter Munes and ISAG will update the budget in the quarterly study design update for the Board's May meeting

Smart Buffer Study Design

Eszter Munes and Doug Martin Present

Eszter Munes noted that this project has had four rounds of revisions based on the original comments that have resulted in four draft versions of the Smart Buffer Study Design. Eszter added that she, Doug Martin and reviewers met in February and March 2021 to discuss questions and concerns about the study design. This version of the study design includes recommendations made at these meetings and from comments submitted in February and March, Doug Martin (WFPA) noted that there seemed to be various options to improve perfection of buffer to provide an optimal solution but at the same time compare options to pre-harvested measurements of shade. AJ Kroll stated that before a decision can be made we need to understand the technical issues. Joe Murray stated that fact this was never assigned to any SAG should be made clear. Bill Ehinger stated that there were good changes on clarifying what is meant by “effectiveness”, however the Np work group’s smart buffer concept was different from what is in the proposal. Also to reduce any reduction in shade is not clear whether you would get the same amount of shade currently with the same buffers. Type N workgroup also states the Site-specific buffers (Smart buffers) will be designed to retain trees that provide shade. Chris Mendoza stated that there is confusion concerning how the full shade is defined based on simply comparing pre to post-harvest shade at the site selection. It seems to be a confusing term assuming that it is equivalent to 100% effective shade. He requested additional language clarifying the difference between the two. Doug Martin suggested this is an exploratory project but if we are validating shade it would become more than an exploratory project? Todd Baldwin noted this is not a CMER study design because it didn’t go through as a scoping document. And this is not a CMER project but is in a CMER review that will be provided it to ISPR.

Chris Mendoza added from chat box: The following is the CMER cover language I was speaking to:

<p><i>Option (d) for “Other Reports”:</i> <i>This report was initiated by [insert group (e.g., the Forests and Fish Policy group under the Forests and Fish Adaptive Management Program)]. The report is intended to inform the Adaptive Management Program and provide information supplemental to the work of the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) and the [...Title of CMER Adaptive Management program...]. Definition of “Exploratory Reports” under CMER disclaimer: Option (b) for “Exploratory Reports”:</i> <i>This exploratory report was prepared for the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER) and contains scientific information, which was intended to improve or focus the science underlying the Forest and Fish Adaptive Management program. The project is part of the [...Title</i></p>
--

Doug Martin noted that the study shows it can give shade but doesn’t set a shade target or target “no change in shade”. There should be a measure existing before pre-harvest and after harvest to evaluate effectiveness of how successful putting shade on the ground using a model. The question is whether the methods achieve the goal of evaluation? This should be viewed as an exploratory project.

Harry Bell moved to approve the study design. The motion did not pass.

Jenny Knoth requested members who voted no give an explanation of why they did.

Patrick Lizon voted no because he said he doesn't have enough information to approve. He wanted to better understand the method being used to determine the buffer design and would like to see the calculations that went into the buffer design model.

Chris Mendoza voted no because he wanted to see more articulation on some additions and also wanted explanations to be clear on what the study is not going to do in respect to full shade. He suggested that a revision needs to be drafted to resolve the issues in another meeting and bring it back at the next CMER meeting.

Todd Baldwin voted sideways because he doesn't see this as a CMER project. He doesn't see why this needs CMER approval and thinks it should be sent directly to ISPR.

Doug Martin stated that he can give Patrick Lizon the calculations he is looking for.

AJ Kröll noted that this study provides a nice overview of what types of "references" are informative for forest management studies. He included a url link:

<https://besjournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0021-8901.2004.00924.x>

Chris Mendoza stated he was open to another meeting with Doug Martin and to give it one more stab at resolving remaining issues... Patrick Lizon is also open for another meeting. Harry Bell questioned why we don't give SAG a bigger role in discussing the science of this project?

Action Item: Chris Mendoza will meet with Patrick Lizon and Doug Martin over the next month.

SFL Template and Dispute Resolution

Knoth and Bell Present

Jenny Knoth stated that the workgroup had met and discussed various options to resolve the dispute. They agree a subgroup would continue to work on the 6Q document and plan to meet on March 31st.

eDNA Dispute Resolution

Munes and Knoth Present

The eDNA dispute resolution is in regards to pilot report submitted for CMER approval in Dec 2020. Motion to approve pilot report failed and went into the dispute resolution process. During the first dispute resolution meeting in Feb 2021, CMER voting participants agreed to incorporate lessons learned and remaining concerns into the Six Questions document. Jason Walter drafted the document, incorporating lessons learned from others, and it's been sent for the group for review. The group may meet again in April. Work is ongoing.

Riparian Characteristics and Shade Dispute Resolution

Mark Hicks Present

Mark Hicks noted an informal dispute resolution meeting was held on March 10th to resolve the disputes for both Harry Bell and Patrick Lizon. This meeting was unsuccessful in reaching a consensus solution so the parties were asked to provide position papers to the AMPA and CMER co-chairs in order to begin the second step of CMER's Guided Decision Making Process. The AMPA and co-chairs met on March 18th to discuss the position papers and determine what category of dispute it is. Hicks noted the pathway for resolution changes depending on the type of dispute. The

AMPA and the co-chairs were in consensus that introducing the new prescriptions, particularly the ones that are in active dispute within TFW Policy, is a process foul and cannot be supported.

RCS Study Design Decision

Knuth, Baldwin and Volke Present

Malia Volke gave a presentation to help everyone understand how Todd Baldwin's suggested modifications would affect the RCS study design regarding (Options 1-3).

Potential Solutions:

- Option 1: Remove the Eastside from Study Project Proposal
- Option 2: Confine site selection to Ns streams on the eastside
- Option 3: Confine site selection on Np and F streams to isolated streams on the eastside

Discussion:

Jenelle Black asked if Option 1 would leave open the study on the Eastside after being implemented on Westside. Todd Baldwin noted that there are concerns where the sites are located but the streams haven't been identified as yet.

Mark Hicks noted that the Eastside was a Policy priority and was agreed to in the scoping details document and would need to be approved to be de-prioritized. Doug Martin noted that finding tiny streams likely will be difficult. To pilot test all the options and finding all these little streams could change prescription and become complicated. Jenelle Black noted that conducting the eastern Washington study in the uplands might be a better option than dropping the east side altogether. Jenny Knuth noted that doing a study in Eastern Washington doesn't necessarily give you a comparison to Western Washington and vice versa. Malia Volke noted that the upland idea has been discussed several times and users may not feel it captures streams. Using different site selection criteria on the Eastside and Westside would limit comparisons across study sites. Chris Mendoza mentioned that the upland versus the riparian difference will come with their own issues based on the Eastside Literature Review CMER study on salvage logging showing that most of the literature was from uplands not RMZs so limited in transferability to riparian areas. Joe Murray noted that this impacts less than 50 acres in Eastern Washington. The study impact has a small impact on the habitat. Mark Hicks noted that any changes would require going back to Policy even if CMER agrees. He also noted if this is to be a pilot study using upland stands we need to have a conversation on this. Douglas Martin noted that the pilot would accomplish two good things 1) test model without hurting environment and 2) focus study both on Eastside and Westside. It would be the same study just a phased approach and a smart move. Patrick Lizon asked if treatments on the Np streams on the eastside can be implemented under current rule. Mark Hicks noted that there is a stream width issue. Jenelle Black noted that we would be better able to assess the scale of the problems after site selection [showed us what we were coming up with. Harry Bell noted that we are testing our rules here and we should not limit ourselves by what the rules are. Mark Hicks noted that the Board has approved pilot rule making on other studies to allow harvesting beyond what is allowed in the rules. Aimee McIntyre had concerns about approving the study design as is knowing that the Eastside Tribes had concerns with including eastside streams in the study. Chris Mendoza noted that RCS is already going a step further in filling CMER's main knowledge gaps based on research already conducted by CMER on Westside Type N and Eastside Type F waters. Jenny Knuth noted that it is disturbing that this discussion is occurring now since we are involved in a

Dispute Resolution over suggesting additional treatments to the RCS; an action considered too late in the process.

AJ Kroll mentioned that there was a great article on the need to do ecological studies more than once...once isn't enough to close "knowledge" gaps:
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ece3.5836>

There was a discussion on alternatives to treatment buffer width that raised concerns about considering potential changes to the scoping document, if we are protecting the landowners and habitat, and how changes to treatment buffer width will affect habitat and alter the budget.

Discussion Continues:

Douglas Martin mentioned CMER has a consensus on the technical aspects of RCS. Aimee McIntyre noted that it is unclear how you then evaluate if eastside will be needed based on results from Westside. Patrick Lizon suggested changing the motion that the implementation of the RCS study on the eastside is to be done only where the treatments can be done in accordance with existing rules or is this a policy decision. Joe Murray asked if we send the study to ISPR and then remove the Eastside, will it need to go back to ISPR. Mark Hicks suggested sending the whole thing along with questions to ISPR regarding the removal of the eastside and how that could impact the study design.

Chris Mendoza agreed with Mark and suggested that adding an extra question to CMER's standard 8 questions to ISPR has to be agreed on, but could be considered. Aimee McIntyre stated that it feels like by starting with Westside we would just be postponing the same issue until a later conversation, which would then happen potentially after the Westside was already done, but if we then modified eastside treatments, what does that do to applicability of study wide results to the entire state? Malia Volke mentioned that she thought ISPR reviewers would need to have more information about sample size, Eco regional comparisons, etc. Chris Mendoza stated that the study would have to go to CMER for approval if drafted by Todd Baldwin and brought back to Policy. Mark Hicks noted that the study would go to ISPR and if no concerns it would come back and would only be stopped if Policy will not fund.

Todd Baldwin moved that the RCS Study continue as a Westside specific study and evaluate if the Eastside is needed once those results come in

Motion: not seconded; motion failed

Chris Mendoza moved that the RCS study design be approved as is and sent to ISPR.

The motion passed.

Hard Rock Phase II

A McIntyre and Kroll Present

Aimee McIntyre noted that the chapters went to ISPR for full review and the final drafts were approved.

Debbie Kay moved to approve Chapter 1. The motion passed.

Julie Dieu moved to approve Chapter 2. The motion passed.

Debbie Kay moved to approve Chapter 3. The motion passed.

Action Item: Harry Bell and Bill Ehinger are going to meet to discuss the rounding off of tables.

Chapter 4 Discussion:

Doug Martin noted that the results were fair and helped in his understanding. He also noted that the ISPR comments could have done more concerning the interpretation of the level of detection. Harry Bell mentioned that there were errors in the reference pages in relation to figures that didn't match. Harry Bell and Greg Stewart are going to meet to discuss the rounding off of tables. Jenelle Black noted (from chat box) that we need to have a good talk about "significance," or get a statistician to talk about it. "Significance" is relative. I think most statisticians, including Loveday Conquest, would argue that in many of these studies with small sample sizes, a significance of 0.10 would be more appropriate. P values are an indicator, not an end-all. Refer to Greg's talk from last year.

Chris Mendoza moved to approve Chapter 4. The motion passed.

CMER SAG Updates

Knott and PM's Present

Overview

- The Project Team finalized the ENREP project management plan and it was approved at the February SAGE and CMER meetings.
- Chris Mendoza added edits and Eszter Munes updated the Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project and the Table listing project PIs for PHB and DPC studies for the Board.
- WetSAG has voted to move forward with scoping for WMZ in FY21. Debbie Kay has taken the lead on developing a task list for the process, including some preliminary GIS work to inform scoping discussions and generating a list of wetland functions to evaluate for inclusion in the study. Update to the project charter is in progress. Additional tasks and a work plan will be forthcoming
- WetSAG has reviewed and approved an updated budget for FWEP.
- Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project - A subgroup was formed to work on the Site Selection and Data Management document.

Update from TFW Policy and FP Board

Marc Hicks Presents

Mark Hicks gave an update from the TFW Policy and FP Board. Mark stated that after the Legislature meets next week we could see the recommended budget approved. Mark also noted that there is an update from the Policy Np workgroup and they are working on a draft to give to policy of the work and will then have Policy members clarify questions so they can finalize the report. Mark Hicks is reviewing the WFPA Np Basin FPA Proposal Initiation request.

Public Comment

Charles Chesney, past participant

Comments from Charles Chesney – sent as an update in email because audio was not clear.

About some Errors of Omission - I wish to correct a misperception from comments by Chris Mendoza

(CMER Co-Chair) about a ‘gold standard’ (i.e., regarding long term ecological monitoring projects, and CMER). With regard to the data of value, and the value of data, given CMER efforts... CMER is embarrassingly very much short-sighted (including the FP Board, TFW Policy) with regard to a long term monitoring project-the Channel Reference Site Network Wood In Small Streams Project (CRSNWISSP)-over 30 years, my work has yielded measured, not modeled, numerical results on channel wood inputs, channel wood outputs, sediment storage, etc., etc. I have also worked on a project called ‘Taneum-WWWD’, What Would Wood Do’, (Jesus being a Wood substitution-6 repeat visits in a 5 mile valley segment, focused on great work of Scott Nicolai [Yakama Nation], and others). Taneum Creek is a right bank tributary of the Yakima River near Thorp, mostly in WDW lands.

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Forest Protection Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER Staff
Chesney, Charles	Member of General Public
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Hicks, Mark	Department of Natural Resources – AMPA
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ WSAC, CMER co-chair
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources - AMP Project Manager
Munes, Eszter	Department of Natural Resources – AMP Project Manager
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER Staff
Walter, Jason	ISAG co-chair
Volke, Malia	CMER Staff