

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research (CMER) Committee

Tuesday, October 27, 2020 // 9:00 am – 4:00 pm

Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Prepared for CMER by Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Secretary Senior

Motions October 27 th , 2020	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
Approve the September 22 meeting minutes as amended.	Chris Mendoza/Aimee McIntyre (Up: Chris Mendoza, Ash Roorbach, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin, A.J. Kroll, Doug Martin, Debbie Kay)
Approve the edits to the CMER work plan presented by ISAG.	Chris Mendoza/Aimee McIntyre (Up: Chris Mendoza, Ash Roorbach, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Todd Baldwin, A.J. Kroll)
Approve the edits to the CMER work plan presented by WetSAG.	Chris Mendoza/Aimee McIntyre (Up: Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin, Todd Baldwin, Doug Martin, A.J. Kroll, Ash Roorbach)
Include Joe Murray and William Ehinger as a representative at the at the Extensive Monitoring Workshop Agenda subgroup formed by Policy. If Ehinger cannot attend, Mendoza will attend in his stead.	Harry Bell/Doug Martin (Up: Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, A.J. Kroll, Ash Roorbach)

Action Items	
Action Item	Responsibility
Comments on the WIP Tool Phase II Final Report are due COB on November 27 th , 2020.	CMER, assigned reviewers (Todd Baldwin, Kalispel tribe, Patrick Lizon, Ecology, and Julie Dieu, Rayonier)
Presentations from the day's meeting will be distributed to CMER.	Jacob Hibbeln
Project Managers will work with Chris Mendoza and Jacob Hibbeln to fill out the CMER Reviewer table with existing projects and project reviewers.	Project Managers, Chris Mendoza, Jacob Hibbeln
Regarding the Smart Buffer Review, comments are due by November 13 th . Everyone should send their comments to Ben Flint. A conversation of how to	CMER

proceed with comments will be discussed at the November CMER meeting.	
Assuming the RCS Study Design is approved by RSAG on November 20 th , it will be distributed to CMER with comments due on December 21 st . Reviewers will be assigned at the November 17 th CMER meeting.	CMER, Jacob Hibbeln

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

Chris Mendoza, co-chair

After roll was taken, Mendoza began the meeting by asking someone to read two ground rules. After edits were reviewed, Mendoza made motion #1 to approve the September meeting minutes as amended.

Roads Project Modeling Effort Presentation

Amanda Manaster, University of Washington and Charlie Luce, Project Investigator (USFS)

After Manaster presented on fine sediment production, CMER members were given the opportunity to ask clarifying or supplemental questions.

Wetlands Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Tool Phase II

Meghan Halabisky, University of Washington

Heather Gibbs, DNR, introduced the WIP Tool, stating that the intention of Phase I (completed in 2018) was to create the tool. Phase II is focused on training the model and doing field validation. After this presentation, reviewers for the final report were requested.

Once Halabisky presented, CMER members were given the opportunity to ask clarifying or supplemental questions. Halabisky stated that she would send Jenelle Black, CMER Scientist, a link to where she can find the data set referred to in the presentation.

Comments on the final report are due by close of business on November 27th, starting the 30-day clock. Todd Baldwin, Kalispel tribe, Patrick Lizon, Ecology, and Julie Dieu, Rayonier, volunteered to review. Mendoza reminded the group that WetSAG has already seen this.

Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project (EMEP) Presentation

Kai Ross, Cramer Fish Sciences

Gibbs first explained that this project was halted in ISPR for about a year. The final report was approved by ISPR about a month ago and SAGE will be asking for approval at the November CMER meeting.

Ross gave his presentation, after which CMER members had the opportunity to ask clarifying or supplemental questions.

Doug Martin, WFPA, asked if comments from ISPR were sent out. If not, he requested a copy. Gibbs responded that she would have to check with Mark Hicks, AMPA before these are sent out. Hicks stated that different AMPA's have dealt with ISPR comments differently over time and that he will search for documents relative to the ISPR review of EMEP. Hicks sent the comments to Doug Martin, and the Co-Chairs and Jacob Hibbeln, later in the meeting for circulation.

Harry Bell, WFPA, asked who would complete the 6 questions component. Mendoza stated that SAGE will but might consider asking the Principal Investigator (PI) to answer questions 4a and 4b. Gibbs added that Ross has already completed said questions and that Baldwin, Teresa Miskovic, DNR, and herself will cooperate to answer the remaining questions.

The goal is to have the EMEP Final Report up for review at the November CMER meeting.

Hard Rock Phase II and Soft Rock Status Update

Aimee McIntyre, WDFW and Bill Ehinger, Ecology

McIntyre stated that the authors are currently addressing comments made by ISPR and that the revised chapters are due at the end of the month. Once they go through ISPR again, the project team will work with ISPR to get approval. Approval is needed on all chapters, after which the project team will combine the chapters into one final report which will be brought to CMER for approval.

Mendoza commented that this needs to get to the TFW Policy committee as soon as possible because the Type Np Workgroup is reliant on this for completing their recommendations.

Jenny Knoth, co-chair, then asked Ehinger if he would be ready to present some extended monitoring data for Soft Rock for the spring. Ehinger responded that he will not be ready to present on the extended monitoring Soft Rock data until April of 2021. Hard Rock temperature data has been analyzed and can be presented on anytime.

Ehinger then clarified that the Soft Rock chapters were trickling in to ISPR and that getting them back at the end of February is a reasonable estimate. Hicks spoke up, stating that there will be a delay on synthesis work until the end of the year due to the heavy workload of the associate editor.

McIntyre then mentioned that there is a summary/conclusions chapter for the Phase 2 Hard Rock study that is not being sent to ISPR at the moment because the project team needs approval on the other chapters before the conclusions chapter can be completed.

Harry Bell, WFPA, agreed with Mendoza in that Hard Rock should be sent out as soon as possible and then once the data from Soft Rock is received, Ehinger can do a comparison between the two. Ehinger emphasized that he could present on Hard Rock extended monitoring data to the Type Np work group anytime.

Gibbs then stated that although the Type Np Workgroup would like to see the final documents, they are not letting that hold up the delivery of their recommendations.

Discussion on Project Reviewers

Mendoza

The purpose of this conversation was to review which people were reviewing which projects. Mendoza reminded the group that if one does not have time to review a document, he or she can always designate someone to review for them if one still wants to participate in the review process. Mendoza proposed that the table be updated, starting with 2020 projects.

After an inquiry from Joe Murray, WFPA, Mendoza suggested adding dates that reviews are due from now on. Black asked who would maintain the table, to which Mendoza responded that it could be a joint effort between the co-chairs and project managers. Miskovic suggested that project managers could update this when the CMER SAG updates are drafted every month. Hicks suggested that this table could be sent out in the mailing and be updated on screen whenever reviewers are assigned to a document.

CMER Work Plan Edits

Gibbs

Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG)

Gibbs displayed edits made by ISAG to section 5.1 of the CMER Work Plan. Edits were mainly pertaining to the eDNA and Potential Habitat Break (PHB) projects. Mendoza made motion #2 to approve the edits made by ISAG. The motion passed.

Wetlands Scientific Advisory Group (WetSAG)

Gibbs explained that the document sent out contained ISAG, WetSAG, and RSAG edits. However, RSAG edits were not discussed today. WetSAG mainly edited section 5.9, many of which were regarding the Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project (FWEP). Gibbs also specified that due to a lack of funding, WetSAG will be doing much of the work on the Wetlands Management Zone (WMZ) Effectiveness Monitoring project. Gibbs reviewed the timeline, concluding that this is expected to be ready for CMER approval early 2021. Mendoza then made motion #3 to approve the WetSAG edits to the CMER work plan. The motion passed.

SFL Template Review Update

Knoth

Knoth stated that the workgroup is continuing the review of the template and she has sent the request for a 30 day extension to Policy. A comment matrix has been assembled and that the hope is to have something for review at the November meeting.

Smart Buffer response from author update

Doug Martin, WFPA and Ben Flint, DNR

Martin stated that he essentially rewrote the study design based on all the comments made and indicated in the comment matrix what was addressed. Flint added that this was sent out on October 6th for review, so according to the standard timeline, comments would be due on November 6th. Ash Roorbach, NWIFC, expressed concern about timing and a new due date of November 13th was decided on.

Regarding next steps, Mendoza expressed that it would be beneficial to send this back to Policy. Hicks added that a potential next step for the study could be to generate a pilot rule by the Forest Practices Board. For this to happen, it would first have to be approved by CMER. It is important to ensure that sending this report to Policy does not slow down the CMER process.

WetSAG Outside Publication of WIP

Mendoza

Mendoza stated that permission must be granted to use data points for the report. Black pointed out that one of the concerns could be with landowners, assuming that data is coming from their land. Mendoza stated this probably is not a huge concern here because much of the data came from the Mashel watershed. However, for the methods paper, the source of the data would have to be double checked.

Hicks added that this information will be put on the public site; therefore, information about landowner agreements should be gathered to see if landowners are okay with any data being displayed publicly.

NCASI (National Council for Air and Stream Improvement) Involvement in Roads Project

Flint and Dieu

Dieu stated that NCASI has known about this project since before the scoping phase and then gave a brief history of NCASI's involvement in the project. What makes the most sense is for NCASI to provide financial support certain project aspects that are not inherently covered by CMER.

Black stated that she will be sending NCASI a list of CMER expenses, much of which is in field work. In total, NCASI will contribute about \$40,000 while the CMER contribution is \$135,000.

Mendoza pointed out that some outside cooperators are not aware of the CMER process and that NCASI needs to be very clear that they are not part of that. Hicks responded that a conversation about involvement needs to be had in order to stay true to the CMER process.

Roads Prescription Project Update

Flint

Flint stated that he had recently met with the DNR heavy equipment crew regarding road maintenance in the volcanic provinces and that a new site installation is scheduled for the beginning of November. The target is to have all sites up and running by the end of November. Recently, there have been several process improvements made in order to ensure that data will be collected properly through the water season.

CMER SAG Updates

Mendoza

Flint first stated that, at some member's request, the SAG Updates have been condensed to make them more readable and that any feedback is welcome.

Joe Murray, WFPA, commented that an RSAG meeting was recently rescheduled to accommodate an early CMER meeting in November. The Riparian, Characteristics, and Shade (RCS) study design will hopefully be approved. Miskovic added that she is hoping to send out the study design after it is approved by RSAG. Assuming it is approved by RSAG on November 20th, comments would be due on December 21st. It was decided assigning reviewers can wait until the November 17th CMER meeting.

TFW Policy Agenda Review

Hicks

Hicks first updated CMER on the SFL Dispute Resolution, stating that the group is currently searching for a mediator.

After going through the main points of the Policy agenda, Knoth asked if there was a CMER member willing to help the Extensive Monitoring Workshop Workgroup. If not, she would be willing to help. Murray stated that he had volunteered to help, after which Mendoza expressed that he would prefer Ehinger to be a part of the group. Roorbach added that Policy would like some help putting together an agenda for the workshop because many people involved in Policy are not clear about what extensive monitoring would accomplish; he advised that the co-chairs be part of the workgroup.

Bell made motion #4 to include Murray as a CMER representative at the Extensive Monitoring Workshop Workgroup. After further discussion, the motion was revised to include Ehinger. If Ehinger is unable to participate, Mendoza will take his place.

Public Comment

charles chesney inquired about the purpose of having IMS as a database for CMER. Hicks responded that this system contains a lot of detailed information on projects and monitoring projects which also helps when CMER wants to look into information from past studies. There is also proprietary information on IMS. Mendoza told chesney that he can complete a public disclosure request if he would like more information.

chesney then asked how he could elevate his request for a formal meeting event for a discussion on causal inference from natural experiments. He inquired if there is any interest in CMER to look more into causal inferences.

Conclusions

Hibbeln and Mendoza

After Hibbeln reviewed the motions and action items on screen, Miskovic reminded CMER that comments on the ETHEP scoping document are due on November 16th. Mendoza reminded the group that the November CMER meeting will take place on November 17th.

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Flint, Ben	Department of Natural Resources
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Halabisky, Meghan	University of Washington
Hibbeln, Jacob	CMER
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
Luce, Charlie	US Forest Service
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
Manaster, Amanda	University of Washington
§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

Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Roni, Phil	Cramer Fish Sciences
Ross, Kai	Cramer Fish Sciences
Stewart, Greg	CMER
Walter, Jason	ISAG co-chair
Volke, Malia	CMER