

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, August 23, 2022 // 9:00 am – 4:40PM

Hybrid Meeting: In-person and Zoom

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>July 2022 Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> **** moved to approve the July 2022 minutes.</p> <p>The motion passed</p> <p>Moved to next month due to mailing difficulties</p>	<p>Seconded:</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Stephanie Estrella (Proxy for Patrick Lizon), Todd Baldwin, Mark Meleason, Mark Mobbs, Chris Mendoza, Julie Dieu, and Aimee McIntyre.</p> <p>Sideways:</p> <p>Abstain:</p> <p>Absent:</p>
<p>ENREP Project Charter</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the ENREP Charter.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Chris Mendoza</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Todd Baldwin, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Aimee McIntyre, Mark Meleason, Doug Martin, Mark Mobbs, Stephanie Estrella (Proxy for Patrick Lizon), Jenny Knoth, and Julie Dieu.</p> <p>Absent: A.J. Kroll</p>
<p>PHB Study Design</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the current PHB study design, with the caveat that any changes to the study design / stats approach / request for open review and/or additional questions for ISPR reviewers be agreed to be the workgroup + ISAG before proceeding. So approve the study design and defer to workgroup/ISAG for consensus recommendation on ISPR review process (open/close/additional questions). And request that the workgroup + ISAG get back to CMER in September about their recommended ISPR approach. Approval to move to ISPR is contingent on project team/ISAG consensus and CMER approval of the ISPR approach.</p> <p>Aimee McIntyre withdrew previous motion</p>	<p>Seconded: Jenny Knoth</p>

<p>Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the current PHB Study Design, with the caveat that the workgroup/ISAG make a consensus recommendation on ISPR review process (Open/close/additional questions) for consideration by CMER in September. CMER would not approve ISPR until discussion of ISPR proposal in September.</p> <p>Jenny Knoth proposed amendment to the motion on the table to approve the study design to allow ISAG to further clarify language regarding statistical analysis of the collected data.</p> <p>Aimee McIntyre agreed with Jenny Knoth's amendment.</p> <p>The motion failed</p> <p>Jenny Knoth moved to accept the edits made to the PHB study design in response to the CMER/SAG review and request that the subgroup addresses the data analysis options and provides a proposal for the type of ISPR requested.</p> <p>Jenny rescinded her motion.</p> <p>Jenny Knoth to move to accept the responses to the reviewers in response to the concurrent 30 day CMER/SAG review of the PHB study design.</p> <p>Jenny rescinded her motion.</p>	<p>Seconded: Harry Bell</p> <p>Up: Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell, Mark Meleason, Doug Marin, Julie Dieu, Stephanie Estrella (Proxy for Patrick Lizon), and Aimee McIntyre.</p> <p>Sideways: Todd Baldwin, Debbie Kay, and Mark Mobbs.</p> <p>Down: Chris Mendoza</p> <p>Absent: A.J. Kroll</p> <p>Seconded: Doug Martin Mark Meleason</p> <p>Up:</p> <p>Sideways:</p> <p>Abstain:</p> <p>Absent: A.J. Kroll</p>
<p>Riparian Literature Synthesis</p> <p>Motion: Chris Mendoza moved to approve the Riparian Synthesis document from RSAG.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Mark Meleason</p> <p>Up: Aimee, Jenny, Debbie, Harry, Chris, Todd, Mark Mobbs, Mark Meleason, Stephanie, and Julie.</p> <p>Sideways: Doug Martin</p> <p>Absent: A.J. Kroll</p>
<p>Extensive Monitoring Memo</p> <p>Motion: Aimee McIntyre moved to approve the extensive monitoring transmittal to Policy.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie</p> <p>Up: Julie, Chris, Mark Meleason, Aimee, Stephanie, Harry, Mark Mobbs, Todd, Debbie, Doug Martin, and Jenny.</p> <p>Absent:</p>

	A.J. Kroll
<p>Westside Type F Exploratory Report</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Chris Mendoza moved to extend review of the Type F Prescription Exploratory report from 60 days to 90 days.</p> <p>Chris Mendoza withdrew his motion.</p> <p>Chris Mendoza moved to extend review of the Type F Prescription Exploratory report to September 16, 2022.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Jenny Knoth</p> <p>Up: Julie, Chris, Mark Meleason, Aimee, Stephanie, Harry, Mark Mobbs, Todd, Debbie, Doug Martin,</p> <p>Absent: A.J. Kroll Harry Bell</p>
<p>WetSAG Work Plan</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Julie Dieu moved to approve the WetSAG CMER Work Plan edits.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Up: Julie, Stephanie, Chris, Mark Meleason, Mark Mobbs, Todd, Debbie, Jenny Knoth</p> <p>Absent: A.J. Kroll Harry Bell Doug Martin</p>
<p>SAGE Work Plan</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Chris Mendoza moved to approve the SAGE Work Plan edits.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay</p> <p>Up: Julie, Stephanie, Chris, Mark Meleason, Mark Mobbs, Todd, Debbie, Jenny</p> <p>Absent: A.J. Kroll Harry Bell Doug Martin</p>

Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
Send out SBD Memo again	Natalie
Review period of the PHB study will be determined by ISAG based on quantity of edits/comments	ISAG

Meet with statistician about the PHB study.	ISAG
Riparian Literature Synthesis Review to be added as an agenda item	September CMER meeting agenda
CCE 30 min agenda item (Riparian Literature Synthesis)	
Send out PowerPoint from Dr. Graham McBride's presentation.	Natalie Church
Send out Westside Type F draft by Monday	Jenelle Black

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chair

Jenny Knoth took roll call

Read the below ground rules:

- Aimee McIntyre read “volunteer your time, talent and expertise to get things done”.
- Jenny Knoth read “read or gather background information ahead of time”.

Saboor gave updates

- Discussed mailings – box site and SharePoint in future. CMER mailing will transition from the serve-list to outlook based email (adaptivemgmtprogram@dnr.wa.gov). This allows having files larger than 5 MB. CMER work plan was an attachment with numbering that probably resembled IP addresses. The email with this attachment has been flagged and encrypted by email security policies. CMER work plan will be shared through box site. Once the AMP SharePoint online site is up and running, all files will be posted there. CMER mailing will continue to be delivered by email but a public box site link will also be added.
- Forest Practices Board meeting update:
 - MPS approved
 - Aimee McIntyre and Bill Ehinger gave a presentation about Type N studies
 - AFF validation study will be part of the water typing studies. AFF will be added to the CMER work plan.
- Forest Practices Board will have a field trip for the Type N recommendation site near Olympia on October 3rd – 4th public okay to attend.
- Forest Practices Board will address SFL issues day after November meeting on the 10th – template dispute aspects and decisions.

ENREP Project Charter

Todd Baldwin explained the charter updates were to match the updates to the study, the budget was updated as well. Jenny Knoth explained, per the PSM, that charters are live documents and there

shouldn't need to be a decision item unless significant changes. Harry Bell asked about the comment he left on the charter about the budget, Anna Toledo responded that the budget listed on the charter is the one on the approved MPS. Budget numbers the same listed and the budget in the out years will be updated as the project moves on. Explained that the budget looked as a group annually and the project managers follow up on the budget monthly. Anna gave a brief update of the project status. Chris Mendoza suggested approval the document so that the project could move forward. There was a motion made to approve the charter and it passed.

PHB Study Design

Anna Toledo explained the study design is in the concurrent CMER/ISAG review and discussed that the comment matrix was completed. Harry Bell asked if it will be an open review from the panel (ISPR). Doug Martin explained that they are going to work on technical issues. Jenny asked if we should iron out the issues prior sending it to ISPR. Doug Martin explained that this needed to be sent to CMER so it was not able to be corrected prior to being sent to CMER. Doug Martin explained his technical issue was that there is not a specific description of what the analysis will be, as it is listed as there will be an analysis completed. He explained that he feels it will help with any uncertainty about the project. Aimee McIntyre expressed that her concern is whether or not we should send this to ISPR and her concern with the fact that this technical issue not being brought up. Chris Mendoza explained that they did respond to the comments and issues raised by Doug and that it was discussion at ISAG/subgroup level on how to address it. ISAG decided to present the study to CMER. He then explained the process of the comments and edits of the project. John Heimburg explained the reasoning for the leaving out the analysis. Harry Bell explained that we try to avoid using ISPR to resolve disputes.

Saboor explained that approving PHB study design is a decision separate from sending it to ISPR. CMER would need to make a separate decision on ISPR because study designs aren't in the 'must' category for ISPR review. Saboor also reminded CMER that open/interactive ISPR is similar to consultancy services and that CMER members wanting open review must send written justification for an open ISPR along with clarification on the focus/questions for the interactive review.

Jenelle Black would encourage CMER to review the project research questions and decided whether the study design lays out and answers the questions Harry Bell suggested that CMER should ask a special question for ISPR to question. This will not change how the study is done but more clarification on an analytical approach. Jenny Knoth explained that she would like to have this cleared up prior to the decision. Aimee McIntyre suggested that CMER decide on the data collection and how to process the data statistically. Consider approve study design but bring the idea of the working with a statistician. Chris Mendoza explained that they did work with a statistician in response to analysis section. It was suggested to continue to work with the statistician. Multiple motions were made and rescinded on approving the study design. A final motion to accept the study design failed to pass.

Riparian Literature Synthesis

Joe Murray gave a brief update of the project and explained that TFW Policy asked to start this project again and asked for questions from CMER. Doug Martin suggested that when the document is sent to TFW Policy to take some of their time to explain that it is a Literature Review instead of an Evidence-Based Review. Joe Murray requested to have Doug send specific information about evidence-based description. Saboor Jawad explained that this is meant to be presented as a mini scoping document. The manner in which it is done is a CMER choice is not TFW Policy's. Joe Murray asked if there should be a document asking what they are wanting specifically. The motion to approve the document to be sent to TFW Policy passed.

Extensive Monitoring Memo

Joe Murray explained that the request is to have CMER’s approval of the discussion document for the Extensive Monitoring workshop with TFW Policy on August 24th. He explained that this will help establish a dialogue and working relationship with TFW Policy.

Westside Type F Exploratory Report

Joe Murray gave a brief description of the project. Alexander Prescott explained that due to the goal to help reduce late mailings is the reasoning behind not addressing all comments and edits. Ash Roorbach explained that in his discussion with Jenelle Black she mentioned that she would like to have more time on addressing comments and completing the document. Chris Mendoza explained that he would to have more time given to give a chance for the rest of his comments to be addressed. It was agreed that there would be more time given to the review time. Jenny and Harry agree. Extend review time and give it a date to be completed by September 16, 2022. A motion was done to confirm the completion date.

CMER Work Plan Review (WetSAG)

Tanner Williamson reviewed the changes and updates to the WetSAG Work Plan.

Science Session: Dr. Graham McBride

Mark Meleason introduced Dr. Graham McBride. Dr. Graham McBride reviewed his PowerPoint. The PowerPoint will be sent out after the meeting.

CMER Work Plan Review (SAGE)

Todd Baldwin and John Heimburg reviewed the changes and updates to the SAGE Work Plan.

TFW Policy Updates

Jenny, Natalie, and Lori gave an update on what was discussed at the August TFW Policy meeting.

Initial Draft Response: Smart Buffer Study Dispute

Jenny gave a brief introduction. Lori Clark explained the next steps.

CMER SAG Updates

Each SAG reviewed the live document and gave an update as needed. Live document was updated while reviewing each SAG reviewed their projects.

Public Comments

charles chesney made public comment.

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 Public
Church, Natalie	DNR – CMER Coordinator
Clark, Lori	DNR project manager
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
§Estrella, Stephanie	Department of Ecology (Proxy for Patrick Lizon)
Hawkins, Tracy	DNR Staff

Heimburg, John	
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Jawad, Saboor	DNR – Adaptive Management Program Administrator
§Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ CMER Co-Chair
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§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
Rubin, Rachel	DNR staff
Schofield, Jenny	DNR project manager
Stewart, Greg	CMER staff
Toledo, Anna	DNR project manager
Walter, Jason	ISAG co-chair
Williamson, Tanner	CMER Scientist

§CMER Voting Member