

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, March 24, 2026 // 9:00AM – 3:15PM

Hybrid Meeting

Motions	
	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>February 2026 Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Motion: Danielle Miles moved to approve the February 2026 meeting minutes.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p>Seconded: Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Up: Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Debbie Kay, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, Hans Berge, Bill Vogel and Doug Martin</p> <p>Down:</p> <p>Abstain:</p> <p>Absent:</p>
<p>Discontinuous Flow Open Review Request</p> <p>Motion: Aimee McIntyre moved to send Disc Flow Study Design to ISPR for interactive/open review.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie Dieu</p> <p>Up: Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre, Danielle Miles, Mark Mobbs, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Debbie Kay, A.J. Kroll, Mark Meleason, Hans Berge, Bill Vogel and Doug Martin</p> <p>Down:</p> <p>Abstain: Chris Mendoza (Sideways as he doesn't believe study design requires open review)</p> <p>Absent:</p>
<p>CMER Work Plan Prioritization</p> <p>Motion: Aimee McIntyre moved to approve phase one project spreadsheet with columns A-H, including project risk & uncertainty scores to TFW Policy and no ranking and no comments; include risk and uncertainty.</p> <p>The motion passed.</p>	<p>Seconded: Danielle Miles</p> <p>Up: Welles Bretherton, Aimee McIntyre, 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>Down:</p> <p>Abstain:</p> <p>Absent:</p>

Action Item	Responsibility
Provide presentation ideas on low flows for upcoming Science Session. Send suggestions by 4:30pm on April 11 th to Sebastian.	CMER members
Share papers on low flows for upcoming Science Session. Send suggestions, including contact information, by April 11 th . SPO folder with topic-related materials: Low Flows	CMER members
Complete phase two of prioritization table by EOD on Wednesday, April 15 th . Send spreadsheets to Theryn and Jenelle	CMER members
Spreadsheet with histograms distributed to CMER members by end of week.	Jenelle Black

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

Ash Roorbach, CMER co-chair, took roll call.

Ground Rules

- Stay on topic. - A.J. Kroll
- Pursue win-win solutions. - Welles Bretherton

Staff Updates

- Lori provided an update on the Type Np Hardrock Phase 3 arbitration. The arbitration panel reviewed the Type Np Hard Rock Phase 3 background and position papers and have provided a decision memo. They met with the CMER disputing parties on Tuesday March 3. The final decision memo was provided March 11th. This concluded the dispute, and the decision is binding. After the SAG and CMER approved the final 6 questions document (which are responses to the ‘CMER/TFW Policy Interaction Framework’) we will deliver the report, and the authors will provide a presentation to Policy.
- Lori shared that WDFW provided the four final reports produced through the FPAMP case study project. They did not receive any comments on the draft reports. WDFW’s legislative liaison will forward these reports to the state legislature. Lori will share this report with the Board in the May meeting mailing. TFW Policy has formed a workgroup to prepare action items in response to the WDFW report. The Board and/or TFW Policy may find it valuable to discuss an action plan in response to the recommendations in the WDFW report.
- Reminder that CMER co-chair elections will occur in May. Nominations are taken in April, and elections are in May. 1 seat will be open starting July 1, 2026. CMER typically follows the co-chair rotation schedule: [CMER Co-Chair Rotation.xlsx](#).
- CMER discussion about who to invite for an upcoming Science Session. SPO folder with topic-related materials: [Low Flows](#)

Review Last Month Action Items

- Submit completed work plan prioritization table to Theryn and Jenelle by March 16th, end of business
 - Addressed in today’s agenda item for lengthy discussion and motion.

No Public Comments

TFW Policy Updates

Rico Vinh, Policy co-chair, reviewed the motions and actions from March's Policy meeting.

Discontinuous Flow Study Design Interactive ISPR Review Request

There was much discussion at February's meeting about open vs double-blind review, the process for requesting an open review, the process at ISPR for both open and double-blind reviews. Jenny gave an overview of the discussion and asked CMER members to approve the request for open/interactive review. Chris has since spoke with the study design authors and provided his insight that CMER may want to consider adding some language as to "why". In addition, Chris provided some context into the last study designs that went to open review, and that if it were to be used more in the future then more detail is necessary in the PSM. Lori added some insight into Board Manual and PSM changes that will make processes clearer. Upon Harry asking if he could be engaged in the open review process, Lori asked for some clarity on intent and that with open review, it's crucial to keep an opportunity for reviewer input and open discourse with the Project team without outside involvement. Welles echoed that sentiment and described his experience, sharing that during Type F workgroup there were many people listening in that began to participate, making the group large and less effective. Most CMER members agreed that it would be best to keep the open review between the project team and reviewers. There was a vote to send the document to ISPR as an open review and the vote passed.

CMER Work Plan Prioritization Discussion

The Prioritization Subgroup sent out a "blind exercise" so individual CMER members can score without knowing others' results. The spreadsheet was sent out to CMER members to complete by March 16th. Per the discussion, CMER members were welcome to call anyone to discuss the various topics, raise discussion at SAGs, etc., but only CMER members provided a ranking. While presenting the latest spreadsheet after compellation, Jenelle and Theryn gave an overview of the project ranking. CMER scientists added some comments where relevant, and CMER was directed to the location of the spreadsheet that had those comments. Jenelle discussed why some rows of the ranking should be proposed for deletion due to redundancy or projects that will not be worked on in the next biennium. Some will remain in the comprehensive project list but be removed from this prioritization sheet. Chris expressed his apprehension with being able to change scores after being able to view other's rankings and reasonings, as this exercise was a blind ranking. Lori explained that the ranking is subjective and should be malleable to other's perspectives, as it's open to interpretation, and CMER being a scientific body should have discussion on the rankings before sending to Policy. Aimee echoed that sentiment that because there are misconceptions and so many projects, she is curious how people interpreted each project with their own institutional knowledge. Lori reiterated that this meeting is the opportunity to add context and discussion. There was a lengthy discussion about what the process going forward should look like, and if scores should be allowed to be changed. Ultimately, members agreed to take a short break and hear feedback from CMER scientists before progressing. CMER scientists took turns providing insight/context on specific projects, takeaways from scoring, and addressed comments from CMER members. Many CMER members expressed that the comments from members reflected that some members didn't fully understand some of the projects and that the comments provided were often contradictory and varied. Many expressed that these comments should not be sent to Policy because they would sow confusion. Joe expressed his satisfaction with the comments and that they should be sent alongside the scoring. Aimee stated that there is too much contradiction within comments and would not agree to send comments to Policy, rather just rankings as they are. The discussion was cut short due to other agenda items but was continued after lunch (see below).

Schedule L-1 Discussion

Compass Management facilitated discussion for moving forward with Schedule L-1. Phillip Halteman presented a slideshow that showed themes that the Compass team heard in their discussions with CMER and TFW Policy voting members, related to Fines in Gravel specifically, and the SL1 revision process in general. Challenges that will arise throughout the SL-1 discussion include CMER members not having a shared understanding of the purpose of SL-1 targets, update process, what deliverables should be, and how hard to work to achieve those. In addition, there are differing interpretations of what healthy dialogue between CMER and Policy should look like.

Phillip provided some reflections from their previous MPS report, including that making recommendations about targets necessarily embeds values-based judgements and trade-offs. In order for CMER to work productively on the technical questions and not get bogged down in differing assumptions about context and implications, CMER needs clarity on the purpose and scope of the update exercise, and the desired output. Improved and more frequent dialogue between Policy and CMER (known as the interface zone) should make it *easier* to maintain and respect the distinction between technical and policy questions and topics, allowing CMER to focus on the technical questions. Chris expressed concern that decisions about process that were previously approved would be unwound. Phillip clarified that there is no unwinding, just revisiting/evaluation of the process. Aimee raised the fact that she's worried about talking about each target independently as it reduces their ability to find common ground and be able to compromise, that some or all targets should be examined together. There was a discussion about potential need for input from Policy on spatial scope, concerns related to inconsistencies from prior agreements, and how CMER comes to agreement on what to send to Policy without going in circles. A recommended proposal was a "parking lot" to place items that are in TFW Policy's purview and should not be considered by CMER, and if CMER is needed to evaluate certain metrics.

Some suggested next steps include that the process needs to work for both CMER and Policy and it needs to make good use of the work already done. Compass has suggested to start with the following tasks:

- Clarify context scope, expectations, outputs, overall process, etc.
- Develop clear, tightly scoped technical questions for CMER to provide input on working from SME input.
- Sequence and direct technical and policy questions/topics appropriately and work with the appropriate group at the right time to facilitate dialogue.

Compass will meet with Lori and Theryn and determine next steps and a path forward.

CMER Work Plan Prioritization Discussion Continued

During lunch, possible motion language was written for CMER consideration. Ash established that it's important to send something to Policy now, since they are beginning prioritization discussions, Members did not seem interested in adjusting scores before sending the Phase 1 prioritization to policy. CMER members also requested if Jenelle could produce some statistics on the median and spread for the risk and uncertainty scores from CMER.

Jenelle presented the projects sorted by rank, including status and risk and uncertainty averages. She added an average, median, and standard deviation, plus a histogram to better present information on how members ranked. Mark Meleason asked for some clarity of what some of the potential motions mean for Policy's understanding. Chris explained that as long as the AMPA and co-chairs are there to explain batch 1 vs 2, he is confident that Policy will understand. Doug explained that sending two ranks may become confusing. Debbie asked if sending comments includes scientists' clarifications, and members discussed

the best way to handle comments. Aimee motioned to move the Phase 1 scores forward without comments, as they were meant for CMER conversation, with full delivery in April/May. Aimee’s motion passed. CMER will work on scoring the Phase 2 projects combined with Phase 1 and send in their revised sheets by EOD on April 15th. This topic will be on the agenda again at the April CMER meeting.

CMER SAG Updates

Each SAG reviewed the CMER SAG updates document.

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§ Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
§ Berge, Hans	UCUT – Eastern Washington Tribes
§ Bretherton, Welles	Department of Ecology
§ Dieu, Julie	Washington Farm Forestry Association
§ Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§ Kroll, A.J.	Washington Forest Protection Association
§ McIntyre, Aimee	Department of Fish and Wildlife
§ 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	Quinalt Nation – Western Washington Tribes
§ Vogel, Bill	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Anderberg, Travis	Member of the Public
Belleveau, Lisa	Skokomish Tribe
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
Holy, Shae	Skokomish Tribe
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Kautz, Kyle	Nisqually Tribe
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Pavlik, Robert	CMER Scientist
Prescott, Alexander	DNR Project Manager
Roorbach, Ash	CMER Co-Chair/Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Rubin, Rachel	DNR CMER Scientist
Schofield, Jenny	DNR Project Manager
Toledo, Anna	DNR Project Manager
Vinh, Rico	TFW Policy Co-Chair
Walter, Jason	ISAG Co-chair
Whelan, Sebastian	DNR – Adaptive Management Program Coordinator

Williamson, Tanner	CMER Scientist
--------------------	----------------

§ CMER Voting Member