Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research Committee (CMER)
March 27, 2018
Hal Holmes Community Center, Ellensburg, WA

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe
§Bell, Harry (ph)	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Berge, Hans	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
chesney, charles	Member of the Public
§Dieu, Julie (ph)	Rayonier
Davis, Emily	Northwest Indian Fish Commission – CMER Staff
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Haemmerle, Howard	Department of Natural Resources
§Hicks, Mark (ph)	Department of Ecology
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association – CMER Co-Chair
Johnson, Angela	Department of Natural Resources
§Kay, Debbie (ph)	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny (ph)	Green Crow - CMER Co-Chair
§Martin, Doug (ph)	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Mendoza, Chris (ph)	Conservation Caucus
Murray, Joe (ph)	Washington Forest Protection Association
Ojala-Barbour, Reed (ph)	Department of Fish and Wildlife
Roorbach, Ash (ph)	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schuett-Hames, Dave	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission - CMER Staff
Shramek Patti	Department of Natural Resources – CMER Coordinator
Stewart, Greg	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission – CMER Staff

§Indicates official CMER members and alternates; (ph) indicates attended via phone.

*Indicates Decision

Doug Hooks started the meeting by going over the CMER portion of the AMP ground rules found in the Board Manual Section 22. He voiced his concerns with the lack of respect that occurred at the February meeting. Dave Schuett-Hames thanked Hooks for going over the ground rules and stated that he felt the line has been crossed recently. Greg Stewart supported that and remarked that CMER has outside participants as well and the lack of respect doesn't reflect well on the Committee. Schuett-Hames volunteered to be in the work group Dave would also like to review the ground rules to see if they may be revised for specific applicability to CMER. He would like to see a group formed to add the ground rules to the Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM).

Decisions:

Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP) TWIG

- ***Combined Study Design, Prospective Findings Report, and Implementation Recommendations** – *approval*
  Hooks reviewed the history of the request, and reported on the results of the March 23, 2018 meeting with the TWIG.

  Combined Study Design – Todd Baldwin motioned to approve the ISPR approved Study Design, Mark Hicks seconded

  Roll call vote:
  A.J. Kroll – absent
  Chris Mendoza – aye – but has implementation concerns.
  Debbie Kay – aye
  Doug Martin – sideways – recognize hard work done by TWIG, unfortunately remain to have low confidence in the study design and concerns about the applicability of the study.
  Harry Bell – sideways – still have a lot of doubts about study, but no issue with scientists. Would like a more robust design.
  Jenny Knoth – sideways
  Julie Dieu – aye
  Marc Hayes – absent
  Mark Hicks – aye
  Mark Mobbs – absent
  Todd Baldwin – aye
  Approved

  Prospective Findings Report – Jenny Knoth remarked that Question #3 in the Findings Report didn't really follow the PSM. Hooks replied that the Lean process isn't in the PSM.

  Martin remarked that he thinks the Findings Report isn't detailed enough and needs to be rewritten with limitations. He believes the findings report does a poor job of informing Policy. Lacks statement of short time-period of study (2 years – related to biota, temperature, hydrology (temporal response components)) therefore limited on what it can inform. Needs to point out that it is not connected to Type F temperature issues. Needs to be clearly stated in language Policy will understand. Applicability to the whole eastside is in questions since we only have 3 pairs in northeast Washington. Hicks said that was a reasonable request. Greg Stewart replied that he could copy and paste from Study Design, and Knoth agreed. Bell said he thinks there needs to be a more robust discussion of the

limitations of making inferences beyond the study sites that result from the small and non-random sample size. Hicks replied that there are available sites and he does not want to speculate. Ash Roorbach commented that Bell's questions could be handled in the management plan. Mendoza remarked that Bell's questions are actually what is going to be answered when the study is finished, if conducted as written. He agrees with Roorbach that these questions can be addressed in the management plan. Martin replied that Policy will make the decision, and they need to know what they are paying for, what they are and aren't getting. Before the vote, Stewart added detail from the Study Design to the Findings Report during a break.

Baldwin motioned to approve the Findings Report, Hicks seconded as revised.

Roll call vote:
A.J. Kroll - absent
Chris Mendoza – aye
Debbie Kay – aye
Doug Martin –sideways
Harry Bell – sideways
Jenny Knoth - aye
Julie Dieu – aye
Marc Hayes – absent
Mark Mobbs – absent
Todd Baldwin - aye
Approved

Implementation Plan – Mendoza voiced concerns about the budget and the cost of PhD staff when not needed. Stewart replied that there is one PhD student for area where CMER doesn't have expertise, and they chose the University of Idaho because of expertise and proximity. Mendoza said the budget was rammed through without CMER approval, and he hopes that doesn't happen in the future. Hooks commented that previous budget was a BACI placeholder, but that has changed now, and it seems that Chris is wanting to know the reasoning for this change. Stewart replied that Soft Rock budget was used as the placeholder budget, but it isn't representative of the ENREP study. The ENREP TWIG looked at several options and looked for least cost, as well as including costs that typically have not been included in the past (write up, etc). Hicks asked Mendoza what he would like to do. Mendoza replied that he would like to see the budget details. Bell agreed and would like to see a separation of the budget in case other the three East Cascade sites can't be found. Schuett-Hames expressed his concern that CMER appears to be uninformed about their role in development and approval of a project's budget.

There were questions on how the implementation team was assembled, who was picked, and who will oversee the project. Haemmerle replied that they followed the process laid out in the PSM. Chuck Hawkins and Tim Link will be the co-PIs.

Hicks moved to approve the implementation plan, Baldwin seconded

Roll call vote:
A.J. Kroll – absent
Chris Mendoza – aye – but would like to get the budget details.
Debbie Kay – aye
Doug Martin – sideways – needs lead PI
Harry Bell – aye
Jenny Knoth – aye
Julie Dieu – aye
Marc Hayes - absent
Mark Hicks – aye
Mark Mobbs - absent
Todd Baldwin – aye
Approved

RSAG

- **Changes in Stand Structure, Buffer Tree Mortality and Riparian-Associated Functions 10 Years after Timber Harvest Adjacent to Non-Fish Bearing Perennial Streams in Western Washington report review** (10 year BCIF) – *assign reviewers; discuss presentation for April CMER meeting.*
  Reviewers - Mendoza, Knoth, and Kay. Comments due to Angela Johnson on April 26, 2018.

Next steps: Schuett-Hames will give a presentation at the April CMER meeting.

UPSAG

- ***Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy –** approval to send to Policy
  Dieu reviewed how comments were addressed and asked for approval.

Bell motioned to approve, Knoth seconded

Roll call vote:
A.J. Kroll - absent
Chris Mendoza – approved

Debbie Kay – approved
Doug Martin – approved
Harry Bell – approved
Jenny Knoth – approved
Julie Dieu – approved
Mark Hayes - absent
Mark Hicks – sideways – still don't see as a good strategy
Mark Mobbs - absent
Todd Baldwin – approved
Approved

Next steps: Submit to Policy at their April meeting

Discussion:

- **Contents of Final Findings Reports**
  Mendoza would like to form a smaller group to review the PSM and make recommendations for what should go into final findings reports (Chapter 2 with references to Chapter 7). Bell agreed with Mendoza. Roorbach reported that the sub-group is halfway through revising Chapter 8 of the PSM. They may have something ready for CMER review in three months. Hooks suggested that maybe the group could take up Chapter 2 and applicable references in Chapter 7 when they completed with Chapter 8. Berge supported this. Haemmerle remarked that there is a document: Guidance for Developing a Findings Report approved by CMER April 2012.
  Next steps: This will occur after revisions to Chapter 8 is completed.

Updates:

- **Report from Policy** – *February 28 and March 1, 2018 meetings*
  Berge reported on the February 28 (Master Project Schedule review and presentations) and March 1 (Walking through details and making decisions on budget) meetings. The only decision at the March meeting was approval of the $40,000 for the eDNA project. The final decisions and approval will occur at the April meeting. Hooks remarked that Policy was very appreciative of the efforts that the SAGs, TWIGs, and PMs put into the reports. Changes will be made to budgets and schedules since there are many projects are coming online at this time.

  Timber Fish & Wildlife Policy meeting minutes are located on the Department of Natural Resources web page at http://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board/tfw-policy-committee.

CMER

- **Ongoing and Upcoming Reviews**
  - Forested Wetlands Effectiveness project Study Design. TWIG is working on incorporating reviewer comments.
  - Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study comments due March 30, 2018.

SAG and TWIG Updates

Angela Johnson, Howard Haemmerle, and SAG/TWIG Chairs reviewed the updates document and answered questions. Shramek will send the update document out after the meeting.

Public Comment Period

charles chesney commented that he appreciates CMER holding meetings in Eastern Washington. He had suggestion for the PSM: roles and competencies, particularly as it relates to expertise and confirmation bias. He also mentioned that he is on the hunt for forest practices and cumulative effects. He would appreciate suggestions for a peer review study. He has questions on how data sets are valued, and how they are used for claims of success and returns on investment.

Recap of Assignments/Decisions approved

- ENREP Combined Study Design, Prospective Findings Report, and Implementation Recommendations approved.
- Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy approved to go to Policy and will be presented to Policy at their April meeting.
- Mendoza, Knoth, and Kay are reviewers for the BCIF 10 year report, comments are due to Angela Johnson April 26, 2018.
- PSM sub-group will take on contents of the Findings Report when they are completed with Chapter 8.
- Shramek will send out the SAG/TWIG updates document after the meeting.

Adjourn