

CMER Meeting
Tuesday, May 26, 2020, 9:00 am – 2:30 pm
Held remotely using GoToMeeting

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER Science Staff
chesney, charles	Member of Public
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Gibbs, Heather	Department of Natural Resources
Flint, Ben	Department of Natural Resources
Hicks, Mark	Department of Natural Resources – AMPA
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Hough-Snee, Nate	Four Peaks Environmental Science & Data Solutions
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association, CMER co-chair
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinalt Indian Nation
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Munes, Eszter	Washington Department of Natural Resources
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Swanson, Scott	Washington State Association of Counties
Stewart, Greg	CMER Science Staff
Volke, Malia	CMER Science Staff
Walters, Jason	Weyerhaeuser
Whittaker, Kara	Conservation Caucus - UPSAG co-chair
Rachel Pirot	UPSAG

§ Board-approved voting members.

Motions/Action Items

Motions 5/26/2020	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
Approved the April Meeting minutes with a small edit from Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chair	Aimee McIntyre/Harry Bell (all thumbs up)
Approved the Answers to the CMER Prospective 6 Questions document for the Hard Rock Amphibian Demographics Project.	Doug Martin/Harry Bell (Todd Baldwin, Kalispell, sideways; all other thumbs up)
Approved the FWEP Literature Review document conditioned upon the author making copy editing corrections	Chris Mendoza/Debbie Kay (all thumbs up)

Action Items 5/26/2020	
Action	Responsibility
Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, and AJ Kroll agreed to review the Prospective 6 questions and scoping documents for the Deep Seated Landslide Research Strategy Project. Comments are due back by June 26 th .	Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, AJ Kroll
Word versions of the documents will be sent to reviewers and Harry Bell.	Ben Flint
Nate Hough-Snee will incorporate editorial changes made to the FWEP Literature Review by June 1.	Nate Hough-Snee
A map showing locations with LiDAR coverage in Washington will be sent to Jacob Hibbeln, after which he will send out to CMER. Voting members have been asked to think about their projects and where LiDAR coverage would be beneficial.	Ben Flint, Jacob Hibbeln, CMER voting members

Minutes

Introductions

Mendoza and Knoth

Chris Mendoza, CMER co-chair, began by introducing Jenny Knoth, WFFA/Counties, as his new co-chair. After reviewing remote meeting conduct and ground rules, Knoth went through the agenda and asked voting caucus members if they had any contributions.

Presentation: Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy: Landslide Mapping and Classification Project Draft Scoping Document

Flint and Dieu

Julie Dieu, Rayonier, and Ben Flint, DNR, gave a presentation on the Deep Seated Landslide (DSL) research strategy. At the end, Dieu presented the alternatives that the UPSAG had considered. Alternative 2 is the preferred alternative which is in the CMER budget. Members discussed what the proper process for selecting alternatives is. Mendoza clarified that the process according to CMER's protocols and standards manual is for CMER to vote on a scoping alternative, after which the decision would be passed on to Policy for approval.

UPSAG

Flint and Knoth

After the presentation, Flint and Knoth asked for volunteers to review the DSL Scoping document and Prospective 6 questions. Debbie Kay, Suquamish, AJ Kroll, Weyerhaeuser, and Mendoza offered to review the scoping document. Comments are due to Ben Flint by June 26th.

April 28th Meeting Minutes

Knoth

After a small edit from Knoth, motion #1 to approve the meeting minutes from April and passed with all thumbs up.

Answers to CMER's Prospective 6 Questions for Hard Rock Extended Monitoring (Amphibian Demographics)

Gibbs and McIntyre

Aimee McIntyre, WDFW explained that LWAG has a study proposal for a phase III of the hard rock study that would be focused on amphibian demographics post-harvest. This step is following the new process for extended monitoring requests which was approved by CMER and Policy. After summarizing this phase of the project, McIntyre stated that funding is requested for next biennium but can be pushed out if necessary. Doug Martin, WFPA, made motion #2 to approve the document, after which discussion ensued.

Mendoza commented on question 4A, suggesting the information does not match the findings report from the stream temperature chapter of Type N Hard Rock Phase I study report. McIntyre explained that everything on this current document is from the new analysis associated with the Phase II report that is currently in ISPR review. She noted this analysis should trump the 2 year post-harvest results previously used. McIntyre also explained that the conclusions made in the document are restricted to amphibian

response and don't focus on stream temperature. This is a prospective findings report that can be presented to Policy that is reflective of the current state of knowledge.

Discussion was concluded and Knoth called for a vote. All thumbs were up with the exception of Todd Baldwin, Kalispell tribe who voted sideways, choosing to defer to the Westside tribes on this vote. Motion #2 was approved.

FWEP Literature Review

Munes

Eszter Munes, DNR, explained that comments made by the reviewers were minimal and did not change the content of the document. Nate Hough-Snee, Four Peaks Environmental, can make these edits by June 1, 2020.

Mendoza made motion #3 to accept the document conditioned upon the author making copy editorial corrections. Debbie Kay, Suquamish tribe, seconded and motion passed.

LiDAR Acquisition through Washington Department of Natural Resources

Flint

Flint first explained the funding sources for LiDAR acquisition, explaining that CMER should be represented as a stakeholder at the WGS Meeting in June. Funding sources are: internal funding from the legislature, grant funding (this will cover up to 20% as long as it covers a federal need), and other third parties such as counties, other state and federal agencies).

Flint is asking CMER members to consider where they think the priorities for coverage should be. The following comments for where LiDAR would be beneficial are:

- Teresa Miskovic, DNR, stated that the Mount Spokane area for the Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP) would need to be acquired prior to harvest (by this fall) and snowfall. This can be leaf-on or off coverage.
- Jenelle Black, NWIFC, stated that leaf-off LiDAR would be helpful around the Roads Prescription Project site areas, specifically around the Toutle and Kid Valley blocks as well as the Naselle blocks.

Flint stated that the plan is to go through the LiDAR acquisition process just in case there are additional funds at the end of the biennium. The cost relies on identifying where and what quality LiDAR coverage is needed.

eDNA Dispute Resolution

Hicks and Mendoza

Mark Hicks, AMPA, briefly summarized the history of the Dispute Resolution, explaining that A.J. Kroll, Weyerhaeuser, agreed to let the comments go to the author in the informal meeting that was held as part of Step 1 of CMER's Guided Decision Making process. Kroll still believes that the study is fundamentally flawed and will likely vote not to approve the report. Hicks noted normally an issue cannot be considered settled if a party steps aside with the intention not to approve at a later stage. However, in this situation both parties are willing to accept the outcome of the report not being finalized after coming back from the author. The reason the proponents were okay with this likely outcome is that they have taken the position that getting responses to their questions and concerns would be of great help in developing their lessons learned document for this opportunistic pilot study.

The next step is for Munes and Hicks to follow up with the author of the document and find out what the author will respond to, acquire all of the data that CMER paid for and bring it back to CMER for a vote at which time CMER will have one final say on whether to pay the author to proceed.

Mendoza stated that the report can still move forward to Policy if not approved by consensus. Knoth and Hicks also stated that the document will not “die” but does not go to Policy or the Board because it is a methods paper. Even if CMER does not approve this report, it will still be sent to Policy. Jason Walter, Weyerhaeuser, asked about non-consensus projects and how a project would move forward with this. Mendoza stated that CMER’s Dispute Resolution guided decision making process provides a path for non-consensus and used the CMER Landslide Effectiveness Monitoring Project as an example.

Direction on Extended Monitoring Memo

Mendoza

Mendoza began by going through the details of the documents which were sent out in the CMER mailing - the Extended Monitoring Memo, form, and appendix. Overall, there is still value in step 1 and using summary information sheets and other forms in the appendix previously developed by CMER before answering the prospective 6 questions. The point of these documents is to ensure that CMER understands how extended monitoring projects should be proposed and to create a standard process for future extended monitoring proposals.

Hard Rock Extended Monitoring Phase II ISPR Issues

McIntyre

McIntyre has received the ISPR review from Phase II, which was grouped into like-sections by different reviewers. Between each section, the consistent feedback was that the project team relied too heavily on the Phase I Report. Many comments had to do with restructuring the report and including more detail. Details on the study design and methodology are especially important.

Hicks spoke with the executive editor who told them the level of detail in describing their methods was inadequate and inconsistent between each section. Hicks asked the associated Project Investigators to review recommendations for addressing comments. After this is done, Hicks will meet with the executive editor to formally resolve the issues.

CMER SAG Updates

Mendoza

Mendoza briefly summarized the document, highlighting the latest updates to projects from last month. Joe Murray, WFPA, gave an update on the CMER Work plan Improvement Group. So far, the group has met once. Moving forward, there will be regular updates every month.

Report from TFW Policy

Hicks

Hicks went through the main decision points made at the May Policy meeting, mentioning that the committee is scheduled to discuss the Bull Trout-Overlay study in July.

Report from Forest Practices Board

Hicks

Hicks then gave a general update on the decision points made by the Forest Practices Board (FPB) at the May meeting. He mentioned the Washington Forest Protection Association (WFPA) Proposal Initiation (PI) and that TFW Policy would decide what to do with that next meeting.

Knoth asked for clarification on what the next steps are for ISAG regarding the Boards motion on water typing projects (PHB Validation, DPC, and LiDAR). Hicks reported that the FPB accepted a strategy for how to finalize the water typing study designs. At the February meeting, the Board motioned for CMER to revise study designs and to determine the feasibility of combining them for cost-effectiveness and efficiency. Hicks stated that he will attend the next ISAG meeting to help clarify this.

Public Comment

charles chesney spoke briefly about wisdom gleaned about wildfire effects, especially on channel wood input and channel wood dynamics (hydraulics, habitats, accretion, depletion).