

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, August 24th, 2021 // 9:00 am – 3:54 pm

Remotely held using GoToMeeting

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Ash Roorbach <i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i> moved to approve the July Meeting Minutes with amendments.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie Dieu (<i>Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association</i>)</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Ash Roorbach <i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i></p> <p>Absent: Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p>WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design with LiDAR methodology</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Jenny Knoth (<i>CMER co-chair</i>) moved to approve the smart buffer design for delivery to the next step in the AMP.</p> <p>The motion failed</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie Dieu (<i>Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association</i>)</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Jenny Knoth, Mark Meleason</p> <p>Down: Patrick Lizon, Chris Mendoza</p> <p>Sideways: Debbie Kay, Aimee McIntyre, Todd Baldwin, Ash Roorbach <i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i></p> <p>Abstain: Doug Martin</p>
<p>WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design with LiDAR methodology Next Step</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Harry Bell (<i>Washington Farm Forestry Association</i>) moved to create a CMER technical subcommittee of CMER members and CMER staff to try to resolve the open issues and report for the September CMER mailing.</p> <p>The motion failed</p>	<p>Seconded: Mark Meleason (<i>County</i>)</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Mark Meleason</p> <p>Down: A.J. Kroll, Jenny Knoth</p> <p>Sideways: Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Ash Roorbach <i>proxy for Mark Mobbs</i>, Patrick Lizon</p> <p>Abstain: Doug Martin</p>

<p>Soft Rock Final Report - Chapter 1</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Chris Mendoza (<i>CMER co-chair</i>) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 1.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie Dieu (<i>Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association</i>)</p> <p>Up: Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Mark Mobbs, Mark Meleason, Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Sideways: Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p>Soft Rock Final Report - Chapter 2</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Aimee McIntyre (<i>Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife</i>) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 2.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Mark Mobbs (<i>WTC Quinault</i>)</p> <p>Up: Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Mark Mobbs, Mark Meleason, Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Sideways: Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p>Soft Rock Final Report - Chapter 3</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Julie Dieu (<i>Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association</i>) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 3.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay (<i>Suquamish Tribe</i>)</p> <p>Up: Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Mark Mobbs, Mark Meleason, Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Sideways: Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p>Soft Rock Final Report - Chapter 4</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Aimee McIntyre (<i>Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife</i>) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 4.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie Dieu (<i>Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association</i>)</p> <p>Up: Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Mark Mobbs, Aimee McIntyre</p> <p>Sideways: Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell, Mark Meleason</p> <p>Down: none</p>
<p>Forested Wetland Effectiveness Project</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Aimee McIntyre (<i>Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife</i>) moved to approve the FWEP Charter.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Todd Baldwin (<i>Kalispel Tribe of Indians</i>)</p> <p>Up: Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Mark Mobbs, Aimee McIntyre, Jenny Knoth, Harry Bell,</p> <p>Sideways: Mark Meleason</p>

<p>Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions</p> <p>Motion: Patrick Lizon, (<i>Dept. of Ecology</i>) moved to approve answers to the 6 Qs for the hard rock phase 2 effectiveness study.</p> <p>The motion failed</p>	<p>Seconded: Chris Mendoza (<i>CMER co-chair</i>)</p> <p>Up: Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Patrick Lizon</p> <p>Sideways: Mark Mobbs Mark Meleason, Julie Dieu, Jenny Knoth</p> <p>No: AJ Kroll, Harry Bell, Doug Martin</p> <p>Abstain: Aimee McIntyre</p>
---	--

Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p>Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions</p> <p>Meeting to be set up with the members that voted “no” on the motion to resolve the remaining issues to include the PI authors and hopefully bring it back for a vote in September.</p> <p>Send out doodle poll for scheduling.</p> <p>Encourage all CMER members to attend.</p> <p>A request for the members who voted against the Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions document to send their comments of what they agreed on and didn’t agree on. Comments are to be sent to Bill Ehinger.</p>	<p>Co-chairs /Lori Clark /Bill Ehinger /Doug Martin /Harry Bell</p>
<p>SFLO Small Forest Landowner Six Questions Working Group</p> <p>Memo created by the AMPA and co-chairs sent out to CMER members with request for comments.</p> <p>Comments are due back to Eszter Munes by Sept. 14th.</p>	<p>Co-chairs/AMPA</p> <p>CMER members</p>
<p>Ecology Presentation is to be mailed out.</p>	<p>Mary Colton</p>
<p>WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design with LiDAR methodology</p>	<p>The AMPA and co-chairs are to meet to discuss DR and next steps. They will report back to CMER in September.</p>

A J Kroll (<i>Weyerhaeuser, Washington Forest Protection Association</i>) invoked the dispute resolution process.	
Audit Recommendations SAO recommendations to CMER.	AMPA
CMER Science Session Request for CMER Members to send ideas for Science Sessions	Comments are to be sent to co-chairs

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

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

Introductions

Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*) introduced himself as the new AMPA to the CMER members.

Mark Meleason (*County*) introduced himself as the new CMER member representing the County caucus.

Two ground rules were read.

Updates

- The CPEACE workgroup is working on summarizing the flow charts from the CPEACE workshop.
- Jenny Knoth offered to email some interesting essays from Robert Lackey concerning science, scientists and Policy advocacy.

Meeting Minutes

Ash Roorbach *proxy for Mark Mobbs* moved to approve the July Meeting Minutes with amendments. It was seconded by Julie Dieu. **The motion passed.**

Science Session

Presentation “Watershed Health Monitoring for Statewide Status & Trends”

Glen Merritt (Department of Ecology) gave a presentation on the Watershed Health Monitoring Program. Some highlights included:

- The origins of the program that began in the 1970s with the Clean Water Act.
- The goal for estimating habitat status and the trends that included salmonid limiting factors.
- The probability design for random site selection (GRTS).

- The standardized methods and the benefits they derived from the EPA's national rivers and streams surveys.

Questions:

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) asked how the monitoring was used, relative to effectiveness monitoring, for policy development and if there were different policies for the eight regions.

Glen noted that Policy compares data side by side to provide some context for the results. He added that for certain issues there are indicators on a broad scale that would give Policy makers information on where to allocate money for restoration activities.

Ash Roorbach (*Northwest Indian Fish Commission*) asked when interpreting the results, how the program accounts for non-access to sites when the landowners don't give permission. Glen noted that this was not an issue until this year and they are monitoring the volume of sites that are getting rejected and tempering their interpretation accordingly.

Joe Murray (*Washington Forest Protection Association*) asked how they could access the information and acquire extractions on conditions based on land use. Glen noted that with each download of data from the database you can pull down a county or monitoring region but they don't have data pertaining to the land use. He added that in terms of data description you can use the data dictionary. He added you can access interactive maps on the web page where they have sampled.

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) asked what temperature measurements they were taking. Glen noted that the temperature measurements are point measurements with one taken upon arrival and one taken at departure. Harry asked if the wood volume ratings related to some base line that relates to salmon needs. Glen noted that the graphic developed from the state of the salmon was volume per 100 meters for rating. He added that relating to specific populations it would be more of an ecology watershed analysis.

The link for river stream monitoring is:
<https://ecology.wa.gov/Research-Data/Monitoring-assessment/River-stream-monitoring/Habitat-monitoring/Habitat-monitoring-methods>.

The link for the Watershed Health Monitor Program is:
<https://ecology.wa.gov/WatershedHealthMonitoring>

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted that the presentation would be sent out today to the CMER members.

WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design with LiDAR methodology

Eszter Munes (*DNR / Doug Martin (WFPA)*)

Decision: approve the Smart Buffer Design.

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) noted that the author Doug Martin revised the Smart Buffer Study Design to include the LiDAR methodology and submitted the new version to CMER for review in June 2021. He added that comments were compiled in a matrix and provided to the author for response. He

noted that since the initial review, Doug has worked through hundreds of comments to narrow down to the scope of a handful. He noted that comments were presented in June and received back in July, then resubmitted with a new request for approval.

Eszter Munes added that Chris Mendoza requested that his remaining comments be sent out as part of the mailing (“one-pager”). The document includes some remaining concerns and comments from a review iteration just prior to the addition of the LiDAR content. She stated that depending on the outcome of the vote to approve the study design, CMER will need to vote on whether to send it to ISPR.

Chris Mendoza clarified that the “one-pager” was to summarize remaining comments for the possibility of a third party, technical review. The possibility for a third party technical review was discussed at the May 2021 CMER meeting, but was shelved during the LiDAR review.

Jenny Knoth moved to approve the Smart Buffer Design for delivery to the next step in the AMP. **The motion failed.**

Next Steps

Chris Mendoza noted that CMER won’t send this study to ISPR without CMER approval. He noted that there is a potential to hire a 3rd party to review the comments.

Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*) noted he wasn’t sure that the remaining comments are significant enough to require a 3rd party review at this point and suggested that maybe CMER staff scientists could have a discussion on the comments initially.

Chris Mendoza noted that they have qualified CMER members that could look at the comments which are resolvable and he was not opposed to using CMER staff scientists to come to a resolution.

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) noted that he thought the usual CMER process would be to go into dispute resolution and the first level of that would be to have an informal discussion. He noted he wasn’t sure where the 3rd party fit into their process.

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted that she understood that the 3rd party was suggested by the AMPA at that time because Chris Mendoza and Patrick Lizon didn’t understand the answers to the questions and therefore couldn’t approve them. Patrick Lizon, (*Dept. of Ecology*) responded that his issue was not in the understanding of the methodology but a disagreement over the full shade shed treatment and that is was not necessary and he thought a 3rd party reviewing this could help.

A J Kroll (*Weyerhaeuser, Washington Forest Protection Association*) asked for clarification of the comments that are still unresolved. Chris noted that these have been sent out in the latest matrix.

Doug Martin (*WFPA*) noted that he only responded to comments on the current version and if a problem exists in the current version he wanted to know what the problem is and he is looking for a technical - based argument. Chris Mendoza noted that comments from the previous version are still relevant because they didn’t change.

Eszter Munes (*DNR*) asked if the technical review by either a 3rd party or CMER staff scientist, would be binding and how would the process be different from the previous review to move it forward. She asked if a technical reviewer approved the documents and the comments were answered satisfactorily would CMER be obligated to approve the document or do others need to weigh in.

Chris Mendoza answered that this would still come back to CMER for a vote after having a 3rd party weigh in on this along with Doug Martin. He added that if you elect not to have a review then it would go to Policy as not approved.

Mark Meleason (*County*) noted that he had reviewed the document and talked to Doug Martin about the specifics and offered to put something in writing if anyone were interested in viewing his comments and the reason he voted “yes”.

Chris Mendoza noted if we have an internal or 3rd party review the Smart Buffer study design, any CMER member can attend those meetings and add their comments. He added that this is not a dispute resolution process and therefore an arbitrator doesn't settle this.

Jenelle Black (*CMER Staff*) noted that the reason we have CMER scientists is so scientific and technical aspects can be resolved within the CMER committee. She mentioned that Greg Stewart has already made comments on the Smart Buffer Design Document and would be a potential candidate for a reviewer role and would bring background and support to bear on the topic. Greg Stewart (*CMER Staff*) noted he would be open to this.

A J Kroll (*Weyerhaeuser, Washington Forest Protection Association*) noted that some of the questions were related to additional treatments and that is a separate manner. He noted that Doug Martin was clear on what the objectives of the study and this is simply a technical issue that we should be able to solve.

A J Kroll asked if he can invoke Dispute Resolution based on what CMER members just voted on. Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*) responded that if discussions have been exhausted then a Dispute Resolution can be invoked. However, he noted that at this point he felt there is still room for discussion and the possibility of having a CMER scientist subcommittee review the comments. Saboor noted the need to determine whether ordinary discussions have been exhausted and whether a recommendation or a project is being held from moving forward. .

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted that CMER was asked by Policy to determine if this study was technically sound and then decide what happens to the study. She added CMER needs to determine what the unresolved issues are to move forward.

A J Kroll noted that he didn't feel having another subcommittee review the issues that haven't been agreed on is going to work and again noted he would like to invoke Dispute Resolution.

Patrick Lizon, (*Dept. of Ecology*) noted that the Smart Buffer study has already been started in field and he has some technical concerns. He asked if this goes to a subcommittee to review and his technical issues are validated, will Doug Martin be willing to change the Study Design based on those technical comments. Doug responded that if it is a valid technical issue that would improve the Study Design and can be implemented affordably then, yes, a change can be made.

Motion:

Harry Bell moved to create a CMER technical subcommittee of CMER members and CMER staff to try to resolve the open issue. **The motion was rescinded to add a timeline.**

Aimee McIntyre, (*Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*) noted that a timeline to the motion should be added.

Motion:

Harry Bell moved to create a CMER technical subcommittee of CMER members and CMER staff to try to resolve the open issues and report for the September CMER mailing. **The motion failed.**

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) noted that since the motion failed CMER must decide if this goes to Policy as no consensus or moves into Dispute Resolution invoked by AJ Kroll. He added this will be up for discussion between the co-chairs and the AMPA to move forward with a decision.

Soft Rock Final Report

Lori Clark (*DNR*)

Lori noted that Soft Rock Chapters 5, 6, and 7 were approved by CMER in July. She added that the Executive Summary will be reviewed after Chapters 1-4 are approved by CMER. She noted that Soft Rock Chapters 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been approved by the ISPR associate editors and were mailed to CMER August 2nd for review and are up for approval today. There were no questions.

Motion

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 1.

The motion passed.

Motion:

Aimee McIntyre, (*Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 2.

The motion passed.

Motion:

Julie Dieu (*Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association*) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 3.

The motion passed.

Motion:

Aimee McIntyre, (*Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 4.

The motion passed.

Lori noted that the Soft Rock Six Questions will be out for review by September 14th. Chris Mendoza asked that comments for the Six Questions be sent out to CMER members for review by August 31st to allow time for the project team to receive feedback and respond before the September CMER meeting mailing. The 6 Questions will then be ready for the CMER mailing on September 21st so that it can come up for a vote at the CMER meeting in September.

Forested Wetland Effectiveness Project

Eszter Munes (*DNR*)/Debbie Kay (*Suquamish Tribe*)

Eszter noted that WetSAG updated the FWEP project charter to align language with the FWEP Chrono sequence study design and made edits for clarity and it is up for approval today.

Aimee McIntyre asked about the critical question in the 2nd paragraph in the study that referred to the statement of how forested wetlands recover from harvest and whether the question should be changed from "how" to "whether and to what extent"? Jenelle noted that we weren't changing critical questions at this point in the process.

Motion:

Aimee McIntyre (*Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*) moved to approve the FWEP Charter.

The motion passed.

Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions

Aimee McIntyre, (*Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*)

Aimee noted that the comments on the Six Questions Hard Rock Phase II report were received from CMER reviewers. She added that the comments were combined in a single draft and distributed to the PIs and the final document was sent out to CMER for review. She added that they are asking for CMER approval today. Aimee opened it for questions.

Questions

Doug Martin (*WFPA*) noted he had a concern that this document and previous documents are not Policy readable and are too long for Policy to review and CMER should address this going forward.

Jenelle Black (*CMER*) noted that the purpose in an effectiveness study is to say whether our rules are meeting the objectives that are outlined in the HCP. She added that a validation study is to look at whether the rules are appropriate or not and if our results indicate that we are meeting the objectives outlined in the HCP. Jenny Knoth noted that validation studies would be interesting because we don't fully understand the biological effects.

A J Kroll (*Weyerhaeuser, Washington Forest Protection Association*) noted that there is an opportunity here for the Hard Rock Six Questions to be cognizant of the Type N Work Group Report.

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) noted that in reference to the mean temperature change for the sites the Hard Rock study looked at, the study did not say that the sites surpassed any particulate standards and to the report authors need to make that clear and pull out any reference to the .03 C water quality standard. Bill responded that standards are complicated and they had pulled out the reference to the .03 C standard except when it referenced a performance target. He added that he thought he had responded to all those concerns in the comments for the Six Questions and offered to have a discussion with Harry about any issues.

Motion:

Patrick Lizon, (*Dept. of Ecology*) moved to approve answers to the Six Questions for the Hard Rock Phase 2 Effectiveness Study.

The motion failed.

Next Steps

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) noted that the co-chairs will meet with Harry Bell, Doug Martin, and Bill

Ehinger to discuss the unresolved issues. Chris noted that the meeting is open to anyone that would like to join. Lori Clark offered to set up the meeting before the next CMER meeting. Bill Ehinger (*Dept. of Ecology*) requested comments before they meet. Chris noted that it is too late to submit new comments but they can address the comments that they didn't agree with. Aimee McIntyre noted that the question for CMER members is which original comments have not been addressed adequately in the minds of the reviewers.

SFLO Small Forest Landowner Six Questions Working Group

Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*)

Saboor gave an update from his meeting with the co-chairs concerning the SFLO Six Questions Work Group memo and the scientific review from CMER. Some highlights:

- He noted that this was a clear Policy request for a review of an external science issue highlighting the differences to proposal initiation process.
- He recommended to the co-chairs that the committee draft a memo of different opinions of the issues and have this sent to the Policy committee.
- He noted that there is no major item that is holding up the project in CMER and the dispute is now in Policy.
- The AMPA recommended that CMER work on the memo and have the members review and comment on the areas of disagreement.

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) mentioned that the comments are to be sent to Eszter Munes (*DNR*) and asked to have them back by September 14th in order to make the CMER mailing for next month.

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) noted that he tried to get a 2nd discussion that featured the prescriptions and noted that CMER has an obligation to do a good technical review. He noted he believes the next step is Dispute Resolution and that he will not sign off to working on memo. He noted that it would be a dismissal of the work that Cramer and ISPR has done. He added that he would like to see CMER continue on an informed decision-making process and working on each prescription and the science behind each prescription.

Chris noted that CMER's process is that the AMPA will meet with the co-chairs and make a decision. He added that the next step is to work on a memo and the path going forward and it is not Dispute Resolution as this point.

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted that the co-chairs viewed this as an initial stage of Dispute Resolution process. She added that she is disappointed that there is a reluctance to have any technical discussions and hopefully this memo is one way CMER can address those issues.

Next Steps:

- A memo will be created by the AMPA and co-chairs to be sent out to CMER members with request for comments
- The comments for the memo are due back by Sept. 14th

Type Np Discontinuous Flow Charter (Intermittent Streams Project Charter)

Lori Clark (*DNR*) / Aimee McIntyre, (*Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*)

Aimee gave an overview of the updated charter with the new timeline and membership information. Some highlights:

- There is an update to the timeline in Table 1.
- Change to team membership.
- The budget has been updated.
- Though a future study has not been prioritized or funded, there are critical questions related to the issue of stream intermittency in the current CMER Work Plan.
- A draft Scoping Document is anticipated to be delivered to CMER in March or April 2022.
- \$24,000 of the budget was not spent in the last fiscal year but it will not be rolled over to the current year.
- The completion of the scoping document will not cost CMER anything.
- The \$80,000 proposed budget is for Study Design development, if approved.

Update from TFW Policy

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

- Policy is reviewing the Type Np Work Group report and the results of the CMER studies and are continuing to meet to develop alternatives hopefully leading to a recommendation to the Board.
- There is a dispute regarding the WFPA Desk Top analysis. Stage I is complete and they have moved into Stage II. Policy will be hiring a mediator.
- At the August FP Board meeting the co-chairs presented the potential for Policy of hiring a facilitator. The facilitator must be qualified to act as a mediator in order to become aware of issues that are being addressed in Policy and be available when Policy moves to a Stage II Dispute.
- The Board approved, as part of the MPS and associated budget, \$45,000 to go towards a facilitator and the Policy co-chairs will meet with the AMPA to put together a contract.
- The Policy 2022 proposed work plan is available.
- Policy is continuing to work on how they can better collaborate as a Policy team post-CPEACE.
- Policy is working on the SAO audit recommendations.
- Policy and CMER can work on the SAO recommendations and these will be presented to the FP Board by the AMPA through a report. There are timelines associated with the FP Board approved work plan to address the accepted recommendations from the SAO report. The CMER and Policy due dates for addressing the SAO recommendations are in calendar year 2022.
- The AMPA will work with both CMER and Policy to deliver both reports to the Board.

Joe Murray (*Washington Forest Protection Association*) asked where Policy was with the Extensive Monitoring Project. Meghan noted that the Extensive Monitoring subcommittee has sent information back to the Policy co-chairs and CMER will see something in the fall.

CMER SAG Updates

The following are the “live” updates to the CMER/SAG report that was in the mailing:

Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project

CMER approved the FWEP charter August 24th.

Type N Soft Rock Final report

Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 4 were approved by CMER August 24th.

WFPA Smart Buffer Design

The author provided CMER with a revised version of the Study Design along with a request for approval at the August meeting. CMER did not approve this at the August 24th meeting. The CMER co-chairs will meet with AMPA to discuss the next steps.

Hard Rock Phase II Six Question

The Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions document failed to pass at CMER. CMER members will meet with the PI’s in August and bring the Hard Rock Phase II Six Questions document back to CMER in September.

Small Forest Landowner PI

The SFL subgroup met on June 28 to continue work on several documents intended to inform a final deliverable to Policy. After the meeting, several members of the subgroup submitted a notice of intent to discontinue participation in the SFL Six Questions Working Group. Their recommendation to resume work on the CMER memo from December 2020, is outlined in the notification. A discussion of how this fits into the AMP’s Dispute Resolution process occurred at the August 24th CMER meeting. A memo on the agreements and disagreements will sent out by the AMPA and co-chairs to CMER and will be presented at the September meeting.

Potential Habitat Breaks (PHB) Project

The date for the project has been changed from November 2021 to February 2022.

Closing Comment

Saboor Jawad (*AMPA*) gave an update on the DNR staff availability and support for September and October.

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
Hough-Snee, Nate	Four Peaks Environmental
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
Merritt, Glen	Department of Ecology
Miskovic, Teresa	DNR
Mobbs, Mark	WTC Quinault
Munes, Eszter	DNR
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER
Tuttle, Meghan	Policy co-chair
Walter, Jason	ISAG co-chair
Volke, Malia	CMER