

# Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER)

## Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, ~~March 22~~April 26, 2022 // 9:00 am – 3:45PM  
Remotely held using Zoom

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p><b>March 2022 Meeting Notes</b></p> <p><b><u>Motion:</u></b></p> <p>Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the <del>February</del><u>March</u> 2022 meeting notes.</p> <p><b>The motion passed</b></p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Chris Mendoza</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Julie Dieu, Aimee McIntyre, Ash Roorbach, Chris Mendoza, Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Mark Meleason, A.J. Kroll, Stephanie Estrella, and Doug Martin.</p> <p><b>Absent:</b> Jenny Knoth</p>
<p><b>Charter: Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring</b></p> <p>Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring Charter.</p> <p><b>The motion passed</b></p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Todd Baldwin</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Aimee McIntyre, Todd Baldwin, Stephanie, Doug Martin, Mark Meleason, Chris Mendoza, Ash Roorbach, Julie Dieu, Harry Bell, Jenny Knoth, A.J. Kroll.</p>
<p><b>Approve Eastside Forest Health Strategy</b></p> <p>Chris Mendoza moved to approve the Eastside Forest Health Strategy contingent upon Todd’s revisions in response to CMER input.</p> <p><b>The motion passed</b></p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Aimee McIntyre</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Aimee McIntyre, Doug Martin, Chris Mendoza, Todd Baldwin, Stephanie Estrella, Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell, Mark Meleason, A.J. Kroll, Ash Roorbach, and Julie Dieu.</p>

Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p><b>Communicate if you would like to be a part of the project team of the extensive monitoring to work with RSAG.</b></p>	<p>Chris Mendoza Ash Roorbach Mark Meleason Doug Martin Jenny Knoth</p>

## Notes:

### Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

*Chris Mendoza, CMER Co-Chair*

Natalie Church took roll call

Chris Mendoza did an icebreaker

### Read ground rules:

- Tracy Hawkins read all of the tips for meeting attendees.
  - Key activities/tasks for participants to ensure they contribute to and get the most out of the meetings they attend.
    - Respond in a timely manner to requests for agenda items.
    - Be on time.
    - Be well prepared: Be familiar with agenda and objectives.
    - Review minutes of previous meeting.
    - Read or gather background information ahead of time.
    - Have action items assigned to you at prior meetings completed.
    - Be concise and to the point.
    - Participate in a constructive manner.
    - Be respectful of others.
    - Caution an offender of bullying or aggressive behavior.
    - Stay on topic.
    - Volunteer your time, talent and expertise to get things done.
    - Be realistic in your availability and ability to carry out action items

### Staff Updates:

- Patrick Lizon is going to be leaving CMER as of today's meeting.
- Eastern Washington CMER Scientist should be starting in June 2022.

### Science Session:

#### Building Blocks of Good Science

#### **Motivation** – questions to ask

- What is the primary motivation of the proposal or paper?
- Are you sold on what drives the inquiry at hand?
- Does the authors'/applicants' motivation align with that of the sponsors?

#### **Objectives** – questions to ask

- Are the objectives of the proposal clearly laid out?
- Are they sufficiently justified/motivated?
- Do they support the call for proposals?
- Will the achievements on the objectives be measurable upon implementation of the proposal? In other words, will you know if and to what degree would the objectives have been achieved?

#### **Methods** – Role of models

- **Descriptive models** goal of methodology describe an existing system statistical models, survey instruments, and questionnaires.

- **Predictive models** – what happens to come attributes of system? Simulation, scenario analyses, and financial analyses.
- **Prescriptive models** – what is the best course of action? Optimization and multi-attribute decision theory.
- **The scientific methods** - hypothesis testing (statistics), conjecture-and-proof (mathematics), decision procedures (decision science) yes or no questions, and indigenous knowledge.

#### **Methods – Questions to ask**

- Are the methods in alignment with the objectives of the study or proposal?
- Is the study problem-driven or method-driven?
- Are models to be used?

#### **Resources - Personnel, time, money, and data**

Questions to ask:

- Is proposed study feasible to complete in given timeline
- Is proposed study feasible given existing plus request personnel?
- How about data needs?
- Is size of requested funds commensurate with the value of propose inquiry?
- What is the likely ecological (e.g. carbon footprint) of the project?

#### **Potential impact**

- Who or what would be impacted and how?
- Is impact likely to be positive?
- Is potential impact commensurate with costs?

#### **Risk**

- How to assess study risk?
- Did applicants provide a risk statement or analysis?

#### **Scientific merit**

#### **Closing thoughts.**

- What is the motivation of the scientist?
- What is good science?
- How to measure good science?
- Does good science have to be expensive?

During the presentation Harry Bell mentioned that what he feels we struggle with as a whole, is separating science and asking critical questions with TFW Policy and who use the critical questions. Policy is trying to put a spin on what research CMER does and what science is asking. Dr. Sándor F. Tóth explained that the chart within his slideshow is not for scientific method; it is chart for decision-making in natural resource management, as an example, reading a proposal. The scientist has to make an effort to not be influenced by the bias to the questions that the Policy makers are asking.

#### **Charter: Wetland Management Zone Effectiveness Monitoring:**

Alexander Prescott discussed that the changes to this charter are administrative in nature, changing Alexander Prescott to the Project Manager and completion dates. Chris Mendoza made a comment about the Project Deliverables and Project Timeline table regarding Best Available

Science (BAS) being included within the scoping process, as outlined in the CMER Protocols and Standards Manual. Joe Murray asked what the difference was between this charter and the charter that was presented in 2017. Alexander Prescott explained that it was more of an administrative change with the roles and responsibility section and refining the roles and responsibilities of the Project Manager and people involved. Also, updating the estimated completion dates since early in the process. Harry Bell asked about the L1 objectives and targets does not see water quality standards applied to wetlands. Difference between what we are trying to do and what the charter is talking about. Alexander answered that “aquatic resource objectives” is a roundabout way of saying water quality standards. Harry Bell asked to have Saboor Jawad respond to this question. Saboor Jawad answered Harry Bell by explaining that L1 is probably the background and that L2 in number 6 Project Objectives is more specific to this project. Chris Mendoza explained that previously this question was sorted out at WetSAG and addressed in the scoping process and that it does not need to be added to the charter as it is already listed in number 1. Chris Mendoza explained that the charters are living documents and once the project team starts to scope the project the critical questions could possibly be modified before it gets approved by CMER and TFW Policy.

### **CMER Review: Western Washington Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring Exploratory Field Study Report**

Jenelle Black reviewed the Field Study Report and gave a presentation about Westside Type F Exploratory Study Report. There was discussion about who will be the CMER Reviewers. Jenny Knoth, Mark Meleason, Debbie Kay, Julie Dieu, and Aimee McIntyre volunteered to be the CMER reviewers. 30 days to receipt, Alexander is PM for this project. Comments are due back on May 18, 2022 and are to be sent to Jenelle Black and Alexander Prescott. Back for approval at June 2022 CMER meeting. June is the Hard Deadline for this report.

### **Policy Request to Scope Extensive Monitoring Project:**

Saboor Jawad discussed the AMPA Memo on the Extensive Monitoring Project and highlighted a few parts in document:

- Develop an Extensive monitoring proposal for stream temp and riparian stand conditions.
- To scope a landscape scale extensive monitoring project to collect data to understand status/trends of key indicators and provide context for ongoing and future prescription scale studies.
- Identify data and analysis methods that have potential to contribute to validation monitoring.
- EM does not address cause and effect relationships
- Will inform future targeted Intensive Monitoring project proposals.

Saboor Jawad discussed that it is only this biennium to complete TFW Policy’s request to Scope Extensive Monitoring.

Chris Mendoza explained that CMER is to scope extensive monitoring and that RSAG has already done work on this. He mentioned that creating a project team would be beneficial to this project. Chris Mendoza (be part of the discussion), Ash Roorbach, Mark Meleason, Doug Martin, and Jenny Knoth all volunteered to be part of the project team.

Ash Roorbach discussed that there is a need to have further conversation with Policy as they have not been able to articulate what they would like from this. Conversation with project team

and policy would be beneficial. Chris Mendoza discussed that CMER should be relegating this to RSAG who's done the majority of work on extensive monitoring. Todd Baldwin expressed concern about the deadline and the budget. Saboor Jawad responded by explaining that Policy is having an on-going discussion about the budget and have allocated enough funds. CMER should be able to complete the two pieces within the remainder of this biennium.

### **Approve Eastside Forest Health Strategy:**

Todd Baldwin reviewed the Eastside Forest Strategy document and the comments/edits that he received. Aimee McIntyre discussed her reasoning for her comments/edits to this document. Chris Mendoza discussed his reasoning for his comments/edits.

Harry Bell proposed to add e. how do PCT, commercial thinning, hydrology and geophysical characteristics (e.g., stream size, valley confinement, soil wetness, topographic position) influence susceptibility/risk to wildfire?). (This was entered into the chat box)

Todd Baldwin accepted to add Harry Bell's addition to the Eastside Forest Health Strategy document. Jenny Schofield will send CMER the clean and updated version after Todd completes it.

### **UPSAG Updates:**

Ted Turner gave a presentation and showed a slideshow of the UPSAG project updates.

### **Policy Update:**

Marc Engel gave an update on disputes and what took place at the TFW Policy Meeting.

### **CMER SAG Updates:**

SAG co-chairs updated the live SAG update document with help from PMs.

### **Public Comments:**

charles chesney emailed below public comments:

Public Comments  
submitted by  
charles chesney  
April 26, 2022

(To prevent and avoid telephone call kerfuffles and hangups, I will submit this message BEFOREHAND. I suggest Natalie Church or Lori Clark read the text of this document verbatim during the time slot to provide topical comments. (I regret asynchronicity but call quality problems have limited my feedback recently).

one, please read and absorb the Lee MacDonald work (Colorado State University) for definitions of seven monitoring types [baseline, trend, implementation, effectiveness, validation, compliance, project)-an eighth type was suggested, 'sensitivity' (as Exper Mentor pursues through PESSCA-Ahtanum, PESSCA-Quilcene- PESSCA-Sol Duc [PESSCA-performance

evaluation of stream channel condition assessment]). Put this to long term memory and recall regarding ‘what is monitoring?’ Nuff said.

two, Exper Mentor (CRSNWISSP) has MEASURED channel wood flux (NOT modeled like Meleason et al.) - that is, flux IS channel wood import, export, and input on small, steep stream channel corridors in the Columbia River Basin, for decades. This CRSNWISSP work is baseline, trend, effectiveness, validation (research), and project monitoring. What other global scale empirical (evidence-based practice, real actual channel corridor data not remotely sensed but body collected) datasets have MEASURED channel wood flux in the Columbia River Basin? My answer, no other in space, time, and critical questions, past and present. What entities are neglecting duty of care, fiduciary care (i.e, delivery value to stakeholders), and, standard of care-with regard to ecosystem products (copping the silly ‘working forests’ moniker in the Olympic Peninsula)?

three, I remain amused by an ongoing ‘dimension obsession’ with regard to channel organic matter (Jenelle Black talk, today). Channel wood. Repeated use of moniker ‘large’ is misleading with respect to channel wood performance over space and time, especially in ‘small’, ‘steep’ stream channel corridors. [As m/any know, fingertip (‘headwater’) channels in stream networks comprise >75% of channel network length, in the Columbia River Basin. From Yaak Libby, MT to Sol Duc Beaver, WA to McKenzie Oakridge, OR-this is truly documented, in my monitoring experience over 40 years.] ‘Large’ wood is an unnecessary and confusing seduction away from evidence-based practice in poorly defined ‘headwater basins’. ALTOOZ (as in, ‘WWWD-Taneum’; chesney, 2009) is an antidote for widespread human performance incompetence about experimental fluvial xylogy. ALTOOZ is a valuable conceptual framework for long term ecological monitoring.

four, well before the CMER August 2021 (many years, and counting), I have posed the question to CMER, with no replies, regarding this-what causal inferences can be, will be, drawn from experimental/natural project events with the two site Spokane-area ‘post-forest hydrology’ study? Two sites, BACI, representing forest hydrology conditions in FFR lands of two-thirds of the Washington state land area? To be clear, TIM LINK, what causal inferences from this ongoing project? Stakeholders need to know about causal inferences from an experiment. Value delivery.

Thank you for your consideration from the perspective of a veteran Experimental Fluvial Xylogist. Columbia River Basin, USA

charles chesney, Public Eye, Prime Monitor

## Conclusion/Review/Action Items

### List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association – Small Forest Landowners

Black, Jenelle	CMER staff scientist
chesney, charles	Member of the Public
Church, Natalie	DNR – Adaptive Management Program Administrative Assistant
Clark, Lori at 12:30PM	DNR Lead Project Manager
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier UPSAG
Engel, Marc	DNR/Policy Co-Chair (for TFW Policy updates)
§Estrella, Stephanie	Department of Ecology (Proxy for Patrick Lizon)
Hawkins, Tracey	DNR Staff
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Jawad, Saboor	AMPA – DNR Adaptive Management Program Administrator
§Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association, CMER Co-Chair
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Martin, Doug left at 1:45PM	Washington Forest Protection Association
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Meleason, Mark	County Caucus
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miller, Ken	Small Forest Landowners
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association, RSAG Chair
Prescott, Alexander	DNR Project Manager
§Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (Proxy for Debbie Kay)
Schofield, Jenny	DNR Project Manager
Stewart, Greg	CMER staff scientist
Stednick, J.D.	
Dr. Sándor F. Tóth	Guest Speaker
Toledo, Anna	DNR Project Manager
Turner, Ted	Weyerhaeuser USPAG Chair
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser ISAG Chair
Weekes, Anne	Conservation Caucus UPSAG
Williamson, Tanner	CMER staff scientist

§CMER Voting Member