

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, September 28th, 2021 // 9:00 am – 5:01 pm

Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Aimee McIntyre (<i>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</i>) moved to approve the August Meeting Minutes with amendments.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Joe Murray (<i>acting as proxy for Julie Dieu - Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association</i>)</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Mark Mobbs, Mark Meleason, Joe Murray (<i>proxy for Julie Dieu</i>)</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p>SFLO Small Forest Landowner Six Questions Working Group</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Harry Bell (<i>Washington Forest Protection Association</i>) moved that CMER recognize, as best available science, the Independent Function Evaluation (IFE) and results shown in Table 8 of the Cramer Assessment along with the ISPR comments specific to the IFE</p> <p>The motion failed</p>	<p>Seconded: Joe Murray (<i>acting as proxy for Doug Martin - Washington Forest Protection Association</i>)</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Joe Murray</p> <p>Sideways: Mark Meleason, Julie Dieu, AJ Kroll</p> <p>Down: Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Recused: Jenny Knoth Abstain: Chris Mendoza</p>
<p>ISAG Water Typing update memo to the FPB</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Todd Baldwin (<i>Kalispel Tribe of Indians</i>) moved to approve sending the ISAG Water Typing Update Memo to the FPB</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay (<i>Suquamish Tribe – NW Indian Fish Commission</i>)</p> <p>Up: Todd Baldwin, Jenny Knoth, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, Chris Mendoza, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Mark Meleason, A.J. Kroll, Joe Murray (<i>proxy for Doug Martin</i>)</p> <p>Sideways: Harry Bell</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p>Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions</p> <p><u>Motion</u> Chris Mendoza (<i>Conservation Caucus</i>) moved to</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie Dieu (<i>Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association</i>)</p> <p>Up: Todd Baldwin, Chris Mendoza, Patrick Lizon, Debbie Kay, Mark Mobbs</p>

<p>approve the CMER answers to the Six Questions to the Hard Rock Extended report.</p> <p>The motion failed</p>	<p>Sideways: Mark Meleason, Jenny Knoth, Julie Dieu</p> <p>Abstain: Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Down: Doug Martin, Harry Bell, A.J. Kroll</p>
<p>Soft Rock Executive Summary</p> <p><u>Motion:</u></p> <p>Aimee McIntyre (<i>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</i>) moved to approve the Soft Rock Executive Summary.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Chris Mendoza (<i>Conservation Caucus</i>)</p> <p>Up: Todd Baldwin, Jenny Knoth, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, Chris Mendoza, Aimee McIntyre, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell, Joe Murray (<i>proxy for Doug Martin</i>)</p> <p>Sideways: Mark Meleason</p>
<p>Soft Rock Six Questions</p> <p><u>Motion:</u></p> <p>Aimee McIntyre (<i>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</i>) moved to approve the Soft Rock Six Questions response to Policy.</p> <p>The motion failed</p>	<p>Seconded: Patrick Lizon (<i>Department of Ecology</i>)</p> <p>Up: Aimee McIntyre, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin, Julie Dieu, Ash Roorbach (<i>proxy for Debbie Kay</i>), Mark Mobbs, Chris Mendoza</p> <p>Sideways: Mark Meleason, AJ Kroll</p> <p>Down: Harry Bell, Jenny Knoth, Joe Murray (<i>proxy for Doug Martin</i>)</p>

Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p>CPEACE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chris Mendoza will create a “ranking” spreadsheet (from CPEACE list) to send out to CMER members before the next meeting for members to prioritize what CMER should work on first. CMER members to have their responses back to co-chairs by October 12th. 	<p>Chris Mendoza CMER Members</p>
<p>WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design with LiDAR methodology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AMPA facilitates and initiates the first informal meeting for the next step in consideration of a Dispute Resolution that was invoked. A doodle poll invitation for the meeting to be sent to members. 	<p>Saboor Jawad</p>

<p>SFLO Small Forest Landowner Six Questions Working Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send out the SFLO document again in “Word”. • Create a list of agreements and disagreements and incorporate into a memo. Comments will be in a bullet format and brought back to CMER. 	<p>Memo List - Co-chairs</p>
<p>SAO Audit Report</p> <p>Formation of a CMER/Policy Work Group to work on Recommendation #6 in partnership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CMER members to talk to their management concerning their time and level of commitment and confirm in October if they will be able to participate in the Work Group. 	<p>CMER Members</p>
<p>CMER Mailing Material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracked and Working Documents to be sent to CMER Members in “Word” • Final Documents to be sent out in PDF format 	
<p>Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AJ Kroll invoked a Dispute Resolution • AMPA to send out doodle poll to set up initial informal meeting 	<p>Saboor Jawad</p>
<p>Hard Rock Phase III Project Charter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new draft to be sent out by Aimee McIntyre • This decision is moved to the October meeting 	<p>Aimee McIntyre</p>
<p>Soft Rock Six Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A “Word” document of the Six Questions will be sent out to the members with tracked changes. • Bill Ehinger requested members make comments on the “clean” document • A meeting will be set up by Lori Clark for CMER members who made comments to discuss them with the authors. 	<p>Lori Clark</p>

The Roads Project

- A QA session for the Roads annual report will be on the October CMER Science Session

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

Jenny Knoth / Chris Mendoza, (*CMER co-chairs*)

Introductions

Jenny Knoth took roll call.

Saboor Jawad (AMPA) opened the meeting with an “Ice Breaker”.

Two ground rules were read.

Rotation of the CMER co-chairs

Jenny Knoth reviewed the list of CMER co-chairs and their rotation over the past years. The process and timeline were reviewed for future co-chairs. Chris Mendoza encouraged members to consider becoming a co-chair especially if they haven’t served before. Jenny noted that you don’t have to be a CMER voting member to serve as the CMER co-chair and asked that members get back to them if they are interested in serving.

Meeting Minutes

Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the August 24th Meeting Minutes with amendments. It was seconded by Joe Murray. **The motion passed.**

Patrick Lizon requested that page numbers be added to the minutes.

Updates

- Joe Murray noted he will act as proxy for Julie Dieu and Doug Martin of the Washington Forest Protection Association when they are not at the meeting today.
- Saboor Jawad noted that Eszter Munes is on extended leave till the middle of November. He noted that Heather Gibbs is no longer working for DNR and Lori Clark will be the point person for both Eszter and Heather’s projects. He added that they are quickly working on filling the Project Manager position.
- Saboor noted that a science review is currently being worked on by WDFW. The review was originally proposed as an AMP project. He added that the legislature allocated funding to complete this work outside the AMP and that study authors are revising the scope of work. He noted that the study will review CMER science since 1999 and document the reasons for why the studies were funded and evaluate the degree to which the studies have informed Policy issues. Aimee McIntyre noted the study would be informative to the AMP. She added that they are hiring a social scientist

from the University of Washington who will oversee this work. Harry Bell asked what role if any CMER will play in this and if CMER will have an opportunity to make comments on the project report. Saboor responded that this is not an AMP project and that CMER will not be directly involved. He added that CMER could be interviewed if the line of inquiry leads to that and it does involve CMER science.

Science Session – CPEACE

Chris Mendoza spoke to the flip chart document from the CPEACE Group 3 notes that was a follow up on what attendees had learned from the CPEACE Work Shop.

Chris summarized an outline of specific AMP processes that Group 3 thought worked and didn't work. He noted that it was now time for CMER to narrow the scope of this work and asked for comments on where they would like to start. He noted that the list was open to expansion or subtraction but the important issue was to prioritize what the members decide to work on. He added that this project overlaps with the recommendations that CMER will have to respond to in the State Auditor Office report.

Aimee McIntyre mentioned she was not clear if we have figured out from the CPEACE training CMER's next steps or action items. She asked how do we take the lessons learned and identify action items and prioritize them.

Debbie Kay noted that we suffer from a trust problem and don't spend enough time being direct and asking members hard questions if necessary.

After the discussion Chris Mendoza created an action item:

Action Item

- Chris Mendoza will create a "ranking" spreadsheet (from CPEACE list) to send out to CMER members before the next meeting for members to prioritize what CMER should work on first.
- CMER members are to have their responses back to co-chairs by October 12th.

Jenelle Black requested that the administrative topics be taken off the list because they don't require CMER resources. Chris noted that he would take those off before sending out to CMER.

Robert Lackey Documents

Jenny Knoth asked for input from members on the two papers from Robert Lackey that were sent in the mailing: Axioms of Ecological Policy and Science Scientists and Policy Advocacy.

Patrick Lizon noted that what he liked about Robert Lackey's 2007 article on Science-Scientists and Policy Advocacy was that it emphasized that it was important to keep Policy preferences from CMER science.

Harry Bell noted that in follow up to Patrick's comment, Policy clearly has input on what science CMER works on. He added his concern dealt with the fact that the independent SAGs put together work plans which Policy rarely participates in and therefore Policy doesn't do a good job of prioritizing our projects.

He added that he was disappointed in the lack of consideration from Policy on what the SAGs are proposing and this needs more discussion.

Chris Mendoza noted that CMER provides ample opportunity for Policy to weigh in on all our projects and gave examples including reviewing our critical questions during project development, scoping and study alternatives, project charters, CMER's prospective answers to six questions, etc., and how they are approved along the way. Whether they do this in favor of one caucus' priority over another is not up to us and it is important for us as CMER members to keep our Policy members informed on all our projects so they are better prepared.

Mark Meleason noted that the Lackey documents highlighted the fact that you have to respect the fire wall between Policy and Science and the importance of respecting others. He added he wasn't clear about CMER's role in outside science.

Jenny Knoth noted that CMER is charged with translating Policy's questions into testable hypotheses and ensuring that Policy has an understanding of what we (CMER) sends them.

Joe Murray noted that when communication is a problem it is important for CMER to reflect on what part of that problem is ours.

Glen Merritt's Ecology Presentation - "Watershed Health Monitoring for Statewide Status & Trends"

Jenny asked if CMER thought the information from these types of presentations was still of interest and if CMER wanted other conversations to include topics like extensive monitoring, etc. Jenny noted she will add time to discuss presentations as a topic in a dedicated CMER Science Session.

Update from TFW Policy

Marc Engel / Meghan Tuttle (*Policy co-chairs*)

Meghan Tuttle gave an update from Policy:

- The Policy work load is heavy and they have had additional meetings concerning the Type Np Discussions.
- The WFPA PI has gone to Stage II of the Dispute Resolution process and they are currently putting a contract together to hire a mediator. They hope to have hired a mediator by the end of December or early January.
- The Forested Wetland Effectiveness Charter was approved by Policy at their September meeting.
- Policy is evaluating the SAO audit recommendations with a focus on the definition of "net gains" and the creation of a joint Work Group between Policy and CMER to work on the recommendations. The AMPA will be presenting a definition of "net gains" at the October Policy Meeting,
- Policy will be reviewing the Relatively Low Impact proposal request from SFLO at the October meeting and the AMPA will be submitting a memo response to the request.
- Policy will review the Hard Rock Phase III Charter if it is approved at CMER today and hopefully have approval on the Charter in November.

Meghan added that at the August FP Board meeting the Chair requested that Policy look at the CMER voting membership composition and Policy is asking for clarification on this because it wasn't approved as a FP Board motion. Since that time the Policy co-chairs met with the outgoing and interim FP Chairs and the understanding is that this will become part of the SAO recommendations request. She added that this will be presented at the October Policy meeting and Policy will decide if they want to request a formal motion from the FP Board, defer this to the AMPA or determine if Policy members will spend more time evaluating.

Meghan added that they are extending the extensive monitoring committee to include both CMER and Policy members.

Debbie Kay asked if Meghan knew what factors Policy is looking at for the CMER voting member composition. Meghan noted that there was no official direction from the FP Board. She added that CMER isn't set up as a one to one caucus membership composition like Policy. She added that there are caucuses at Policy that would like to see CMER voting membership composition as a one to one ratio and Policy is taking those concerns very seriously. This is part of the reason this is being evaluated. Marc Engel noted that voting members at Policy are self-appointed whereas CMER voting members are voted on by the FP Board so this could end up being a motion that has to be approved at the Board level to give us succinct direction.

Saboor Jawad noted that in reference to the two audit recommendations that refer to revisiting the decision making model it pertains to the CMER membership voting composition and this work has been assigned to caucus principals.

WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design with LiDAR methodology

Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*)

Saboor gave a background on how the Smart Buffer Study Design ended up in CMER. He noted that the Smart Buffer Study Design came to CMER as a result of a proposal initiation process. He added that the AMPA (at that time) recommended that Policy not accept the proposal because the proponents hadn't planned for it to go through CMER. He added that the AMPA then met with the proponents and they agreed to have it go through CMER at which time he withdrew his initial memo and replaced it with a memo that requested that Policy accept it as a science tracked proposal that would go to CMER for review. He noted that Policy accepted this and sent it to CMER with the proponents accepting there would be changes to the proposal when it went through the CMER process. He noted that the AMPA requested that this study should be considered as if it originated in CMER and would go through the same process as any CMER study. He added that this was an accepted AMP project and sent to CMER for review. He added that failure to reach consensus is holding up the project and that the Dispute Resolution process applies to this project. He added he will be setting up an informal meeting as the next step and if there is no consensus at that point, the AMPA and co-chairs will meet to determine the next step of the process.

Action Item

The AMPA will facilitate and initiate the first informal meeting for the next step in consideration of a Dispute Resolution that was invoked. A doddle poll invitation for the meeting will be sent to members.

SFLO Six Questions

Jenny Knoth / Chris Mendoza, (*CMER co-chairs*)

Jenny noted that the memo on how to proceed with the SFLO project was sent out for comments.

Harry Bell noted that his concerns listed in the memo were not all shown and needed to be incorporated into the document. Jenny noted that her concern was that the memo with comments were sent in a PDF format that limited her viewing all the comments. Harry noted he does not support the memo and to move this to Policy is a breach of our protocol as many of the technical issues were not addressed. Chris Mendoza noted that the memo that was drafted by the co-chairs was intended to show what was agreed to and not agreed to when comparing the two versions of the answers to the Six Questions.

Aimee McIntyre asked that this memo be resent as a “Word” document. She asked if CMER could do a full review of the comments.

Saboor Jawad noted that this project did not come to CMER as an accepted project but as a review and that distinction is important as to how it is reviewed in CMER.

Todd Baldwin noted that though we might not come to a consensus he felt it was a good idea to submit the memo to Policy.

Debbie Kay noted there is disagreement on Teply’s review and some thought the review said everything was fine and others thought the review suggested that the prescription wouldn’t protect the resources or meet the FP rules and we are missing some information. She added that the difficulty is that there is no unanimous interpretation to send to Policy about the review. Jenny asked if CMER is questioning if ISPR did their job or are we going to acknowledge that this has gone through a review and Policy should look at it. Chris Mendoza noted we should keep our response simple and bullet point the agreements and disagreements making it an inclusive document to give to Policy.

Jenelle Black noted that the SFLO’s had wanted a review of the entire project not just a review of the Scientific Justification.

Chris Mendoza noted that the AMPA had met with the co-chairs and the decision was to focus on the disagreements and agreements in the document. Harry Bell noted that this was not a decision they were authorized to make according to CMER’s standard protocol. He added that his suggestion is to focus on the independent function evaluation and comments that ISPR made on that independent function. Jenny noted that the memo needs to be refined.

Harry Bell presented a motion:

I motion that CMER recognize, as best available science, the Independent Function Evaluation (IFE) and results shown in Table 8 of the Cramer Assessment along with the ISPR comments specific to the IFE.
--

Chris Mendoza called Harry's motion a process foul, and noted that this motion should not be allowed because of a prior decision made by the AMPA and CMER co-chairs outlined in our guided decision making process, so this is outside of CMER's process.

Jenny Knoth asked why this PI seems to skirt around the normal process. Debbie Kay responded that this is a proposal for a rule change not a proposal for a study and when it was brought to CMER initially no comments were accepted. Saboor Jawad noted that the PI went through two rounds of formal dispute resolution in Policy.

Mark Meleason noted that this project was originally submitted to the Board and then to Policy and then sent to CMER. He added this is not a normal CMER process and added that this was set up as a rule and not a study and CMER can't create rules.

Harry Bell noted that this started with legislation that asked for special consideration for the SFLO. The SFLO's were frustrated that nothing was being done so they decided to develop prescriptions as an alternate plan and hired Doug Martin to write the SJ. He added that his motion is not suggesting the protection for the prescriptions are adequate and that the work that the Independent Function Evaluation did categorizes the difference between the rules and the prescriptions. He added that CMER was asked to look at the SJ but the Independent Function Evaluation is a more current and complete work.

Chris Mendoza called a process foul on Harry's motion to be voted on. He reiterated that this motion should not be allowed because of a prior decision made and it is outside the process of what CMER is supposed to do.

Motion

Harry Bell moved that CMER recognize, as best available science, the Independent Function Evaluation (IFE) and results shown in Table 8 of the Cramer Assessment along with the ISPR comments specific to the IFE. **The motion failed**

Chris Mendoza noted that Joe Murray cannot second a motion for Doug Martin since he is the author of the SJ and that's a direct conflict of interest and therefore, he should be recused. Joe Murray noted that he had no direction from Doug Martin on how to vote and was given discretion to vote as he saw fit.

Action Item

- The SFLO document will be resent to the CMER voting members in a "Word" format to view the comments.
- The co-chairs and the AMPA will create a list of agreements and disagreements. This will be incorporated into a memo with comments listed in a bullet format which will be presented to Policy.

SAO Audit Report

Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*)

Saboor gave a summary of the work plan from the State Auditor's Office (SAO) Audit Report that was accepted by the FP Board at their May meeting and noted that this will frame what is required by the Work Group that he is requesting be formed. He noted that the SAO completed a Performance Audit of

the Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program (AMP) in January 2021 that provided 13 recommendations for improving program performance. He noted that the report stated that the AMP is not operating as it should and if not changed will languish, putting WA at risk for litigation. He added that the Work Plan consists of 11 recommendations and are assigned responsibilities to the AMP staff and caucus principals. He added that the recommendations have timelines attached to them and some of them require extra resources. He noted that these will be part of a decision package that DNR has submitted and will be part of the Governor's budget request.

Saboar outlined the recommendations:

1. **Review Decision Making Model** – this requires caucus participation and they are requesting a reconsideration of the consensus basis decision making model.

2. **Changes to the AMP Process** - evaluated through AMP committees:

SAO Recommendation #6 Adopt decision criteria for determining actions (*assigned to both CMER and Policy*). The AMPA will work with the Policy/CMER co-chairs and work group members to develop an option paper that will be presented to the FP Board by November 2022.

SAO Recommendation #5 Net gains model for project planning (*assigned to Policy*). This includes bundling projects together so benefits exist for multiple caucuses.

3. **Administrative Recommendations** - these recommendations are administrative in nature and to be evaluated primarily by the Board and AMP staff and will require additional resources.

- They include updating Dispute Resolution language in the Board Manual from “can be” to “will be”.
- Triggers will be set for projects invoking Dispute Resolution.
- Tracking Systems will be included to follow each stage of the project on a public dashboard and this will require \$425,000 funding followed by on-going costs.
- Develop procedures to ensure required biennial performance audits are conducted on the program by DNR and will require \$156,000.
- Ensure a peer review of the entire science program is conducted every five years and will require \$281,000.
- Create an on-boarding or training process for new members – involves creating training modules and will require \$213,000.

Action Item

- Formation of a CMER/Policy Work Group to work on Recommendation #6 in partnership.
- CMER members are to talk to their management concerning their time and level of commitment and confirm in October if they will be able to participate in the Work Group.

Jenny Knoth noted that to make it easier in relation to time commitment, we could consider using part of the CMER meeting time devoted to the Work Group. Saboar noted that there will be two meetings

required for 2021 and more frequent meetings in 2022. He added that the FP Board is expecting a progress report by November 2021.

ISAG Water Typing update memo to the FPB

Cody Thomas (*ISAG*)

Cody Thomas noted that this memo highlights work completed, and progress made on water typing projects by ISAG since May 2021. He added that ISAG members are currently meeting at least two times per month and working on revisions to the PHB Study Design. He added that once the draft of the PHB Study Design is completed ISAG will start developing the DPC Study Design. He added that ISAG is on track to submit a final proposed draft of the PHB Study Design to CMER by February 2022.

Cody showed the graph of the PHB and DPC Study Design development timelines. He noted that ISAG is asking CMER for approval to send this memo to the FP Board.

Todd Baldwin moved to approve sending the ISAG Water Typing Update Memo to the FPB.

The motion passed.

CMER Guidance to Six Questions and Six Questions Template

Jenny Knoth / Chris Mendoza, (*CMER co-chairs*)

Jenny opened the discussion on the Six Questions documents to provide clarity to the group on how CMER answers the Six Questions document and delivers the information. This was a request by A. J. Kroll who noted there was confusion on what should go into the Six Questions document and added that there was a need to review any sources of ambiguity. Chris Mendoza stated that the guidance was designed by CMER for the very purpose of removing ambiguity with a focus on how to summarize the information that would be carried over from previously approved CMER reports. He added that additional guidance added to the Answers to Six Questions at a later date where intended to provide examples of areas on which to comment that would help align the findings of the approved report.

Aimee McIntyre noted that there is a level of interpretation on the amount of detail from the authors especially in reference to Question 4a “*What does the study tell us*” and (4b) “*What does the study not tell us*”. Chris Mendoza noted there are two versions of the Answers to Six Questions and the first draft contains “prospective” answers which occurs before the study is even funded that CMER anticipates answers for, and the latter when the study is completed. Harry Bell asked concerning question (4a), should “implications to the rules. etc.” be in a CMER report and noted that this seems to cross into Policy. Chris Mendoza noted that the key word is the studies “relationships” to the rules. Harry Bell noted that there is a reference in question (5) to recently completed studies but there is no guidance to discuss the differences between the current study and the recently completed studies. Jenny Knoth stated that the findings from CMER studies reported in the six questions need to be put into the context of not only other CMER work but with respect to the broader, relevant, literature on the topic. For example, a literature review usually precedes and informs a study design so to close the loop, the authors should revisit the literature for newer information and put the result of CMER studies in the context of that body of knowledge. Harry Bell noted that it would be beneficial for Policy to weigh in on what they would like

to see in the answers to the Six Questions. Jenny Knoth noted that this was a useful discussion and will be ongoing in the meetings to help CMER work more efficiently.

Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions

Lori Clark (*Supervisory Project Manager*)

Lori Clark noted that the Type N Hard Rock Six Questions document was not approved at the August CMER meeting. She noted that the PIs and CMER members who voted against the Type N Hard Rock Six Questions document met to discuss issues that needed further revisions. She added that the revised Type N Hard Rock Six Questions document was distributed to the attendees and comments were sent back. She added that the Type N Hard Rock 6 Questions document is up for approval today.

Jenny Knoth noted that because the document was in PDF the track changes and comments were not able to be viewed clearly and requested that all working documents going forward be sent in “Word”.

Doug Martin reviewed his comments on the Six Questions. He noted his main concern was that the information is abstract and not providing the means and in some cases misleading. He added that the sites had various responses to the temperature and why should CMER just give Policy a bullet point that reports the mean change and not report each sites temperature results.

A discussion followed reviewing the document comments between Doug Martin, Bill Ehinger, Harry Bell and Chris Mendoza. At the end of the discussion Chris Mendoza noted that CMER is on record having already approved the answers the Six Questions from Hard Rock Phase I in 2018, and Phase II is simply extended monitoring of Phase I. He then asked what research between Phase I approval and now has occurred to support Doug’s position to rewrite answers that have already been approved by CMER. He added that Policy funded Phase II Hard Rock so CMER could monitor a longer post-harvest recovery response and there was no intent to change the nature of the study.

Jenny asked Doug Martin if there was any middle ground found today or does it require another meeting. Doug responded that there needs to be a larger discussion in a format that allows us to get the facts out. Bill Ehinger requested that Doug send a more detailed explanation concerning his comments about some answers being misleading.

Motion

Chris Mendoza moved to approve the CMER answers to Six Questions to the Hard Rock Extended report.
The Motion Failed.

AJ Kroll invoked a Dispute Resolution.

Saboor Jawad noted that the next step is to set up an informal meeting and no position papers are required at this point.

Action Item

The AMPA will send out doodle poll to set up an initial informal meeting for the action of invoking a Dispute Resolution.

Hard Rock Phase III Project Charter

Aimee McIntyre (*Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife*)

Aimee gave a review of the HR Phase III Project Charter. She noted that there had seen a substantial decline in amphibian (coastal tailed frog) densities (as much as 90%) across all treatments in the seven and eight year post harvest and this led LWAG to suggest to CMER and Policy to continue study of amphibian demographics in the Hard Rock study. She added that this is an extension of the Phase I study and requires a charter, which was not required when the Phase I study design was approved by CMER in 2005. She added that Phase III will only include amphibian demographics.

Todd Baldwin requested more time to review the document before he can vote on it. Aimee noted that work needs to start now because site access need to be secured from landowners.

Action Item

- A new draft will be sent out from Aimee McIntyre.
 - This decision is moved to the October CMER meeting.
-

Soft Rock Executive Summary

Lori Clark (*Supervisory Project Manager*)

Lori noted that all Type N Soft Rock chapters have been reviewed and approved by CMER. The Executive Summary was shared with CMER on July 11th and again with the CMER mailing and is up for approval at today's meeting.

Motion

Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the Soft Rock Executive Summary.

The motion passed

Soft Rock Six Questions

Lori Clark (*Supervisory Project Manager*)

Lori noted that the comments to the Soft Rock Six Questions received this month were reviewed.

Jenny Knoth noted that she never saw clear answers to the following questions in the document and if that is not directly addressed in the study we should make that clear.

The study addressed CMER Work Plan Critical Questions derived from Schedule L-1, including:

- *Are riparian processes and functions provided by Type N buffers maintained at levels that meet Forest Practices (FP) Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) Resource Objectives and Performance Targets for shade, stream temperature, and large wood recruitment?*
- *How do Type N riparian prescriptions affect water quality delivered to downstream Type F/S waters?*

More comments were reviewed. It was noted that members needed to see a "Word" document to view the comments more clearly. Bill Ehinger noted that the clean and tracked document should be mailed.

Motion

Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the Soft Rock Six Questions response to Policy.

The motion failed

Action Item

- A “Word” document will be sent out to the members in track changes.
 - Bill Ehinger requested members make comments on the “clean” document.
 - Members who made comments are to meet with the authors to resolve any issues. The meeting will be set up by Lori Clark.
-

CMER SAG Updates

WetSAG

No new updates from the report.

UPSAG

Update to date: UPSAG is making good progress on the DSL Study Design and is on track to have a draft Study Design by **spring of 2022**.

SAGE

Update to ENREP: They will start harvest on two of the basins beginning of next week.

RSAG

Soft Rock Executive Summary was passed at the CMER September meeting.

Soft Rock Six Questions failed to pass at the CMER September meeting and the documents will be sent out again in a “Word” format to members.

ISAG

The Water Typing Strategy Memo was approved today at the CMER September meeting to go to Policy.

LWAG

Hard Rock Phase II: The Answers to Six Questions was not approved at CMER and the Dispute Resolution process was invoked. An informal meeting will be convened by AMPA for the first step.

Hard Rock Phase III: The decision on charter approval will be moved to the CMER October meeting and the document will be sent out in a “Word” format.

Discontinuous Np Surface Flows: no change

Road Prescription-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project Team: A question / answer session on the annual report will be part of the next CMER Science Session.

Unstable Slope Criteria Project Team: no change

Small Forest Landowner PI: SFLO Six Questions failed to pass at the CMER September meeting. A list of agreements and disagreements will be incorporated into a memo with comments and brought back to CMER in October.

Changes to the Anticipated Documents for CMER Consideration/Review Next 12 Months:

Hard Rock Phase II anticipated date of delivery changed to “pending DR”.

Hard Rock Phase III anticipated date of delivery changed to “Nov 21”.

Soft Rock anticipated date of delivery changed to “Oct 21” with question mark.

Soft Rock – Executive Summary anticipated date of delivery changed to “Oct 21”.

SFLO Template Science Justification anticipated date of delivery changed to “Oct 21”.

Deep Seated Landslide Strategy: Landslide Mapping and Classification changed from Final Report to “Study Design”.

Unstable Slopes Criteria Project - Susceptibility and Runout Final Report changed to “Study Design”.

Westside Type F Exploratory Study changed from pilot study to “Exploratory Study”.

Updated PM responsibility changed from Heather Gibbs to Lori Clark.

Public Comment

There were no public comments.

The meeting was adjourned.

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER
Clark, Lori	DNR
Colton, Mary	DNR
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Engel, Marc	Policy co-chair
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ CMER Co-Chair
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Jawad, Saboor	DNR AMPA
§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
Miskovic, Teresa	DNR
Mobbs, Mark	WTC Quinault
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER

Thomas, Cody	STOI
Tuttle, Meghan	Policy co-chair
Volke, Malia	CMER