

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, November 26, 2025 // 9:00AM – 4:55PM

Virtual: Zoom

| Motions | |
|--|--|
| Motion | Move/Second (Vote) |
| <p>October 2024 Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Debbie Kay moved to approve the October 2024 meeting minutes as amended.</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Welles Bretherton</p> <p>Up: Doug Martin, Welles Bretherton, Debbie Kay, Julie Dieu, Joe Murray (proxy for Mark Meleason), Jenny Knoth, Chris Mendoza, A.J. Kroll, Mark Mobbs, Hans Berge, and Harry Bell.</p> <p>Absent: Aimee McIntyre</p> |
| <p>Riparian Literature Synthesis</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Jenny Knoth moved to preface the RFL review with note from CMER that expresses our views on accuracy and final product not meeting our standards (needs). CMER considers this work to be an annotated bibliography and will use it in that manner.</p> <p>Friendly amendment (Chris Mendoza/Aimee McIntyre): preface the RFL review with note from CMER that expresses our views on accuracy and final product not meeting our standards (needs). CMER will address the factual inaccuracies before finalizing. CMER considers this work to be an annotated bibliography and will use it in that manner. CMER will include an “Inside cover letter” as a disclaimer.</p> <p>The motion passed</p> | <p>Seconded: Harry Bell (accepted friendly amendment)</p> <p>Up: Chris Mendoza, Welles Bretherton, Jenny Knoth, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, Harry Bell, Hans Berge, Doug Martin, Julie Dieu, Joe Murray (proxy for Mark Meleason), Aimee McIntyre, and A.J. Kroll</p> |

| Action Items | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Action Items | Responsibility |
| <p>If you have interest in any of the equipment or ideas for process of decommissioning the Roads Project reach out to Alexander Prescott.</p> | <p>CMER Members</p> |
| <p>Schedule PSM edits Workgroup on Wednesday, December 4th at 3:00-5:00PM</p> | <p>Natalie Church</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Bring suggested wording and edits to workgroup meeting. Most current version located: CMER Review . | Ash Roorbach, Jenny Knoth, Debbie Kay, Joe Murray, Harry Bell, Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre, and Chris Mendoza. |
| Riparian Literature Review: Factual inaccuracy edits due January 30, 2025. Send to contractors by the end of January 2025 and authors to return in enough time to be sent in the CMER mailing for the February 2025 CMER meeting. | CMER Reviewers |
| Put clean version of Riparian Lit. Synthesis in CMER review folder CMER Review | Anna Toledo |
| Add “Inside Cover Letter” to February 2025 CMER agenda | Natalie Church |
| Email suggestions for CMER Science Conference by Friday, December 13 th to Jenny Knoth, Chris Mendoza, Welles Bretherton, and A.J. Kroll. | CMER Voting members |
| Review what parking lot items needs to be discussed by CMER and what needs to be discussed by RSAG. | CMER co-chairs |
| Complete the changes that need to be made within the CMER Work Plan. | Theryn Henkel/Alexander Prescott |
| Chair/schedule eDNA workgroup starting in January 2025. Invite SAGs to participate in the workgroup. | Jenny Knoth |
| CMER SAG Request for change of DSL Project Team on December CMER meeting agenda. | Theryn Henkel/Natalie Church |

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

Aimee McIntyre, CMER co-chair

Old business: Lori affirmed the action items from the October meeting have been completed.

Natalie Church took roll call.

Ground Rules

- Speak to educate and listen to understand. Welles Bretherton
- Be respectful of other. Ash Roorbach

Staff Updates

- Anna shared that Cramer Fish Sciences is the apparent successful bidder for the PHB/DPC Implementation contract in response to RFQQ 25-12.

Public Comments

No public comments.

TFW Policy Updates

Cody Thomas gave an update on what was discussed at the November 2024 Timber Fish and Wildlife (TFW) Policy Committee meeting.

Roads Project Update

Alexander shared:

- The project team completed a very significant amount of fieldwork in October including annual grading at our nearly 100 project road segments, calibrating all flumes at high flow sites, and completing a ditch line hydraulic assessment of silt traps.
- The PT is currently developing a detailed Implementation Plan (DIP) for the GRAIP/WARSEM sediment delivery analysis and survey, the last of 6 parametrization experiments for the PT to implement. The PT expects to deliver the DIP to CMER in December 2024.
 - The GRAIP/WARSEM Delivery Analysis and Survey will utilize existing data (Dubé et al. 2010 – the CMER Road Sub-Basin Project) and conduct additional road surveys to create a hydraulic connectivity relationship between road drainage diversions and distance to streams as a function of the drain type for western Washington. The potential for sediment delivery is highly variable on the landscape because of hydrologic and topographic influences. Quantifying the likelihood of delivery from a road drainage feature is a critical component of information better enabling us to inform meaningful choices of best management practices (BMPs). In addition, this information is important to the development of our model because the probability of delivery is crucial to accuracy of estimates of sedimentation.
- The project team is currently developing a framework and process for manually counting some traffic camera photos from the project's earlier years when our in-road traffic counters were not operational/reliable.
- Data collection for the final WY of the major experiment has commenced, ongoing site maintenance workload level is fairly high (replacing pendants, tipping bucket pieces, supports for hoses/culverts, etc.).
- The project team is currently evaluating process options for decommissioning the 80 project sites in Grays Harbor, Pacific, Lewis, and Cowlitz counties. We would like to hear from AMP participants on their:
 - Recommendations for process including transportation, coordination, equipment/supplies, disposal/storage, etc.,
 - Capacity to participate in the decommission, and/or
 - Interest in receiving the retired equipment.
- Each of the 80 study sites has approximately:
 - 1-2 steel water bars/troughs. (17-feet long, 4.7" wide, 4" tall)
 - 1 metal sediment tub. (5' wide, 4' tall)
 - 1 tipping bucket and housing
 - 1 20-gal drum
 - A handful of other smaller hoses and pipes
 - 1 flume/flow splitter (only at about 10 sites).
- Preliminary process considerations:
 - Equipment needs: excavator, dump truck (for rock), dump truck or lowboy (for salvaged equipment), pickup truck (for tools, gear)?
 - When the water bars/ troughs are removed, they will need to be immediately filled with rock to ensure good working condition of road. We have access to commercial and private pits as needed.

- Cross drain culverts, which will be kept in place, will need to be fitted with flex pipes and/or the platforms topped with rock to reduce erosion concerns on the out-slope. Exact process TBD pending landowner discussions.
- We have temporary storage sites available in Aberdeen and Toutle

CMER Statistician On-call Contract Update

Theryn Henkel gave a brief update on the on-call statistician. Thus far they have completed 1 work order, have two ongoing, and are starting a fourth. The feedback that Theryn has received has been all positive suggesting the work has been valued and well received. Lori explained that the people that are under contract have a diverse background thus they have been able to serve the needs of each request. They have used about \$80,00 of the contract budget. Joe asked if someone wanted to ask them a question are they able to email them. Theryn explained that she is the main point of contact with the company. We cannot email them questions without having a work order. Once a work order is executed, all communication goes through the project manager to ensure the request aligns with the scope of work. Aimee asked if we were to continue using an on-call statistician would we need to re-solicit the contract and Theryn explained that in the current contract it states that we can continue for two additional biennia. Lori explained that the intention is to continue this contract for another biennium and if any AMP participant has concerns, they should reach out to her.

CMER PSM edits - Participation and Project Team Expectations

Aimee shared that the CMER voting and Project Team members' participation requirements and expectations draft additions to the PSM are in response to both the Forest Practices Board discussion in August about CMER reform needs as well as upcoming changes to participation contracts with DNR. The Board directed CMER to revise their Protocol and Standards Manual to reflect participation requirements and expectations. CMER provided suggested feedback/edits Oct 15-Nov 12. SAGs were given access to the CMER review folder for the duration of the review period. Today CMER will decide which edits to make and Lori will bring the final back for CMER consideration in December and Lori will report back to the Board in February.

The CMER participation section is proposed language for a new section. The Project Team members participation section is an existing section in the PSM. The revised language which was noted in track changes is the only language for CMER consideration at this time. With the upcoming biennium contract there will be required deliverables and timelines as a part of all FP AMP contracts with DNR, therefore the content of these changes is non-negotiable. Lori shared that someone from Business Operations Contracts and Procurement will be attending CMER in January to discuss these upcoming changes.

Lori shared that the AMPA is responsible for ensuring the operation of an efficient, clear and open AMP that serves the needs and priorities of the Board. The WAC clearly states that results of the Science committee's studies are supposed to produce any needed rule changes "as quickly as possible". AMPA and the PMs have a responsibility to ensure that participants are honoring the commitments to keep on task and follow procedures to support AMP success. One of the AMPA's roles is to support the function of CMER advancing the science needed to support adaptive management for FP and facilitates the Board's priorities.

The PSM has established timelines for process documents and section 8.3.1 already notes the default review timelines as 30 days. General timelines for each process document have been established. These timelines are established in the Charters and PM plans that are developed by PTs and approved by SAGs and CMER. When delays occur, it puts the PM and PTs in a difficult position to try to get the project back on track. Delays are very costly to our program, particularly when contractors are involved. The Board asked the State Auditor to audit the program, particularly to identify ways the program could become more efficient and effective in its decision-making. The SAO report calls out the problem that neither

WAC nor the Board Manual assign any person or entity responsibility for holding members and participants accountable for their actions or failure to work together and move rule recommendations forward as the AMP is intended to do.

The Board Manual and/or PSM lack clear guidelines on expectations for participation and consequences for participants who fail to meet those expectations, e.g., not adhering to deadlines, attending meetings unprepared. These are all actions that cause unnecessary delays in the AMP. While many participants are quick to point this out as a significant problem in the program, and especially at CMER and in the SAGs, to date there has not been an accountability pathway. Adding this language in the PSM will ensure all AMP participants understand expectations and responsibilities and will aid in tracking and following up on accountability. The goal of this section is to provide clarity on both expectations and requirements.

Chris Mendoza suggested that only voting CMER members should edit the CMER Participation section of the document as it is only pertaining to the voting members. Aimee responded by explaining that all AMP participants were invited to participate in this review and she doesn't feel that it is fair to not address the comments made by non-voting members.

Lori shared her screen and reviewed each comment and made live notes/comments to capture what was discussed.

Harry suggested that someone keep track of attendance and who is reviewing documents. Lori explained that we already keep track of document review with the [CMER Coordinated Review tracking sheet](#).

There was discussion on if CMER could recommend the Board approve proxies and/or alternates. Chris explained that the burden is on the CMER members to ensure they are prepared for each meeting. Alternates attending CMER meetings without having the background or being up to speed on the issues disrupts progress at CMER and can result in inefficient communication.

Hans suggested that the first step if there is an attendance problem should be brought up by the co-chairs with the CMER member. If an arrangement/agreement is not reached, then the co-chairs should elevate it to the AMPA. Lori responded that this model would not work out very well as it puts a lot of extra responsibility on the CMER co-chairs and are frequently voting members themselves.

Ash asked if we are asking the alternates to follow what the CMER voting members are required to do. There was some agreement that the intention is for the alternatives to come prepared. CMER members are not just supposed to show up to vote but also to participate meaningfully per the CMER ground rules.

A question came up if CMER member could/should assign another CMER member as their proxy.

CMER members acknowledge that there needs to be further discussion on the comments in the document and suggestions for edits need to be added. Natalie worked with the CMER members to find a day/time that works. The following participants put in the meeting chat that they wanted to participate: Ash Roorbach, Jenny Knoth, Debbie Kay, Joe Murray, Harry Bell, Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre, and Chris Mendoza.

Riparian Literature Review

Aimee explained that this was a continuation of the discussion last month. Welles suggested that he is willing to deep dive into the document to try and remedy inaccuracies and repetitiveness between sections. Harry said that he will participate and do his share if it is decided to do this. Rachel Rubin explained that this is beneficial, and, in the future, we can constrain the document more. She explained that doing this might not be the most useful focus of our time. Chris Mendoza reviewed the approved

notes from last meeting, and he suggested that we can move the document forward and frame it in a way that has a disclaimer cover letter. Harry shared the motion that Hans Berge made in the chat. “Return the draft Riparian Function Literature Synthesis to the authors with comments and information necessary for the authors to be able to make the necessary improvements, particularly for CMER studies.” Jenny Knoth explained that she doesn’t see an issue with saying we missed what TFW Policy had desired but here is the document with a disclaimer. Doug Martin explained that he made a comment multiple times during SAG review that there is redundant information, and the authors responded that this is what the contract asked for. Aimee McIntyre explained that we need to make changes to the factual inaccuracies and move forward. It was decided that a clean version of current document will be made available for review, CMER members can flag the minor factual inaccuracies in track changes to return it to the contractor for their awareness and approval. The document will then be brought back to CMER for discussion on the verbiage for a disclaimer and “inside cover letter” at the beginning of the document and approval.

CMER Science Conference

Jenny, AJ, Welles, and Chris are on the CMER Science Conference Workgroup. There have been two meetings to date and the group suggested we have CMER weigh in. The general thought is that the CMER Conference would take place close to a Board meeting to try to encourage their attendance.

Chris Mendoza explained his thoughts are to keep how it was done in the past (day long conference) to highlight the work CMER is doing and inform TFW Policy and the Board about what projects/strategies are moving in the program. He doesn’t see a field trip being successful because we don’t know what issue that TFW Policy and the Board would like to have the field trip focus on. CMER does do field trips and could do one after the CMER Science Conference and invite the Board. Lori shared that the Board already has 1-2 field trips planned for 2025. CMER could collaborate with Board staff on these field trips. Jenny Knoth explained that we don’t have a lot of completed projects at this time. She suggested we could bring people in to discuss AMP topics.

Welles Bretherton explained that he likes the idea the hybrid approach of a field trip with a conference to have more of a conversation about the science in the field. A CMER led field trip would be different in that it would be a science discussion and how things work as a whole. Potentially give an optional field trip.

A.J. Kroll didn’t have anything additional to add.

Harry Bell likes field trip idea to have discussion. Pick a specific topic and then have a hybrid meeting, half day presentation and half day field trip. Joe Murray suggested Pack Forest as a location is good because it has meeting spaces to discuss. He likes the field trip idea to discuss the Type F studies.

Ash Roorbach likes the idea of a field trip, but it depends on the theme/focus. Aimee asked if there is a list of topics/projects and Chris responded that it would be projects completed since the last CMER Science Conference.

There was a general concern about the logistics and available time to do a hybrid meeting,

Work Plan Updates

Discussion on addressing Chris Mendoza’s concern about the changing of the structure of the Work Plan and discuss the projects not assigned to SAGs (e.g., windthrow) on the years that CMER doesn’t review the Work Plan. Aimee suggested that we can use the next two-years until the next Work Plan revision cycle to have a conversation about the projects that “don’t fit” in the current spot and entertain recommendations for moving them in the Work Plan.

SAGE: Anna Toledo shared her screen and reviewed the comments and edits.

Roads: Alexander Prescott shared screen and reviewed the comments and edits.

RSAG: Alexander Prescott shared screen and reviewed the comments and edits. Discussion about a possible change from the “task type” in the tables to “project type”, as well as changes to the reporting of performance targets were put in the parking lot for future workplan revisions.

Completed and Withdrawn: It was decided that the proposed edits were minor and did not need discussion at this meeting.

Appendix A: Theryn Henkel shared her screen and live edited and made comments.

Parking Lot Items

It was decided to push this agenda item to a later date after the CMER co-chairs review what needs to be discussed by CMER and what needs to be discussed by RSAG and will be brought to the correct meetings in the future.

Clarity of eDNA

An eDNA workgroup folder has been created on SharePoint Online and has the documents associated with the completed study copied there [eDNA Workgroup](#) (CMER>Workgroups). This discussion began at the October CMER meeting following the biodiversity monitoring program presentation. The original intent is to keep the group to 3-5 workgroup members. However, in the meeting there was a general consensus that, at this stage, the group should be open to anyone who wants to participate for open discussion. In the future, if there is need for a more focused formal Workgroup, a smaller more concentrated group can be formed. EDNA is one potential tool to use in projects.

The following CMER participants have expressed interest in being on the workgroup: Jenny Knoth, John Heimburg, Hans Berge, and Joe Murray. In addition, ISAG discussed this at their meeting and the following ISAG members have also expressed interest in being on the workgroup: Chris Mendoza, Jenelle Black, Lisa Belleveau, Susannah Maher, and Jason Walter.

Jenny shared that there are some issues with QA/QC so a workgroup could standardize guidelines for how SAGs could/should use eDNA. Interest in getting inclusive group to discuss eDNA. Jenny will chair the group starting in January. All AMP participants are invited to join this group at this time.

CMER SAG Updates

Each SAG reviewed the CMER SAG updates document, which was updated live as needed.

List of Attendees

| Attendees | Representing |
|---------------------|--|
| §Bell, Harry | WFFA– Small Forest Landowners |
| §Berge, Hans | UCUT – Eastern Washington Tribes |
| §Bretherton, Welles | Department of Ecology |
| §Dieu, Julie | Rayonier |
| §Kay, Debbie | Suquamish Tribe |
| §Knoth, Jenny | Washington Farm Forestry Association |
| §Kroll, A.J. | Large Industrial Landowners |
| §Martin, Doug | Washington Forest Protection Association |
| §McIntyre, Aimee | Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife/CMER Co-Chair |

| | |
|---------------------|--|
| §Mendoza, Chris | Conservation Caucus |
| §Mobbs, Mark | Quinault Tribe |
| Belleveau, Lisa | Skokomish Tribe |
| Black, Jenelle | NWIFC CMER Scientist |
| Church, Natalie | DNR – AMP Coordinator |
| Clark, Lori | Adaptive Management Program Administrator |
| Freeman, Elise | CMER Scientist |
| Hage, Vaughn | CMER Natural Resources Technician |
| Henkel, Theryn | DNR Supervisory Project Manager |
| Heimburg, John | WDFW Habitat Program |
| Holy, Shae | Skokomish Tribe |
| Lower, Adam | Chehalis Tribe |
| Miles, Danielle | DNR |
| Murray, Joe | Washington Forest Protection Association Proxy for Mark Meleason |
| Prescott, Alexander | DNR Project Manager |
| Roorbach, Ash | CMER Co-Chair/Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission |
| Schofield, Jenny | DNR Project Manager |
| Toledo, Anna | DNR Project Manager |
| Walter, Jason | ISAG co-chair |
| Williamson, Tanner | CMER Scientist |

§CMER Voting Member