

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER) Committee**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, June 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020 // 9:00am to 1:30 pm  
Remotely held using GoToMeeting

*Prepared for CMER by Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Senior Secretary*

<b>Motions 6/23/2020</b>	
<b>Motion</b>	<b>Move/Second (Vote)</b>
Approve the Roads Project Management Plan.	Chris Mendoza/Aimee McIntyre (all thumbs up)
Approve the request from the Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG) to send the comments back to the author of the eDNA report.	Chris Mendoza/Debbie Kay (Patrick Lizon and AJ Kroll sideways, all other thumbs up)
Begin a concurrent review of the WFPA Smart Buffer Proposal Initiation with participation from CMER and SAGs, following the Protocol and Standards Manual.	Harry Bell/Aimee McIntyre (Todd Baldwin and Debbie Kay sideways, Doug Martin recused, Patrick Lizon absent, all other thumbs up)
Approve the May meeting minutes as amended.	Chris Mendoza/Aimee McIntyre (all thumbs up, Patrick Lizon absent)

<b>Action Items 6/23/2020</b>	
<b>Action</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
The updated WFPA Smart Buffer Proposal Initiation Study Design will be sent to CMER, asking people to send their comments to Ben Flint by July 23 <sup>rd</sup> .	Jacob Hibbeln

## Minutes

### **Introductions**

*Mendoza & Hibbeln*

Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Administrative Assistant, took role after which Chris Mendoza, CMER co-chair, reviewed the agenda and asked if caucuses had any suggested changes.

### **WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design**

*Martin*

Doug Martin, WFPA, gave a presentation on the WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design. The study design had been updated since it was sent to CMER. After the presentation, CMER was given the opportunity to ask questions.

Mark Hicks, AMPA, commented that the timeline of the project could be affected by whether or not it would go through ISPR and what kind of review would need to happen and also that the project would have to go through the process according to the Protocol and Standards Manual.

After voting members asked clarifying questions about the study design, Martin's presentation was concluded.

### **May 23, 2020 Meeting Minutes**

*Mendoza & Hibbeln*

Edits suggested by Jenelle Black, CMER Science staff, were reviewed and then added. After this, Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chair, stated that her comments were not included in the minutes sent out and it was agreed that CMER would return to these later. Knoth's comment was addressed at the end of the day, after which minutes were approved.

### **Roads Project Management Plan**

*Ben Flint*

Ben Flint, DNR, went over the main highlights of the Project Management Plan, briefly touching on the main points of each section. This document can be used to provide a framework for future project management plans.

Black reminded CMER that since there is no SAG attached to this project and so it is up to CMER to oversee it and ensure that the projects targets are being reached.

Mendoza then motioned to approve the document and a vote was taken. The motion was passed.

### **eDNA Pilot Project revisions**

*Munes*

Eszter Munes, DNR, briefly summarized the eDNA Pilot project history and stated that the AMP staff spoke to the author and confirmed that the revisions would take 2 weeks over a 3 month period and that the cost would be what was approved by CMER.

Hicks added that CMER is not continuing with the same standard format. This will probably not be an agreement to continue with this as a CMER approved final report. This could be filed as a draft report and labeled as finish even if it does not get approved by CMER. Despite this, it will help with designing future study designs.

Knoth asked if the budget included a data report and Hicks confirmed that this was part of the contract.

## **Assigning Reviewers for the WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design**

*Mendoza*

After Mendoza reviewed the goals of the conversation Todd Baldwin, Kalispell Tribe, stated that he would appreciate more of an explanation from Hicks regarding the correct process for vetting Proposal Initiations. He referenced the Potential Habitat Break study as an example of a study that had not been vetted by CMER. Baldwin's main point was that he would support this Proposal Initiation if it goes through a SAG and then CMER so that it would be fully vetted.

Hicks reminded CMER that the Forest Practices Board Manual allows for outside science such as this to be brought into the system and then outlined the different processes by which outside science can be brought to CMER. Whether or not this review starts with CMER or a SAG has not been decided yet. Mendoza agreed, emphasizing that SAGs should not be excluded from the review process and that a discussion for how this document would be reviewed should be discussed.

Mendoza emphasized that whatever review process is decided on, TFW Policy will need to be made aware of the fact that CMER has other projects prioritized consistent with the CMER Master Schedule that could be further delayed as a result of reviewing this Proposal Initiation. Several members expressed support for a concurrent review in order to provide a more thorough vetting process.

Using ENREP as an example, Baldwin's main criticism of a concurrent review was that it did not go through a SAG first. Therefore, it took more time to review and the process to approval took longer than it could have had it gone through an official SAG review. He argued that the advantage of having a review at the SAG level is that it opens the door for non-voting CMER members to review the document. However, this is not necessarily allowed at CMER.

Knott reminded CMER that voting members are obligated to review projects and that the goal today is to assign reviewers for this study design. Mendoza agreed, adding that there are 2 paths forward:

1. The study design is sent to RSAG for review (Mendoza then stated that the group is already struggling to maintain current project timelines and this would add to the workload). This would involve sending a memo to Policy informing them of the prioritization that would happen as a result of reviewing this project).
2. A concurrent review where CMER and SAG members provide comments to the author.

Baldwin then motioned for the report to go to RSAG for review and then CMER approval, following the Protocol and Standards Manual. Ash Roorbach, NWIFC, commented that doing an official RSAG review could potentially result in further delays for RSAG. Knott responded by stating that a concurrent review could potentially alleviate the RSAG work load. Aimee McIntyre, WDFW, commented although a concurrent review did not work with ENREP, it was successful in the review of the Hard Rock project.

Baldwin stated that this is the first time seeing this Study Design and that much of the issues can be dealt with if RSAG first reviews the document. At McIntyre's request, Joe Murray, RSAG co-chair, specified that this could take up to 2 months if it were a non-consensus document.

Mendoza then called for a vote on the motion which Baldwin had made. The motion did not pass. Mendoza stated that the motion can be modified, after which Murray clarified that 2 months for RSAG to review the document would be a tight timeline. Knott proposed extending the review time from 30 to 45 or 60 days.

After much debate regarding the amount of time it would take to review the document, Harry Bell motioned for a concurrent review. This originally had a time limit of 45 days, but was then edited to reflect the normal review time as outlined in the Protocol and Standards Manual. This would mean a 30 day concurrent review followed by a 30 day period for the author (Doug Martin, WFPA) to review the comments. After it was clarified that a concurrent review would not exclude anyone, a vote was called and the motion to do a concurrent review passed. Patrick Lizon, Ecology, was absent for this vote.

Official reviewers of the WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design are as follows: Debbie Kay, Suquamish Tribe, Mendoza, and Harry Bell. McIntyre stated that WDFW would like to review the document but that she would not like to be on the official list.

Martin agreed to send an updated Study Design to Flint by July 23<sup>rd</sup>, after which he will send to Doug Martin.

### **Report from Policy Meeting**

*Hicks*

Hicks briefly summarized the main decisions made at the last Policy meeting, emphasizing the Small Forest Landowner Dispute Resolution. Murray asked about where Policy was at in terms of prioritizing questions for the Extensive Riparian Vegetation Monitoring (ERVM) workshop. Hicks responded that the recent budget shifts have affected this process and he will know after the budget sub-committee meets.

### **CMER Work Plan Workgroup**

*Mendoza*

Mendoza stated that as soon as something is ready for CMER's review, it will come back to CMER. For now, he is hoping to have something by the next meeting.

### **Public Comment**

Charles Chesney sent some revisions to last month's meeting minutes to Hibbeln. Those edits were incorporated.

### **Conclusion**

*Mendoza and Hibbeln*

Hibbeln reviewed the motions and action items, after which the meeting was adjourned.

## List of Attendees

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
Austin, Brandon	Kalispel Department of Ecology
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispell Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff
chesney, charles	Member of Public
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Flint, Ben	Department of Natural Resources
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
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
Krausz, Eric	Colville Tribe of Indians
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
§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
Thomas, Cody	Spokane Tribe of Indians
Volke, Malia	Department of Natural Resources
Walter, Jason	Weyerhaeuser