

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER)

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, March 22, 2022 // 9:00 am – 3:45PM
Remotely held using Zoom

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>February 2022 Meeting Notes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u></p> <p>Todd Baldwin moved to approve the February 2022 meeting notes.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay</p> <p>Up: Chris Mendoza, Doug Martin, Mark Meleason, Patrick Lizon, Jenny Knoth, Ash Roorbach, Julie Dieu , Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, A.J. Knoll, and Todd Baldwin.</p>
<p>RCS Study Design Approval: ISPR Approved</p> <p><u>Motion:</u></p> <p>Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the ISPR-approved RCS Study Design, and acknowledge that the planned field-based implementation trial may influence implementation of treatments during overall study implementation.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Mark Meleason</p> <p>Up: Chris Mendoza, Doug Martin, Mark Meleason, Patrick Lizon, Jenny Knoth, Ash Roorbach, Julie Dieu, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, A.J. Knoll</p> <p>Sideways: Mark Mobbs and Todd Baldwin</p>
<p>#1: RCS Add-on Approval</p> <p><u>Motion:</u></p> <p>Todd Baldwin moved to vote on the RCS Add-on study design as modified by the CMER comments.</p> <p>The motion failed</p>	<p>Seconded: Chris Mendoza</p> <p>Up: Doug Martin, Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell, Mark Meleason, Julie Dieu, and A.J. Kroll.</p> <p>Sideways: Patrick Lizon, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, and Aimee McIntyre.</p> <p>Down: Todd Baldwin and Chris Mendoza</p>
<p>#2: RCS Add-on AMPA Memo to Policy Approval</p> <p>Harry Bell moved to follow AMPA's recommendation to ask policy if the add-on's, that are being considered by CMER, a priority.</p>	<p>Seconded: (Amendment) Julie Dieu</p> <p>Up: Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Mark Meleason, Jenny</p>

<p>Seconded: Mark Meleason</p> <p>Aimee McIntyre suggested modification:</p> <p>I move to follow the AMPA's recommendation to ask Policy if the RCS add-on's (for which a study design is in development, but has not been approved, by CMER) are a priority, specifically whether the CMER-approved RCS Study design addresses the full scope of treatments that Policy would like to have investigated, or if the RCS add on includes additional treatments that are a Policy priority.</p> <p>Harry Bell approved the modification</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Knoth, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, and Mark Mobbs.</p> <p>Sideways: Patrick Lizon</p>
--	--

Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
Eastside Forest Health Strategy	CMER commentary Due to Jenny Schofield by 4:00PM on April 14, 2022 Todd to send out to SAGE
Westside Type F prescription effectiveness exploratory report: RSAG request for CMER review	Jenelle Black will have document ready in a couple of days and will be sent out as an early mailing for the April CMER meeting. Review information received from Jenelle Due date will come with document
Co-Chair Rotation	Jenny Knoth and Chris Mendoza to create a list of Co-Chair's responsibilities and provide the expected rotation schedule.

Notes:

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

Jenny Knoth, CMER Co-Chair

Jenny Knoth took roll call

Natalie Church did an icebreaker

Two tips for a good meeting were read:

- Aimee McIntyre chose as “TFW Policy Participants recognize the legitimacy of the goals of others and assume that their own goals will also be respected. (TFW)”
- Chris Mendoza “Individual Policy Committee positions are not the basis for CMER decisions, otherwise the credibility of CMER research can be questioned, resulting in CMER having failed in its function of providing accountable results to the Adaptive Management Program. (CMER)”

Eastside Forest Health Strategy:

Todd Baldwin reviewed Eastside Forest Health Strategy document that was sent out with the mailing. At the last CMER meeting, Todd went through the background of the Eastside Forest Health Strategy. About a year ago, Policy suggested to form a group to figure out how to move forward with this topic. They ended up deciding that a subgroup would work with CMER to form a strategy. The resulting document is more of a guidance document that outlines what is important to stakeholders. The subgroup spent several meetings on forest health issues and looking at supporting literature. SAGE was not able to find much on RMZs. The group has had trouble finding a definite answer to: Who is applying rules to maintain and/or restore riparian functions? Background and questions should be considered by SAGE/CMER for guidance when scoping upcoming research project. Technical questions such as, how heavily stocked are RMZ's may or may not contribute to fire entering the RMZ's. Wetland management prescriptions are applied more often than RMZ prescriptions. What management approaches are best and where are they appropriate? Debbie Kay mentioned that they are just starting the scoping of WMZ Effectiveness Project and it may possibly be an opportunity to do some joint work. Harry Bell asked, how will this relate to ETHEP study? Todd Baldwin explained that it is not really a study at this point, as it depends what comes out of the stakeholder's concerns. Chris Mendoza discussed how this fits into the CMER work plan strategies developed for all programs under each rule group - bringing existing information together to form a more comprehensive program strategy Jenny Knoth and Todd Baldwin discussed if this is a firewall issue if CMER and Policy could discuss the science of the strategy. Todd does not see an issue and answered Mark Meleason's question regarding whether this is a common practice. Todd Baldwin explained that SAGE is not getting involved with responding to comments until there is a final document. CMER comment is available for 30 days. Please send all comments to Jenny Schofield.

CMER Co-Chair rotation:

Typically, the CMER Co-Chair role is a 2-year term and is not a contract. Jenny Knoth explained that a CMER Co-Chair does not need to be a Board-approved voting member of CMER to serve. However, if the candidate is not a voting member, it is recommended the candidate's caucus nominate the candidate to the Board for approval as a core member and that the guidelines are laid out in the PSM. A.J. Kroll suggested dropping down to one Co-Chair and that will hopefully promote someone to step up and fill that second position. Harry Bell suggested having a standard rotation. Chris Mendoza suggested that the rotation needs to be staggered so that there are not 2 new people starting at the same time.

Aimee McIntyre suggested having more explicit expectations to be able to take it to the member's agency to get the okay and support to be able to fill a Co-Chair position. Jenelle Black suggested that it should be more of an AMPA and Co-Chair discussion, Jenny Knoth agreed. Doug Martin gave an explanation that Co-Chairs are there to represent and facilitate the science.

Debbie Kay requested a day in a life of a Co-Chair to be able to take something to her agency to explain the exact process of being a Co-Chair. Jenny Knoth will put together the day in a life of a Co-Chair and she asked Chris to do the same.

RCS Study Design Approval: ISPR Approved:

Following a review of process and a brief discussion regarding the ISPR recommendation for a field trial, CMER voted to approve the RCS Study design. There was agreement that a field trial will address some lingering logistical questions and help refine the implementation of the study. During the conversation, Joe Murray received confirmation from a landowner that they are interested in the RCS Study but would like to have more information about timeline (to help with?) marketing. Chris Mendoza clarified that ISPR did not make their approval of the RCS study design contingent on conducting a field trial and that they approved the study design without it. Joe Murray received confirmation from a landowner that they are interest in the RCS Study but would like to have more information about the timeline, marketing, etc. It was then put to vote and approved.

RCS Add-on Approval:

Jenny Knoth briefly explained what the AMPA and CMER Co-Chairs discussed the issues related to the comments received from reviewers on the RCS Add-on approval. The RCS Add-on is clearly a Policy priority question and at this point no matter the technical merits or feasibility, the AMPA should speak with Policy to learn about their priority. The AMPA and Co-Chairs agreed that a check in with Policy would be useful to possibly prevent another dispute resolution. Saboor Jawad did not attend CMER, but has agreed with CMER co-chairs to carry this message forward to Policy to get feedback to determine if CMER should continue and vote on the RCS Add-ons. RSAG responded to all comments as a workgroup and not individually. The workgroup included Patrick Lizon, John Heimburg, Doug Martin, Harry Bell, Mark Meleason, and Joe Murray.

Lori shared that Saboor feels that going to dispute over the RCS Add-ons is avoidable. CMER could consider sending the add-on to first answer the policy question and then deliberate on the technical merits leading to an approval of the add-on. Or do this in parallel. CMER's decision doesn't have to be an approval decision but a request to AMPA to facilitate answer to a Policy question.

The co-chairs agreed to put the RCS add-on to a vote consistent with the agenda. A vote was taken and CMER did not approve. A follow up motion was presented by Harry Bell, and modified by Aimee McIntyre, to have the AMPA recommend to Policy if the add-on treatments are a priority. The motion passed.

Westside Type F prescription effectiveness exploratory report: RSAG request for CMER review:

The Westside Type F Exploratory Report was not completed in time for the March CMER mailing. Jenelle Black will have document ready in a couple of days and will be sent out as an early mailing for the April CMER meeting. Jenelle will present all of the information at April CMER meeting. Jenelle showed a power point presentation and gave a brief explanation of the report. Questions related to the presentation are to be emailed to Jenelle.

PHB Study Design:

This was a place holder in case there was any questions. There were not any questions at that time.

Comments due by April 24th by noon

Policy Update:

Meghan Tuttle provided Policy updates. They currently are discussing a positive variance in the budget, and are reviewing SAO Recommendations, both net gains and decision criteria. Policy approved the Hard Rock Phase III Charter and it was resolved in stage one of the dispute resolution process. Meghan shared the Np dispute timeline. The upcoming Stage II dispute with the SFLO and the SFLO relatively low impact dispute is in Stage I is taking place in April. Policy is currently working on onboarding new Policy members; there will be training over the summer. Extensive monitoring is on the agenda for the April Policy meeting.

CMER SAG Updates:

Updated the live SAG update document.

Public Comments:

Put up Charles Chesney comments shared via email prior to meeting on screen for others to review.

Public Comments
Submitted by
Charles Chesney
March 22, 2022

Topic FOREST HEALTH and fire effects (on small, steep stream channels in the Columbia River Basin-Ahtanum, Cowiche, Tieton basins.

CONTEXT

- From the Channel Reference Site Network Wood in Small Streams Project (CRSNWISSP)- spawned by the Ahtanum Watershed Analysis
- Over 20 years, 18 sites, 10 repeat visits, Charles Chesney, Prime Monitor
- Baseline results, TFW document #127 of February 2000, see the revision November 2001 (all 18 datasets, here)
- 11 'managed' sites, 7 'unmanaged' sites; 6000 trees in 18 sites
- 2079 small channel wood pieces, 395 large pieces, 300 sediment wedges

CONTENT

- Forest and channel mensuration, 100% surveys, 50 meter stream reach, a pair (left, right) of 'forest plots'-each 25 meters wide (by 50 m length)
- Measure input (terrestrial) and import, export (fluvial processes) of channel wood, down to 1 inch diameter, 12 inch length; no upper dimension limits

CONSEQUENCES

- Measured flux rates (input, import, export) and tree fall rates.
- How many trees fall?
- What fallen trees are terrestrial wood (soil organic matter) or fluvial wood (channel organic matter)?
- What fluvial wood is zone 1 and zone 2 channel wood (current, ‘active’ wood within the channel’s wetted perimeter)?
- These CRSNWISSP data measure, not model, conversion rates from streamside standing trees into zone 1, zone 2, zone 3, and zone 4 channel wood.

ABOUT FIRE EFFECTS-BIG PICTURE

- Recent Norse Peak fire (2018)
- Two close by ‘unmanaged’ sites affected, remarkably different ‘results’
- Two burned sites about <1/2 mile distance apart
- One site, complete burnout, 100% forest mortality, thermal chimney effect (steep, confined, V-notched valley form, very steep hillslopes)
- Other site, unconfined channel, low hillslope gradients, numerous massive streamside trees; spotty crown fire effects, some initial mortality, likely leading to higher mortality in the streamside forest plots
- Big Picture: some recent channel wood input and import; longer time elapsed since fire required to understand Norse Peak fire effects of 2018.
- Major effect, burned and charred bridges collapse, create ramps and rafts
- Minor effect, immediate (<1 year post-fire) response of tree fall into/over channel (fluvial wood creation)
- Sediment wedge channel wood step faces not significantly affected

THE END

- Questions (beyond the scope of this public comment), holler; contact me
- End comment from charles chesney, Prime Monitor, CRSNWISSP

Conclusion/Review/Action Items

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 the Public
Church, Natalie	DNR – Adaptive Management Program Administrative Assistant
Clark, Lori	DNR project manager
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Estrella, Stephanie	Department of Ecology
Hawkins, Tracey	DNR Staff
Heimburg, John	WDFW

Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association, CMER Co-Chair
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Meleason, Mark	County Caucus
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Indian Nation
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Prescott, Alexander	DNR Project manager
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schofield, Jenny	DNR project manager
Stewart, Greg	CMER staff
Tuttle, Meghan	Policy Co-Chair (for updates)
Toledo, Anna	DNR project manager
Walter, Jason	ISAG Co-Chair
Westreich, Lila	Compliance Monitor Manager
Williams, Tanner	CMER Scientist

§CMER Voting Member

Ash Roorbach was proxy for Mark Mobbs 9:00AM-10:05AM

Patrick Lizon left meeting at 3:10PM

Jason Walter left meeting at 3:25PM

Debbie Kay left meeting at 3:25PM