

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 26, 2022 // 9:00AM – 2:20PM

Hybrid Meeting: In-person and remotely held using Zoom

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>June 2022 Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Debbie Kay moved to approve the June 2022 minutes.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Mark Meleason</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Stephanie Estrella (Proxy for Patrick Lizon), Todd Baldwin, Mark Meleason, Ash Roorbach (Proxy for Mark Mobbs), Chris Mendoza, Julie Dieu, Joe Murray (Proxy for Doug Martin)</p> <p>Abstain: Aimee McIntyre</p>

Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p>Review Riparian Literature Synthesis Document and decision item next month. Comments need to be sent to Anna end of business day on August 3rd.</p>	<p>August agenda Communication to Policy RSAG</p>
<p>More refinement of the Extensive Monitoring document prior to the workshop with TFW Policy.</p>	<p>Extensive Monitoring workgroup</p>
<p>Send out Doodle Poll</p>	<p>Alexander Prescott/Natalie Church</p>
<p>Send out initial document and comments in a Word document to be able to make comments.</p>	<p>Alexander Prescott</p>
<p>Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Susceptibility, Frequency, and Runout by Landform Study Design Presentation</p>	<p>August Agenda</p>
<p>Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Susceptibility, Frequency, and Runout by Landform Study Design comments to be sent to Lori Clark by 4:00PM on September 1st</p>	<p>CMER Reviewers</p>
<p>PHB Validation Study Design vote at CMER August meeting.</p>	<p>August Agenda</p>

CMER Work Plan usual update due by: ISAG: August RSAG: October SAGE: August WetSAG: August LWAG: September UPSAG: October Roads: October	SAGs
---	------

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chair

Jenny Knoth did roll call.

Read the below ground rules:

- Mark Meleason read “Be concise and to the point”.
- A.J. Kroll read “Stay on topic”.

Updates

Saboor Jawad discussed the following updates:

- RCS Trial is underway. The project team has now submitted all contracts to DNR contracting office. The contracts should be in place the first week of August with work starting in mid-August.
- The Smart Buffer Dispute panel will send an initial draft decision later this week. The Panel will have a one-on-one with each disputant. The document will be sent out for the August meeting.
- Policy has now approved the Master Project Schedule (MPS) and will be ready to present to the Forest Practices Board (FPB).
- There is a request from the FPB to assign the Water Typing studies to Policy. They will take over from where the project is now and will not change the project.
- There has been issue with the late mailings for the monthly CMER meetings. Late mailing will only be allowed for a few exceptions and if not part of the exception it will be moved to the next meeting agenda.

Riparian Literature Synthesis

Anna Toledo explained that this project was assigned to RSAG last month and they have reviewed the original overview document and are requesting CMER to approve sending this to Policy for feedback. Joe Murray explained that this project is on the fast track and discussed that there was a special meeting held on the 21st of July. Not all members of RSAG were able to attend and feel that there is a need for further review but they have an understanding that this project needs to be fast tracked due to the budget. Saboor explained the reasoning for Policy’s decision to put this project on the MPS which is there was a surplus in the current biennium and this gives us a one-time opportunity to complete this project. Ash Roorbach asked if there would be an issue with pushing this request back thirty days. Anna explained that since the project is

only in the budget for the FY we shouldn't push it back too far as we would not be able to complete the project. Since this is being brought before CMER and Policy to get clarity and guidance if that does need a month to get that then we can figure out the timeline to receive that information. Chris Mendoza explained that if a document is sent to Policy and has not been fully vetted by CMER it is usually not very productive for both CMER and Policy. He also explained that he feels another thirty days could be helpful to get everyone on board with this project. Harry Bell explained that this project was fast tracked in RSAG and we would be able to improve the document but getting the feedback from Policy as soon as possible could prove to be more helpful. Saboor Jawad explained that it is fine to give an update to Policy but will not send documents as it has not been approved by CMER. Ash Roorbach asked about the status of a contract for this project. Anna Toledo explained that there has been some conversation with the University of Idaho but there is not a contract with them at this time because we need to have a scope of work completed before processing a contract. It was decided that there would not be an actual decision on this today and also decided to have people review the document and give comments to Anna by end of day on August 3rd.

Extensive Monitoring

Saboor Jawad explained that the Forest Practices Board Manual for the AMP stipulates that there will be questions that require Policy interpretation of CMER scientific work. This project currently has a number of questions that require Policy interpretation. The answer to these questions will help create a scoping document. There currently is a workshop between CMER and Policy being scheduled for August. Alexander Prescott has sent out a poll to find the availability of CMER. The poll has been requested to be sent out again to CMER members. Alexander will send the link to the poll to CMER members. Joe Murray explained that since we would like to have a functional workshop and document RSAG would like to have more time on the RSAG level. Chris Mendoza agrees with Joe and states that it will go a long way to get a consensus CMER approval prior to being sent to Policy. It was decided to give the workgroup the opportunity for more refinement to the document. Saboor explained that at the workshop with Policy this version of the document could be used or any other document that will be decided on. He also restated that these instances do not require CMER approval, and to help the Adaptive Management Program to stay efficient we do not need to create any extra processes where the process does not exist. This process does not restrict us from having more interactions with Policy. Alexander explained what is going on within RSAG with this project, there are people that are eager to have the interaction with Policy and that have larger questions that they would like to have answered. He gave some context on this document and why it might feel disorganized is that not everyone has the exact same viewpoints. This document was to share the views of all of the members and not editing out perspectives and opinions. Alexander stated that he would discuss changing the time and length of the workgroup meeting with RSAG. Ash Roorbach suggested to focus on where there are disagreements and ask for clarification/guidance there to be able to come forward with a solution and to keep the audience in mind.

Empirical Evaluation of Shallow Landslide Susceptibility, Frequency, and Runout by Landform Study Design

Lori Clark explained that this is project three and four that has been combined into one study design because the methodology are similar. The project team is working with a consultant to finalize the draft for concurrent CMER review. The plan is to have it sent out by August 2nd.

They are requesting to have commitment from at least three CMER members to review the study design. Chris Mendoza, Mark Meleason, Aimee McIntyre, Doug Martin, Jenny Knoth, and Debbie Kay will reach out to another tribal biologist with Geology background committed to reviewing this document. Comments are due to Lori Clark by 4:00PM on September 1st. Jenny Knoth suggested to have a presentation of this project to CMER on what is happening next month.

PHB Validation Study Design

Anna Toledo explained that the current status of this project is that we are in concurrent CMER and ISAG review that was initiated in February 2022. The project team has been working on incorporating the comments received. This revised study design is coming back to CMER on how the project team responded to comments. This will give the reviewers time to decide if their comments were adequately addressed and the idea is that it will come back to CMER in August to receive approval to be sent to ISPR.

FWEP Implementation Update

Tanner Williamson reviewed the memo sent out to CMER members and gave an update on the FWEP implementation. There is a delay in the implementation process because they have been unable to validate enough sites for the study criteria. The full implementation was supposed to begin in August 2022 and it is now scheduled to be done by May 2023. Tanner explained that the second week of September there will be a WetSAG field trip and let him know if anyone would like to attend. Chris Mendoza asked what the difficulty was in finding a site to complete this project. Tanner explained that the data from the 20 and 40 year old sites do not have FPA data. There also is a need to refine the WIP tools to collect another set of sites. Harry Bell asked if there is concern with the scope of inference. Tanner explained the different study areas throughout the state and that they are going to expand their scope in the existing areas after doing more extensive research on site. Tanner stated that the full implementation plan will be brought before CMER either next month or the following.

CMER Work Plan

Saboor Jawad introduced the topic by explaining that there are two parts to the work plan which are: the usual update on the status of each project and then answer the questions that went out to each SAG. The questions were intended to update key tables and assumptions to understand the current state of knowledge for each project and will the understanding of the project effect that rest of the work plan. This information will help guide and facilitate Policy's understanding of the projects and the status of each. The second half of the August CMER meeting will be dedicated to working on the work plan. Harry Bell asked if now is the time to add additional projects to the work plan. Aimee McIntyre explained that it is the time to add projects to the work plan. Her SAG has added some projects to the work plan. LWAG has a pretty good understanding of the usual updates but has more questions on the last four questions. She suggested that having the questions for each project that has been delayed, about the delivery and particularly the second question. There is difficulty in re-summarizing the project especially after creating the six questions that are sent to Policy. Joe Murray gave a suggestion to set up another chapter for projects that are not part of a specific rule group, for example Extensive Monitoring. Debbie Kay explained that looking at it in a process perspective that would need to be a request from Policy to look at that specific issue of projects being classified in multiple rule groups.

Chris Mendoza explained that historically there has been some rearranging of the rule groups. The current structure of the work plan addresses the overlap of projects. Most projects that are added go with the program level they can come from the SAG level, through Policy, or proposed initiation from the public. He also explained how answering the questions were done in the past. Jenny Knoth discussed that some of the issues that are being brought up for updating the work plan are long term goals of incorporating broader knowledge of something on a topic and look at if we are still on track, do we still need to know these things, and where are the knowledge gaps. This can include the science done outside of CMER that matters moving forward. It was decided that each SAG would work through and update the current state of project and to begin looking at the questions. Each SAG decided when they could complete this task. ISAG, SAGE, and WetSAG by August, LWAG by September, and RSAG, UPSAG, and Roads by October. Postpone the workshop to November or December as that will give additional time to complete the preparation needed for this workshop.

Co-chair Selection

Saboor reviewed what happened at last month's co-chair selection, how it ended in a three way tie between Jenny Knoth, Chris Mendoza, and A.J. Kroll. He then reviewed the PSM guidelines for the co-chair selection. Ash Roorbach questioned why we aren't following PSM's select committee option? Saboor responded that options is for when there are multiple nominees and only one position. The PSM is neither clear nor does it prescribe a consensus-based process for selecting co-chairs.

Saboor then proposed three options on how to complete the co-chair selection. Those options are to repeat the same process that was done last month and elevate the matter to Policy only if there is another tie vote; elevate to Policy now; or allow existing co-chairs to serve one year while we clarify the PSM process for co-chair selection.

There was discussion that TFW Policy should not be the ones to choose the new CMER co-chair as they are not as familiar with the process and dynamic within CMER. It was decided that the process would stay the same as last month. Saboor explained that voting members can vote for up to two people and asked that CMER voting members place their vote in the Zoom chat box. Natalie Church tallied the votes and entered them into an Excel spreadsheet. She then shared that document on the screen and Saboor asked for the voting members to review their votes and make sure they were listed correctly. Each voting members stated that their votes were listed correctly. The results of the vote were eight votes for Jenny Knoth, seven votes for A.J. Kroll, and six votes for Chris Mendoza. Saboor extended thanks to Chris Mendoza for all of his time and hard work as a CMER co-chair.

AJ Kroll and Jenny Knoth both indicated they would serve a one-year term.

TFW Policy Updates

Saboor Jawad gave an update on what was discussed at the July 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.

Public Comments

charles chesney

(I am not sure on how to note this but due to technical difficulties I was unable to hear what charles said except that he would keep us posted on what is going on in Spokane.)

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association – Small Forest Landowners
Black, Jenelle	CMER staff
chesney, charles	Member of Public
Church, Natalie	DNR – CMER Coordinator
Clark, Lori	DNR project manager
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
§Estrella, Stephanie	Department of Ecology (Proxy for Patrick Lizon)
Greenwood, Emma	Spokane Tribe TFW rep
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Jawad, Saboor	DNR – Adaptive Management Program Administrator
§Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ CMER Co-Chair
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association (proxy for Joe Murray)
§Meleason, Mark	County Caucus
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Prescott, Alexander	DNR project manager
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission (proxy for Mark Mobbs)
Rubin, Rachel	DNR Scientist
Schofield, Jenny	DNR project manager
Stewart, Greg	CMER staff
Toledo, Anna	DNR project manager
Nikki Venneman	TFW Rep ****
Williams, Tanner	CMER Scientist

§CMER Voting Member