

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, September 27, 2022 // 9:00 am – 4:40PM

Hybrid Meeting: In-person and Zoom

| Motions | |
|--|---|
| Motion | Move/Second (Vote) |
| <p>July 2022 Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the July 2022 meeting minutes.</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu)</p> <p>Up: Mark Meleason, Mark Mobbs, Chris Mendoza, Aimee McIntyre, Doug Martin, A.J. Kroll.</p> <p>Absent: Jenny Knoth Ash Roorbach (proxy for Debbie Kay) Harry Bell</p> |
| <p>August 2022 Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu) moved to approve the August 2022 meeting minutes.</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Mark Meleason</p> <p>Up: Aimee McIntyre, A.J. Kroll, Mark Mobbs, Chris Mendoza, Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu), Mark Meleason, and Doug Martin</p> <p>Absent: Harry Bell Ash Roorbach (proxy for Debbie Kay) Jenny Knoth</p> |
| <p>Open Public Comments</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> A.J. Kroll made a motion to have the Public Comments be done in written form. Aimee McIntyre moved to affirm that CMER will continue to accept public comments. “In lieu of oral comments, I further move that CMER establish the day before any CMER meeting as the deadline for written testimonies and that CMER coordinator must circulate all written public testimonies to CMER members by the day of the CMER meeting.”</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Chris Mendoza</p> <p>Up: Chris Mendoza, Aimee McIntyre, Mark Mobbs, Doug Martin, Mark Meleason, Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu), A.J. Kroll</p> <p>Absent: Harry Bell Ash Roorbach (proxy for Debbie Kay) Jenny Knoth</p> |
| <p>FWEP Project Management Plan</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> **** moved to approve the FWEP Project Management Plan</p> <p>The motion passed/failed</p> | <p>Seconded:</p> <p>Up:</p> <p>Sideways:</p> <p>Down:</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Moved to October CMER Meeting</p> | <p>Abstain:</p> <p>Absent: Jenny Knoth</p> |
| <p>PHB Study Design</p> <p>Motion: Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the PHB Study Design.</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Harry Bell (voting for Jenny Knoth as well)</p> <p>Up: Aimee McIntyre, Harry Bell, Doug Martin, Mark Mobbs, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu), and Ash Roorbach (proxy for Debbie Kay)</p> <p>Abstain: Chris Mendoza</p> <p>Absent: Jenny Knoth</p> |
| <p>ISPR for PHB</p> <p>Motion: Aimee McIntyre moved to approve an open ISPR review of the PHB Study Design with the caveats outlined in the request (specifications for review team) and with the assurance that the statistician that has supported the Study Design development will be included</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Mark Meleason</p> <p>Up: Doug Martin, Mark Meleason, Chris Mendoza, Aimee McIntyre, A.J. Kroll, Mark Mobbs, Ash Roorbach (proxy for Debbie Kay), and Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu)</p> <p>Absent: Jenny Knoth</p> |
| <p>Riparian Literature Synthesis</p> <p>Motion: Chris Mendoza moved to approve the Riparian Function Literature Synthesis request by RSAG.</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Mark Meleason</p> <p>Up: Chris Mendoza, Mark Meleason, Aimee McIntyre, Mark Mobbs, A.J. Kroll, and Harry Bell (voting for Jenny Knoth as well)</p> <p>Sideways: Doug Martin, Ash Roorbach (proxy for Debbie Kay), Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu)</p> <p>Absent: Jenny Knoth</p> |
| <p>RSAG/LWAG Work Plan</p> <p>Motion: Chris Mendoza moved to approve the RSAG and LWAG Work Plan edits.</p> <p>The motion failed</p> | <p>Seconded: Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu)</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, A.J. Kroll, Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu), Mark Mobbs, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, and Ash Roorbach (proxy for Debbie Kay)</p> <p>Sideways: Jenny Knoth (Harry Bell is voting for Jenny Knoth as well)</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Down: Mark Meleason</p> <p>Absent: Jenny Knoth</p> |
| <p>LWAG Work Plan</p> <p>Motion: Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu) moved to approve the LWAG Work Plan edits.</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Harry Bell (voting for Jenny Knoth as well)</p> <p>Up: A.J. Kroll, Doug Martin, Ash Roorbach (proxy for Debbie Kay), Chris Mendoza, Mark Meleason, Joe Murray (proxy for Julie Dieu), Aimee McIntyre, Harry Bell (voting for Jenny Knoth as well), and Mark Mobbs</p> <p>Absent: Jenny Knoth</p> |

| Action Items | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Action Items | Responsibility |
| Open Public Meeting Act will be an agenda item 30-45 minutes | October Meeting Saboor Jawad |
| Send out PowerPoint presentation from the Science Review of AMP | Natalie Church |
| Two weeks is the deadline to submit comments to Tanner and Jenny on FWEP Project Management Plan | CMER members |
| FWEP Project Management | October Agenda |
| RSAG will address issue of the BACI language in the Work Plan and bring forward to CMER next month | October Agenda |
| Westside Type F Exploratory Report | October Agenda |
| Westside Type F Exploratory Report PM/AMPA Meeting | Project Managers to schedule |

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

A.J. Kroll, CMER co-chair

Natalie Church took roll call

Read the below ground rules:

- Aimee McIntyre read: Be realistic in your availability and ability to carry out action items.
- Mark Meleason read: Be concise and to the point.

Saboor Jawad discussed the below updates:

- Forest Practices Board will receive information about Type N dispute at their next meeting. He also explained the field trip is scheduled but the location not decided yet.
- Smart Buffer Design – final decision in mailing and concluded will also inform TFW Policy of the outcome.
- Greg Stewart will be leaving and Jenelle and Saboor will be finding a replacement.
- There is work being done on SharePoint for the AMP. Once completed Lori and Saboor will reach out to everyone individually for the training.

Open Public Comments

Saboor Jawad reviewed the Open Public Meeting requirements. He gave a couple different options: continue the oral comments at the end of the meeting or have written comments sent to the CMER Coordinator and they will send it out prior to the CMER meeting. He explained that we cannot regulate the comments unless there are disruptive comments. The definition of disruptive comment is a direct threat toward an individual at the meeting. Aimee McIntyre asked what the timeframe for comments, Saboor responded that that oral comments should be around 3-5 minutes but he doesn't see a reason to restrict written comments. Mark Mobbs asked what if a member of the public would like to comment on a topic during the meeting. Saboor responded that the co-chairs would need to recognize the individual to speak. Aimee explained that the member of the public could be a guest speaker and they can make comments during their presentation/agenda item. Saboor explained that it would be like what we do now, people have to raise their hand and the co-chair calls on them. A.J. Kroll made a motion to have the Public Comments be done in written form. It was decided that the Public Comments will be done in written format. Saboor stated that this change will take place next month.

Science Review of AMP

Saboor Jawad gave a brief description of the Science Review of AMP Study. Tim Quinn also gave a brief description and introduced Dr. Alex McInturff and Gretchen Sneegrass from the University of Washington. Gretchen reviewed her PowerPoint presentation and discussed the study design. Alex made comments throughout Gretchen's presentation. Natalie Church will send out the PowerPoint presentation to the CMER members after meeting

FWEP Project Management Plan

Tanner Williamson explained that Aimee McIntyre made comments that he tried to address prior to this meeting and he will finish addressing all of them. Jenny Schofield gave a brief overview of the project management plan. Aimee explained her reasoning of her comments that she sent to Tanner and thanked him for addressing her comments. Chris Mendoza explained that he feels it important to note what prior approved documents that are entered into the project management plan. He also asked if the project management plan replace the implementation plan. Jenny Schofield explained that this is a live document and if there were any changes to the document it would be brought back to CMER for approval. Saboor explained that this was previously the implementation plan and it was changed to the project management plan. Chris suggested to make a distinction between the two. In Decision-Making Authority section of the project management plan there needs to be clarification on Policy's role in this. Chris stated that as long as the table stays intact we should be able to draw from it. Aimee McIntyre asked how we should proceed with the project management plan. Jenny Schofield suggested that Tanner address the rest of Aimee's comments and update the document and review/vote at next month's meeting.

PHB Study Design

Anna Toledo explained that there are two different requests for the PHB Study Design. She explained that this study design was not approved last month and the project team has been working diligently to address

comments. The current request is to approve the study design. Chris Mendoza stated that he wanted to have noted that the three proposals have been moved to two proposals. The Eastside Tribes withdrew their proposal. Jason Walter stated that even though the study shows that there are three proposals it should not be a concern since there are no caucus names listed on each proposal. Saboor explained that there are two different decision items as CMER needs to approve the study design as it is currently presented and then it will go to a decision to have ISPR. He explained that the open ISPR does not mean that is open ended. A.J. Kroll asked what the next step would be if the study design is approved but the ISPR is not. Saboor explained that it will go to implementation.

ISPR for PHB

Chris Mendoza explained that it was his understanding that an ISAG request for an open ISPR review of the PHB Study Design would not be sent to CMER. Saboor explained that there is a request to CMER for an open ISPR review process. If it is going to be a double blind ISPR, CMER does not need to approve this because the double blind is the default ISPR. Doug Martin mentioned that bullet three on the CMER request needs to have author statistician listed. He explained that this is a complex study with a lot of moving components in it, which is his reasoning for wanting to have an open ISPR review. John Heimburg discussed that there was a discussion at the ISAG meeting on how this study is time-consuming, which is his reasoning for the open ISPR. Chris explained that he feels like the double blind would be the best and explained that open ISPR reviews are rare. Chris explained that his study has been peer reviewed outside of CMER through the Forest Practices Board and the reviews should be on hand to help with the review. Chris stated that he is willing to help the AMPA to gather the list of people that reviewed it previously to help. Jason explained that there are specific guidelines for the open ISPR. Saboor explained that in an open ISPR, CMER does not get to pick who the reviewers will be but can provide input on desired expertise. It was decided that an open ISPR will be done for this study.

Riparian Function Literature Synthesis

Anna Toledo explained the request and gave a brief overview of the history and details of the Riparian Function Literature Synthesis. She also explained that all of the comments were addressed. Joe Murray asked how useful this document will be for TFW Policy. Ash Roorbach suggested that there should be a discussion with TFW Policy to see if it will be useful. Saboor explained that this is a decision item for Policy's October meeting. A.J. explained that there is a concern in getting the work completed and it could be useful to discuss the overlap of Extensive Monitoring, Westside Type F, and Riparian Function Literature Synthesis. Saboor explained that TFW Policy is the one that put it on the MPS and it needs to be sent back to TFW Policy for them to make a decision. He also explained that the decision today is that CMER approves the changes that RSAG made to the document, then it will be sent back to TFW Policy. Mark Meleason mentioned that the name is listed different throughout the document and that needs to be corrected. Saboor took note of this.

CMER Work Plan Review (RSAG/LWAG)

Lori Clark explained that section one and four will be discussed at the next month's meeting. Lori went through and reviewed the changes and updates to the RSAG and LWAG Work Plan sections. The RSAG Work Plan did not pass and will go back to RSAG and if they are not able to reach consensus it will then go into dispute. Saboor explained that the person who called the dispute is a person will state if they approve or not. Saboor posted in the chat box "from the six questions document: 5. What is the relationship between this study and any others that may be planned, underway, or recently completed? This would need to be answered before we change the work plan". The reasoning for the RSAG Work Plan not being approved was that it listed a BACI study will be done. Jenelle Black explained that it is not whether we do a BACI it is whether we leave the language as is or if we need to change it. Chris Mendoza explained that this was the previously approved language. Doug Martin explained that the Work Plan is a summary of what we have done. A.J. Kroll clarified with Saboor and then explained that at this

time if you want to have the Work Plan move forward now is the time to call dispute and if not we are sending it back to RSAG and bring forward October CMER meeting. It was decided to have the Work Plan to be sent back to RSAG and see if they can come to consensus and then have it brought back to CMER next month.

Westside Type F Exploratory Report

Jenelle Black gave a brief update on the status of report. She stated that they found an error from the beginning of report and had to update the data throughout the document. Harry Bell asked if it would make sense to put outline the critical questions that need to be addressed in the future. Jenelle explained that the critical questions are not touched on in the document. She can anticipate doing that it could add time and she does not feel like it is something that needs to be done. Saboor explained that this report is significantly late. It was supposed to go to the Forest Practices Board February last year. He will inform the Forest Practices Board at their November meeting that there is a need to change the time again. He is asking Jenelle to have a definitive date of completion. Chris objectives of the study are laid out and he doesn't feel that it needs to be changed. Saboor stated that we cannot have a discussion on the study without having the final report for this study. Jenelle stated the timeline will be two weeks for completion. It was decided that there will be a meeting with the reviewers, Project Managers, and the AMPA to help address comments that contradict each other. It was also decided that this will be on the October meeting agenda as a decision item. A.J. Kroll stated that he will be invoking dispute next month if this is not taken care of.

TFW Policy Updates

Court Stanley gave an update on what was discussed at the September TFW Policy meeting.

CMER SAG Updates

Each SAG reviewed the live document and gave an update as needed. Live document was updated while reviewing each SAG reviewed their projects.

List of Attendees

| Attendees | Representing |
|------------------|---|
| §Baldwin, Todd | Kalispel Tribe of Indians |
| §Bell, Harry | Washington Farm Forestry Association – Small Forest Landowners (voting for Jenny Knoth as well) |
| Black, Jenelle | NWIFC CMER Scientist |
| Church, Natalie | DNR – CMER Coordinator |
| Clark, Lori | DNR Project Manager |
| Greenwood, Emma | Spokane Tribe of Indians |
| Hawkins, Tracy | DNR Staff |
| Heimburg, John | |
| Hooks, Doug | Washington Forest Protection Association |
| Jawad, Saboor | DNR – Adaptive Management Program Administrator |
| §Martin, Doug | Washington Forest Protection Association |
| §McIntyre, Aimee | Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife |
| McIntruff, Alex | University of Washington |
| §Meleason, Mark | County Caucus |
| §Mendoza, Chris | Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| §Mobbs, Mark | Quinault Indian Nation |
| Murray, Joe | Washington Forest Protection Association |
| Prescott, Alexander | DNR Project Manager |
| Quinn, Timothy | WDFW Habitat Program, Chief Scientist |
| Roorbach, Ash | Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission |
| Rubin, Rachel | DNR CMER Scientist |
| Schofield, Jenny | DNR Project Manager |
| Sneegas, Gretchen | University of Washington |
| Stewart, Greg | NWIFC, CMER Scientist |
| Toledo, Anna | DNR Project Manager |
| Walter, Jason | ISAG co-chair |
| Williamson, Tanner | CMER Scientist |

§CMER Voting Member