

**Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee**  
**Tuesday, February 24, 2026 // 9:00AM – 12:45PM**  
**Virtual Meeting**

<b>Motions</b>	
	<b>Move/Second (Vote)</b>
<p><b>January 2026 Meeting Minutes</b></p> <p><b><u>Motion:</u></b>  Welles Bretherton moved to approve the January 2026 meeting minutes.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Chris Mendoza</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre (Welles as proxy), Chris Mendoza, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, Hans Berge, Bill Vogel and Doug Martin</p> <p><b>Down:</b></p> <p><b>Abstain:</b> Debbie Kay (Absent for meeting)</p> <p><b>Absent:</b></p>
<p><b>OBIA Final 6 Questions</b></p> <p><b><u>Motion:</u></b>  Julie Dieu moved to approve OBIA 6 Questions Document.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Mark Meleason</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre (Welles as proxy), Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, Hans Berge, Bill Vogel and Doug Martin</p> <p><b>Down:</b></p> <p><b>Abstain:</b></p> <p><b>Absent:</b></p>
<p><b>Extensive Monitoring Charter</b></p> <p><b><u>Motion:</u></b>  Welles Bretherton moved to approve updated Extensive Monitoring Charter understanding budget is forthcoming to CMER then Policy.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Mark Meleason</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre (Welles as proxy), Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, Hans Berge, Bill Vogel and Doug Martin</p> <p><b>Down:</b></p> <p><b>Abstain:</b></p> <p><b>Absent:</b></p>

<p><b>Discontinuous Flow Study Design Approval</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Debbie Kay moved to approve Discontinuous Flow Study Design</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Mark Mobbs</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Welles Bretherton), Aimee McIntyre (Welles as proxy), Debbie Kay, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, and Bill Vogel</p> <p><b>Down:</b></p> <p><b>Abstain:</b> Doug Martin (Sideways due to method inaccuracies, such as how sampling strategy will influence strength of inferences about water temperature and amphibian use) Hans Berge (Sideways due to concerns regarding analytical methods are insufficient for a study design, considering the amount of data collected previously by CMER. Doesn't believe there is enough detail for a thorough ISPR review)</p> <p><b>Absent:</b></p>
<p><b>Discontinuous Flow Study Design to ISPR</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Harry Bell moved to send Discontinuous Flow Study Design to ISPR for an open review.</p> <p>The motion failed.</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Doug Martin</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre (Welles as proxy), Debbie Kay, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, Hans Berge, Bill Vogel and Doug Martin</p> <p><b>Down:</b> Chris Mendoza (CMER PSM states that CMER “defaults” to a blind review if consensus for open review is not met.)</p> <p><b>Abstain:</b></p> <p><b>Absent:</b></p>
<p><b>Discontinuous Flow Study Design to ISPR Cont.</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Danielle Miles moved to send Discontinuous Flow Study Design to ISPR with the anticipation of receiving an open review request from project team, if needed with written technical justification.</p> <p>The motion failed.</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Hans Berge</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre (Welles as proxy), Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Hans Berge, Bill Vogel</p> <p><b>Down:</b> Doug Martin (Two-step process is inefficient and costly in terms of time and money), Harry Bell (Limits transparency of open vs. closed review), Julie Dieu (Does not need to be controversial), A.J. Kroll (Board Manual provides guidance for an open review)</p>

	<p><b>Abstain:</b> Mark Meleason (Sideways because open review is typically implemented for study design where study authors can benefit from open interaction.)</p> <p><b>Absent:</b></p>
<p><b>CMER Work Plan Prioritization</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Danielle Miles moved to approve Work Plan Prioritization Table as presented with additional column for technical comments, with the timeline to submit to CMER staff by end of business on Monday, March 16<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p><b>Seconded:</b> Chris Mendoza</p> <p><b>Up:</b> Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre (Welles as proxy), Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, Hans Berge, Bill Vogel and Doug Martin</p> <p><b>Down:</b></p> <p><b>Abstain:</b></p> <p><b>Absent:</b></p>

Action Item	Responsibility
Submit completed work plan prioritization table to Theryn and Jenelle by March 16 <sup>th</sup> , end of business	CMER voting members

### Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

Danielle Miles, CMER co-chair, and Sebastian Whelan took roll call.

### Ground Rules

- Stay on topic.
- Be concise and to the point.

### Staff Updates

- The arbitration panel reviewed the Type Np Hard Rock Phase 3 background and position papers and have provided a decision memo distributed via email by Lori Clark. They look forward to meeting with the CMER participants on Tuesday March 3 from 9:00-10:30.
- ISPR returned the ETHEP final report review. It will be distributed to the authors today. They will have 6 weeks to respond (by April 7<sup>th</sup>).

### Review Last Month Action Items

- By Friday, January 30<sup>th</sup>, CMER members let Ash know if they want to participate in a work group to update the PSM Guided Decision Making (dispute resolution) section. And let Danielle know if you are interested in participation in a work group to update the PSM Outside Science/Non-CMER Science section of the PSM.
  - The PSM Guided decision-making group met and had initial conversations to begin revision
  - Danielle indicated that due to workload she would not be reaching out to workgroup members until March.
- Check the CMER meeting materials hyperlinked on the CMER website.
  - Completed; documents for the January CMER meeting are updated to show correct track changes
- Work with Compass about supporting CMER with SL-1 starting w/ Fines in Gravel
  - Staff are meeting with Compass to discuss moving SL-1 forward, should have something to discuss in March

### **No Public Comments**

### **TFW Policy Updates**

Policy co-chairs were not in attendance to provide an update. The February meeting was a joint CMER/TFW Policy meeting to hear presentations of the Four Studies of the FPAMP.

### **OBIA Final 6 Questions**

Theryn Henkel reviewed the OBIA draft document and addressed Harry's comments alongside Elise Freeman, CMER scientist. Comments were solicited before the meeting, and as a group, suggestions were resolved. The document was approved. The 6 Questions document will be included in a findings package which will be delivered to TFW Policy at their March meeting, along with a presentation of the findings from the final report.

### **Extensive Monitoring Charter**

Alexander Prescott provided an overview of the charter document, highlight the major changes, including Project Team members, the project timeline, and the Critical Questions. Most of the changes used verbiage directly from the recently approved Scoping Document. Chris expressed his concern of there not being a budget associated with the scoping document, which would normally be reflected in the Charter. Alexander modified wording of an add-on question to provide clarity, with input from CMER scientists. Discussion ensued contemplating that in order to approve, there needs to be a budget. Welles and Jenelle explained that the charter would be updated at that time (when a draft budget is developed). A conversation with Policy regarding the lack of budget clarity and the intention to resolve that through the study design process has already occurred. Motion language was adjusted to include acknowledgment of budget forthcoming.

### **Discontinuous Flow Study Design Approval & Sending to ISPR**

Jenny Schofield reviewed dispute process of Disc Flow. CMER members were sent clean version of document with minor changes that resolved concerns brought forward during dispute resolution. Chris explained that issues were resolved and thanked authors for their work. The report was approved by CMER.

Jenny, along with Reed Ojala-Barbour and Welles Bretherton, shared the ISPR expertise list the Project Team compiled for CMER consideration. Hyporheic exchange was added as a familiarity to “Stream Temperature Dynamics.” The study authors requested an open, interactive ISPR review rather than a double-blind review, indicating that it would be advantageous to be able to have a dialogue with the reviewers about the best way to design the study. There was much discussion about open vs double-blind review, the process for requesting an open review, the process at ISPR for both open and double-blind reviews. Chris Mendoza said CMER has a process for considering author/project team recommendations for an open/interactive review. He said they needed to submit a memo with justification for the open review. Lori said that the PSM says they have to provide technical rationale along with a request for approval by CMER and that was being done verbally. The PSM will need to be revised to reduce uncertainty and misunderstandings.

CMER members suggested that the open review would allow productive conversations with ISPR reviewers. Lori clarified that the ISPR reviewers, during an open review, do not interact with CMER members. They only meet with the authors. After review of PSM and confusion of what the default review process is, it was established that CMER members can propose interactive (open) review. Lori shared that the WAC (222-12-045), the Board Manual, Section 22 and the PSM are not in alignment on how study designs should go through ISPR. The WAC says ISPR is optional for study designs however it is clear that it is common practice at CMER for all study designs to go through ISPR. The Board Manual, Section 22, 4.3 What Will Be Reviewed, Table 1, lists study designs as “may be reviewed” and says it is expected to be an interactive review. The PSM stipulates that for a study design to get an open review there needs to be technical justification provided. Lori said she will work to establish clarity and consistency with the WAC, Board Manual, and PSM.

Following multiple failed votes, Lori suggested that she would move the study design forward to ISPR since the discussions of both failed motions demonstrated that all CMER members are in agreement to send the study design to ISPR, just not the format of the review. Since the first step for both open and double-blind review is identical, the authors could provide the justification memo for March CMER mailing and CMER could then bring the decision to have the ISPR a closed or open review to the March meeting. The first 4-6 weeks of both open and closed review begin the same way, with a double-blind review. Once ISPR provides their review, if it is open, there is a meeting with the authors to discuss the review and authors questions. Harry and Hans expressed concern with Lori submitting the study design to ISPR without a consensus approval from CMER. Lori reminded CMER member that they have the responsibility to follow CMER process, and she reminded them that they can call dispute since there was clearly an impasse with this decision. Lori said she would send an email to follow up on options for moving the study design to ISPR.

### **CMER Work Plan Prioritization Discussion**

Chris Mendoza reviewed rankings and scoring as part of prioritization table. The Prioritization Subgroup will send out “blind exercise” so individual CMER members can score without knowing others’ results. Chris presented a draft example spreadsheet to show how formulas for this exercise will work in ranking at the project level. Discussion began regarding how much scientific expertise each user has completing the exercise, and how estimates pasted from work plan may be subjective. Doug recommended additional guidance or tutorial to assist the user in feeling confident in their rankings. Joe expressed his desire to involve the SAGs, and Chris responded that it would be valuable if they had consensus. Similarly, Harry and Debbie requested a more organized way to compile project knowledge from SAGs; there was a lengthy discussion about the level of SAG involvement, how information/scientific background should be compiled, and need for comments justifying ranking for best efficiency. There was sentiment that there

isn't a need for citations though reasoning for assigning values to uncertainty and risk should be based on real information. The spreadsheet will be sent out to CMER members to complete by March 16<sup>th</sup>. Per the discussion, CMER members are welcome to call anyone to discuss the various topics, raise discussion at SAGs, etc., but only CMER members will be doing the ranking.

## CMER SAG Updates

Each SAG reviewed the CMER SAG updates document.

## List of Attendees

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
§ Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
§ Berge, Hans	UCUT – Eastern Washington Tribes
§ Bretherton, Welles	Department of Ecology (Proxy for Aimee McIntyre)
§ Dieu, Julie	Washington Farm Forestry Association
§ Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§ Kroll, A.J.	Washington Forest Protection Association
§ Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§ Meleason, Mark	Counties Caucus
§ Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
§ Miles, Danielle	Department of Natural Resources/CMER Co-chair
§ Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Nation – Western Washington Tribes
§ Vogel, Bill	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	NWIFC CMER Scientist
Clark, Lori	DNR – Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Freeman, Elise	NWIFC CMER Scientist
Greenwood, Emma	Spokane Tribe
Heimburg, John	WDFW Habitat Program
Henkel, Theryn	DNR Supervisory Project Manager
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Holy, Shae	Skokomish Tribe
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Olsen, Joshua	Nooksack Tribe
Prescott, Alexander	DNR Project Manager
Rubin, Rachel	DNR CMER Scientist
Robbins, Jeff	Department of Ecology
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Co-Chair/Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schofield, Jenny	DNR Project Manager
Toledo, Anna	DNR Project Manager
Walter, Jason	ISAG Co-chair
Wagner, Marlene	NWIFC
Whelan, Sebastian	DNR – Adaptive Management Program Coordinator
Williamson, Tanner	CMER Scientist

§ CMER Voting Member