

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee

Tuesday, January 26, 2021 // 9:00 am – 5:30 pm

Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Motions January 26, 2021	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
Approve CMER December 2020 Meeting Minutes	Aimee M. moved to approve minutes, Bell 2 nd – no objections. Unanimously approved by all voting CMER members in attendance.
Bell crafted a motion in chat box for consideration: CMER write a consensus technical pro and con analysis of the additional treatments and an updated total cost analysis to present to policy as a charter update.	There was no second to move Bell’s motion to a vote.
Mendoza moves to approve the RCS study design.	Seconded by Patrick Lizon. Votes: Kay yes, Mobbs sideways, Baldwin no, McIntyre yes, Martin sideways, Julie D sideways, A.J sideways, Harry Bell no, Mendoza yes, Lizon yes. Motion fails to pass
Motion from J. Knoth (copied from the chat box): CMER will review RCS add-on proposal recommendations adding four additional treatment prescriptions to the RCS study design.	Rescind (for clarity)
Motion from J. Knoth (copied from chat box): CMER approves RCS add-on proposal recommendations adding four additional treatment prescriptions to the RCS study design.	Seconded by Doug Martin Votes: D. Martin yes, H. Bell yes, Julie D. yes, A.J. Kroll sideways, Ash R. sideways (proxy for Debbie Kay), A. McIntyre no, Mark Mobbs no, P. Lizon no, C. Mendoza no., T. Baldwin no. Motion fails to pass
H. Bell moves for SFLO add-on treatments: Motion (copied from chat box): CMER write a consensus technical pro and con analysis of the additional treatments and an updated total cost	Seconded by Doug Martin Votes: D. Martin up, Ash R. (proxy for D. Kay) down, T. Baldwin down, A. McIntyre down, Julie D. up, P. Lizon down, A.J. Kroll

analysis to present to policy as a scope and charter update.	sideways, M. Mobbs down, H. Bell up, Mendoza down Motion fails – Bell calls for dispute resolution.
Motion from Aimee McIntyre: I move to support Bill's proposal that any stream temperature data collected beyond that presented in the Hard Rock Phase II report be included as an addendum to that report.	Seconded by Ash R. Votes: Motion passes unanimously by all CMER voting members in attendance giving thumbs up.
H. Bell moves to approve SAGE EMEP draft answers to CMER 6 Questions	Seconded by T. Baldwin Votes: Motion passes unanimously by all CMER voting members in attendance giving thumbs up. (Ash R. with proxy vote for Debbie Kay.)
Patrick Lizon moves to approve the project summary sheets to go to policy.	Seconded by Debbie Kay. Votes: Motion passes unanimously by all CMER voting members in attendance giving thumbs up.
Debbie Kay moved to approve the 2021-2023 CMER Work plan.	Seconded by Aimee McIntyre. Votes: Motion passes unanimously by all CMER voting members in attendance giving thumbs up.

Action Items 1/26/2021	
Action Item	Responsibility
Get copy of Road BMP presentation from Project Team to distribute to CMER. Charlie Luce will send the presentation in a PDF format.	C. Mendoza
P. Lizon invokes dispute resolution on violation of ground rules/ process by landowner caucus on submission of SFLO treatments to RCS add on.	AMPA (Hicks) and CMER co-chairs (Mendoza and Knoth) will have informal meeting to discuss next steps.

Harry Bell calls for dispute resolution on his last motion that failed.	CMER will have an informal meeting consistent with using the guided decision making process. AMPA and CMER co-chairs will work together to carve out path forward on DR.
Harry Bell will send revised SFL DR proposal to E. Munes by 2/8/21. E. Munes will distribute to the SFL Template workgroup prior to their meeting on 2/17/21 and will also include in the CMER mailing on 2/16/21.	H. Bell and E. Munes

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chair

Ground rules: State motivations and justification clearly.

December 2020 Meeting Minutes:

Comments

T. Baldwin asked question about Pilot rule making for ENREP proposal. Question answered by M. Hicks.

Aimee M moved to approve minutes, Bell 2nd – no objections, approved.

Roads BMP Project Presentation:

Project Team Member Charlie Luce Presents

C. Mendoza asked about the lag time between the road sediment production from truck traffic conveyed via the ditch line and time for the water to be clear of sediment.

Ash R. asked question about sediment accumulation in the bed of the road ditch line that may not get conveyed to tipping bucket.

Jenny K. asked about the ditches that are cleared and cleaned, and if they eventually get revegetated?

J. Murray asked if there are investigations into the type of revegetation for road ditches. Are non-invasive species being used?

G. Stewart asked questions related to the transport capacity and transport limited systems from graph.

Mendoza assignment: Get presentation from project team to distribute to CMER. PDF format.

RCS study design approval, CMER agenda decision item.

Teresa M. project manager

Discussion

Baldwin - CMER reviewer - stated that 25 ft. buffers are no longer feasible to study because with potential for RMZ tree blowdown the response to streams from shade loss is already well known. He has concerns about how it would apply to eastside RMZs, and that uplands could be an alternative to testing shade loss on streams.

Hicks stated that the 25 ft. RMZ treatment was previously decided on during the project scoping review process by consensus from TFW Policy, Westside no-cut buffer width was reduced from 30 ft. in initial draft scoping document. Hicks further stated the 25 ft. was settled on because it serves multiple purposes by TFW Policy.

Bell stated that he is hoping to look at the pros and cons of the additional treatment from the SFLO add-on. Specifically looking at costs. Bell further stated that Policy should have a say in the add-on. He would like the RCS Charter changed to approve the SFLO add-on.

Mendoza clarified that the SFLO add-on was not part of the RCS study design that RSAG approved and sent to CMER for review in December 2020, and that it was a separate issue to be addressed on the agenda next.

Murray stated that the RCS study design was a major rewrite.

Hicks stated that you cannot change the scope of a study design that was previously agreed to and approved by CMER and TFW Policy without consensus by both committees. He said that Scoping set the direction of the study design and included the specifics widths of the prescriptions to be tested, and they need to be consistent once approved.

Martin stated he believes that study design authors (Siskowet) allowed for change to targets different from what was previously approved by CMER and Policy during scoping.

Knoth stated that she recognized there is lots of history with the project and asked if there are technical gaps that need to be filled with the SFLO add on.

J. Black stated that the add-on will not take way from the initial study design's intent.

Knoth stated that following the CMER PSM can stifle creativity. When new information comes from a source it should be considered for incorporation into a CMER study regardless of where the study is in the design process.

Bell stated that he is willing to defer discussion until after next agenda item - CMER considering SFLO add-on treatments.

P. Lizon stated that as part of the work group he questioned the usefulness of testing a 25 ft. RMZ, and the work group told him that the 25 ft. treatment had to stay in because TFW Policy previously approved it. He then raised the question of why now suddenly landowners were proposing testing buffers narrower than 25 ft. outside the scope of what Policy already approved.

Mendoza referred to his email chain sent to RSAG in CMER mailout. He also stated that RSAG/CMER made a recommendation via memo to TFW Policy not to pursue additional shade modeling by Ecology in the RCS study, and that Policy approved that recommendation.

Martin stated that contractor Siskewit left room in their original version of the study design for the SFLO add-on treatments and modeling.

B. Ehinger stated that no one has shown the need for modeling including CMER or TFW Policy based on prior decisions by both committees.

Bell crafted a motion in chat box for consideration:

Motion by Bell (copied from chat box): "CMER write a consensus technical pro and con analysis of the additional treatments and an updated total cost analysis to present to policy as a scope and charter update." There was no second to bring Bell's motion to a vote.

More discussion on SFLO add-on from CMER members, Project Managers and CMER staff.

Mendoza called for point of order and asked to follow agenda by taking vote as per the decision listed on the CMER agenda to approve the RCS study design.

Mendoza moves to approve the RCS study design received by CMER in mailout (motion in chat box), Seconded by P. Lizon.

Votes: Kay up, Mobbs sideways, Baldwin down, Aimee up, Doug M sideways, Julie D sideways, A.J sideways, Harry Bell down, Mendoza up, Patrick up.

Motions fails. No Dispute Resolution called

Further discussion on reasons for failing to pass motion lead by Baldwin with replies from Hicks, A. McIntyre, and J. Black.

RCS – SFLO treatment add-on, CMER agenda decision item.

Teresa M. Project Manager

Discussion by CMER several members on SFLO add-on treatments to RCS study design.

Motion from J. Knoth (copied from chat box): CMER approves RCS add-on proposal recommendations adding four additional treatment prescriptions to the RCS study design.

Seconded by Doug Martin.

Votes: Doug M. up, Harry Bell up, Julie D. up, A.J. Kroll sideways, Ash R. sideways (proxy for Debbie Kay), Aimee M. down, Mark Mobbs down, Patrick Lizon down, Mendoza down, Todd Baldwin down.

Motion failed. No dispute resolution called.

Patrick invokes dispute resolution on violation of ground rules/ process by landowner caucus on submission of SFLO treatments to RCS add on.

Mark Hicks recommends CMER co-chairs meet with AMPA to help P. Lizon and CMER clarify next steps for informal meeting

Discussion involved how to begin the DR process using the guided decision making process from the AMP board manual (Section 22). CMER can have an informal meeting, first with AMPA and CMER co-chairs

H. Bell moves for SFLO add-on treatments: Motion (copied from chat box): CMER write a consensus technical pro and con analysis of the additional treatments and an updated total cost analysis to present to policy as a scope and charter update.

Votes: D. Martin up, Ash R. down, T. Baldwin down, A. McIntyre down, Julie D. up, P. Lizon down, A.J. Kroll sideways, M. Mobbs down, Bell up, Mendoza down,

Motion fails. Harry Bell calls for dispute resolution.

Discussion involving how to begin the DR process. CMER can have an informal meeting. AMPA and CMER co-chairs will work together to carve out path forward on DR.

Hard Rock Extended Temperature Monitoring Data

Update by Bill Ehinger:

Several CMER members asked questions of clarification answered by Bill.

Motion from Aimee McIntyre: I move to support Bill's proposal that any stream temperature data collected beyond that presented in the Hard Rock Phase II report be included as an addendum to that report.

Seconded Ash R.

Motion passes unanimously by all in prior motion votes.

Decision: Approve format to report extended monitoring temperature data

Update on ISPR review of Hard Rock phase II

Chapters will be coming in intermittently for CMER review.

D. Martin requested comments from all 3 ISPR reviewers on Hard Rock phase II report. Mark Hicks stated that he needs to ensure that reviewer names are not revealed to maintain double blind review protocols. Hicks further states that DNR is taking steps to comply with public disclosure requests based on new DNR procedures.

Approval of SAGE EMEP draft answers to CMER 6 Questions

Harry Bell moves to approve

Seconded by Todd Baldwin. Motion passes unanimously by all prior CMER members Debbie Kay is not back so Ash is proxy vote.

Approval of Project Summary sheets for Policy budget meeting.

Minor revisions were made to update current status of a few projects, e.g., RCS Study design summary sheet, Hard Rock Phase II summary sheet, based on prior decisions made at today's meeting recorded above.

Patrick Lizon moves to approve the project summary sheets to go to policy. Seconded by Debbie Kay.

Motion passes unanimously by all in attendance.

CMER work plan approval

Presented by Heather Gibbs

CMER agreed to remove the table in Executive Summary of the work plan.

Debbie Kay moved to approve the CMER Work plan. Seconded by AimeeM.

Vote: approved unanimously by all voting member present.

Smart Buffer Update

The author (D. Martin) has responded to initial comments by reviewers they felt were not adequately addressed in his last round of revisions. The latest draft was emailed out last Friday (January 22, 2021) so there was not adequate time of CMER reviewer to provide feedback by today's meeting. CMER agreed to face to face meeting with the author after February RSAG meeting Thursday. Comments on latest revision are due to PM Eszter M. by Monday February 8, 2021.

Harry Bell SFLO Dispute Resolution Request

Harry Bell stated the SFLO Template Six Questions Document needs to be resurrected. He presented a draft Dispute Resolution proposal over lack of work on the Six Questions, indicating the written document follows the Board Manual guidance for dispute resolution. Ash R. suggested he also consider the guided decision making process from the PSM. Harry will make revisions to align to PSM guidance.

Harry Bell will send revised SFL DR proposal to E. Munes by 2/8/21. E. Munes will distribute to the SFL Template workgroup prior to their meeting on 2/17/21 and will also include in the CMER mailing on 2/16/21. The workgroup will discuss the proposal during the same meeting as the SFL memo to Policy will be revised.

Public Comment

ONE-regarding Tom Black and Charlie Luce work, in western Oregon, years ago- what are Lessons Learned from that roads project (erosion, sedimentation, elaborate and complex measurements)?

TWO-what are planned causal inference steps from the CMER roads project regarding fine sediment delivery to water bodies (channels, wetlands)?

Conclusions

None

Adjourned at 5:33pm

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER Staff
charles chesney	Member of general public
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Gibbs, Heather	AMP Project Manager
Hicks, Mark	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ WSAC, CMER co-chair
Krausz, Eric	Colville Tribe
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser, Washington Forest Protection Association
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	AMP Project Manager
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Munes, Eszter	AMP Project Manager
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Debbie Kay	Northwest Indian Fish Commission
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fish Commission
Thomas, Cody	Spokane Tribe
Stewart, Greg	CMER Staff
Volke, Malia	CMER Staff