

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee

Tuesday, November 17th // 9:00 am – 4:30 pm

Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Prepared for CMER by Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Secretary Senior

Motions November 17 th , 2020	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
Approve the October 27 th meeting minutes as amended.	Julie Dieu/Debbie Kay (Up: Chris Mendoza, Ash Roorbach, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin, A.J. Kroll, Doug Martin, Debbie Kay, Mark Mobbs)
Approve the ISPR approved final EMEP report.	Harry Bell/Patrick Lizon (Up: Chris Mendoza, Ash Roorbach, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Todd Baldwin, A.J. Kroll; absent: Mark Mobbs)
Approve the LWAG version of the CMER work plan.	Chris Mendoza/Debbie Kay (Up: Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin, Todd Baldwin, Doug Martin, A.J. Kroll, Ash Roorbach; absent: Mark Mobbs)
Approve the CMZ and Roads Project section of the UPSAG version of the CMER work plan.	Aimee McIntyre/Harry Bell (Up: Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, A.J. Kroll, Ash Roorbach; absent: Mark Mobbs)

Action Items 11/17/2020	
Action Item	Responsibility
Reviewers for RCS Study Design were chosen. Original reviewers were Mark Hicks, Doug Martin, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay	Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Debbie Kay
Edits to Table 13 in the LWAG version of the CMER work plan will be sent to Heather Gibbs, who will incorporate these into the work plan.	Aimee McIntyre/Heather Gibbs

Edits to the CMZ and Roads Project section of the UPSAG version of the CMER work plan will be sent to Heather Gibbs, who will incorporate these into the work plan.	Project Managers, Chris Mendoza, Jacob Hibbeln
Chris Mendoza will inform Policy about the ongoing discussion within CMER regarding the WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design. Deciding whether or not this goes to ISPR should be a decision point at the December CMER meeting.	CMER

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

Jenny Knoth, co-chair

Knoth took roll and the October meeting minutes were brought on screen. After edits were reviewed, motion #1 to approve the October minutes was introduced and passed.

Protecting our source streams: How and how much?

John Richardson, University of British Columbia

Richardson gave a presentation focusing on the biodiversity in headwaters, after which CMER members had the opportunity to ask questions.

Recognition of Marc Hayes, WDFW

Heather Gibbs, DNR, recognized Hayes' work with CMER and thanked him for his years of service.

Hard Rock Additional Temperature Data Presentation

William Ehinger, ECY

Ehinger presented the temperature data from Hard Rock Phase II, after which CMER members had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions. Chris Mendoza, co-chair, reminded CMER that this is Phase II and that there is additional data that has yet to be analyzed.

Riparian Characteristics and Shade (RCS) Study Design

Malia Volke, DNR and Teresa Miskovic, DNR

Volke presented the study design after which Miskovic briefly explained the project schedule. Miskovic mentioned that this will hopefully be approved by the Riparian Scientific Advisory Group (RSAG) on Friday, after which it will be sent to CMER.

Mendoza asked if this had already gone through a concurrent RSAG/CMER review, after which it was sent back to RSAG. Miskovic responded that the Siskowet version of this study design had gone through concurrent review but since then, substantive changes had been made. Mendoza questioned if 3 reviewers were necessary due to the fact that this had already been reviewed. He also introduced the idea of having the previous reviewers review the latest draft for the sake of consistency.

Harry Bell, WFPA, opined that the document has changed so much that it warrants another rigorous review, especially given the importance of the study. Mendoza disagreed, stating that the degree to which a document changes should not affect the CMER process. Mark Hicks, AMPA, suggested that the original reviewers review this version of the study design if possible. The original reviewers were Hicks, Debbie Kay, Suquamish, Doug Martin, WFPA, and Mendoza. Hicks noted that he would not be serving as a reviewer given he is the AMPA.

Reviewers for this version of the study design are: Todd Baldwin, Kalispel tribe, Bell, and Kay.

Eastside Modeling Effectiveness Project (EMEP) Final Report

Gibbs

Gibbs explained that SAGE is asking for final approval after the report had been reviewed by ISPR. Bell introduced motion #2 to approve the final report. The motion passed, after which Bell inquired about who will complete the Six Questions document. Gibbs responded that SAGE is currently working on this document and will hopefully come to CMER for approval in February 2021 after it is approved by SAGE.

Landscape and Wildlife Advisory Group (LWAG) CMER Work Plan edits

Gibbs and McIntyre

Gibbs explained that most of the edits begin in the Type N Rule Group. Gibbs reviewed changes on screen and invited members to comment on edits. Aimee McIntyre, WDFW, stated that Hard Rock Phase II extended temperature data will be analyzed and reported on at a later date. Hicks stated the importance of CMER addressing whether the Hard Rock Phase II extended temperature data would be recorded in an addendum to the existing report, or if CMER would require the report needs to be modified to incorporate the additional year of data since the decision affects the Master Project Schedule (MPS) budget.

Several members commented on changes made, including to Table 13. McIntyre agreed to send the changes that CMER members requested to Gibbs, who will incorporate changes.

Gibbs then spoke on a new project regarding coastal tailed frog populations' response to Type N prescriptions, giving members the opportunity to ask any questions. McIntyre clarified that the overall project goal is to get the big picture of how coastal tailed frogs are doing in response to Type N prescriptions.

The title change to the Changes in Discontinuous Type Np Waters was also discussed. Bell expressed that because this is LWAG's project, he would not be comfortable with overriding a decision made by the group. Hicks clarified that although LWAG designed this project, the work plan is a CMER product and CMER needs to be in agreement the projects in it.

Upland Processes Scientific Advisory Group (UPSAG) CMER Work Plan edits

Gibbs and Julie Dieu, Rayonier

Due to a time shortage, the goal of today's meeting was revised to cover the CMZ and Roads Project portions of the CMER Work Plan. The most significant changes to the Roads Project portion was the revision of the status change.

Once changes were reviewed, motion #3 was introduced to approve the CMZ and Roads Project portions of the UPSAG version of the CMER work plan.

WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design

Ben Flint, DNR

Flint first updated the group on the status of the review and Knoth reminded CMER that this is more of a methods study as opposed to a pilot study. Hicks stated that generally study designs go to ISPR and the question is whether or not to conduct a double blind review or not. Because of this, CMER should carefully consider the decision before choosing not to send this study design to ISPR. Hicks made it clear that he is not saying it has to go through ISPR, but that it needs to be a well thought out decision because this does have the potential to later inform rule making.

Mendoza commented that the authors called this an exploratory study and that what CMER will do with the study design needs to be considered as well.

Bell added that because this is not a CMER Study Design, he is not sure that it needs to be sent to ISPR. Hicks responded that ISPR is available for outside completed research. If the Adaptive Management Program (AMP) is going to use this study design, an unpublished study can be sent through ISPR. The point of ISPR is to build confidence that time and money are spent on sound projects. Unless CMER is sure that this will not be used for decision making, it would be beneficial to send this to ISPR. In this case, CMER knows that this will provide the Type Np Workgroup information for recommendations on rule change.

Mendoza reminded the group that this is a study design and there are no results. Regardless, he would advise caution and send this to ISPR. Knoth stated that because this is not a CMER

project, it would be helpful to put the study design through an open ISPR review for the sake of thoroughness.

Bell commented that because this is not a CMER product he is inclined to wait to send the document through ISPR until study results are delivered.

Baldwin asked Hicks that because this was sent from the Forest Practices Board to Policy, and from Policy to CMER, if that means that CMER is obligated to make this decision? Hicks responded that this study design is now part of the AMP, and so CMER needs to go through the full process.

Mendoza referenced the CMER approved document regarding the use of non-CMER science, stating that this is a unique situation. He emphasized that if this will be used in the AMP in any capacity, it should be sent through ISPR. Mendoza also commented that CMER has the unique opportunity to work with the author to edit the study design. Therefore, CMER has an active role in participating in what the author submits.

Knoth inquired about whether or not an ISPR review could be completed according to the timeline previously decided on. Hicks responded that he has already warned ISPR that this could be coming and so reviewing within the designated time frame is possible.

Mendoza suggested consulting Policy about how the study design could be used in the AMP. Hicks responded that although this would need be a CMER decision, it is not a bad idea to consult Policy.

Knoth then covered the next steps of the review process, commenting that the author is currently working on revisions. Doug Martin, WFPA, stated that there will not be changes in the objective of the study and that he would welcome an ISPR review. Ash Roorbach, NWIFC, stated that the document still needs CMER approval before it can go to ISPR.

Hicks and Knoth agreed that it is important to make a decision in a timely manner and it was decided that a formal vote would be taken at the next meeting.

SFL PI Template Review

Knoth

Knoth stated that the meeting was rescheduled due to inclement weather and that a meeting was rescheduled for Monday, November 16.

Wetlands Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Tool Update

Eszter Munes, DNR

Munes reminded the group that Meghan Halabisky, UW, presented on Phase II of the report during the October WetSAG meeting. One of the concerns was that private landowners needing

to grant permission to use data from private land. This publication was focused on the Hoh River Watershed and will not use data collected on private land.

CMER SAG Updates

Knoth

Mendoza thanked the Project Managers for trimming the updates, but commented that the Roads Project section was still lengthy. Flint responded that because CMER is the oversight committee, he chose to leave extra details on that project specifically. Gibbs also announced McIntyre as the new co-chair of LWAG and that Flint would be taking over as project manager in January 2021.

Update from TFW Policy and the Forest Practices Board (FPB)

Hicks

Hicks reviewed the main decision points of the last Policy meeting, adding that DNR is currently developing a one page briefing document for the legislature regarding the need for a fully funded AMP that it will be sharing with stakeholders for their input.

Hicks then reviewed the main decision points of the Forest Practices Board meeting, emphasizing the expedited rule making for non-substantive clarifications/corrections on WAC 222.

Conclusions

Knoth and Hibbeln

Motions and action items were reviewed on screen, after which the meeting was adjourned.

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER
Cramer, Darin	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Flint, Ben	Department of Natural Resources
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Hayes, Marc	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Hibbeln, Jacob	CMER
Hicks, Mark	Department of Natural Resources – AMPA
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association

Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ WSAC, CMER co-chair
Krausz, Eric	Colville Tribe
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Munes, Eszter	Department of Natural Resources
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Ojala-Barbour, Reed	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Richardson, John	University of British Columbia
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fish Commission
Thomas, Cody	Spokane Tribe
Walter, Jason	ISAG
Volke, Malia	CMER