

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, August 27, 2024 // 9:00AM – 3:15PM

Virtual - Zoom

Motions	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
<p>July 2024 Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Welles Bretherton moved to approve the July 2024 meeting minutes.</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Hans Berge, Welles Bretherton, Welles Bretherton (Proxy for Aimee McIntyre), Julie Dieu, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, A.J. Kroll, Doug Martin, Mark Meleason, and Chris Mendoza.</p> <p>Abstain: Hans Berge (Proxy for Todd Baldwin)</p>
<p>Westside Type F Final Six Questions</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Mark Meleason moved to approve the scoping template and guidance document</p> <p>The motion passed</p>	<p>Seconded: Julie Dieu</p> <p>Up: Harry Bell, Hans Berge, Hans Berge (Proxy for Todd Baldwin), Welles Bretherton, Welles Bretherton (Proxy for Aimee McIntyre), Julie Dieu, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, A.J. Kroll, Doug Martin, Mark Meleason, and Chris Mendoza.</p>
<p>CMER Co-chair</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> The two nominations for the 2-year term CMER Co-chair, A.J. Kroll and Ash Roorbach</p> <p>8 votes for Ash Roorbach</p> <p>4 votes for A.J. Kroll</p>	<p>Tally vote: Harry Bell: Ash Roorbach Hans Berge: Ash Roorbach Hans Berge (Proxy for Todd Baldwin): Ash Roorbach Welles Bretherton: Ash Roorbach Welles Bretherton (Proxy for Aimee McIntyre): Ash Roorbach Julie Dieu: A.J. Kroll Debbie Kay: Ash Roorbach Jenny Knoth: A.J. Kroll A.J. Kroll: Abstain Doug Martin: A.J. Kroll Mark Meleason, A.J. Kroll Mark Mobbs: Ash Roorbach Chris Mendoza: Ash Roorbach</p>
Action Items	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p>Send out Object-Based Landform Mapping PowerPoint Presentation</p>	<p>Natalie Church</p>

CMER Reviewers for Object-Based Landform Mapping with High-Resolution Topography Study Final Report.	Chris Mendoza, A.J. Kroll, and Harry Bell.
Send out Roads Project PowerPoint Presentation	Natalie Church
Review their Riparian Literature Synthesis comments to decide which comments authors should address. Due COB September 4 th	Jenny Knoth, Welles Bretherton, and A.J. Kroll
Schedule L-1 Subject Matter Experts (SME) Process Memo approval	September Agenda
Add comments to Schedule L-1 Subject Matter Experts (SME) Process Memo and Guidance documents by close of business Sep 5 th . Documents are in CMER review folder: SL1 comments due COB Sep 05 . Come to meeting on September 6 th at 9:00AM to discuss and resolve comments.	CMER
Send out email with Schedule L-1 Subject Matter Experts (SME) Process Memo and Guidance document information/instructions.	Theryn Henkel
Scoping Document and Guidance Document approval.	September Agenda
Comments on Scoping Document and Guidance Document due September 6 th . CMER Review Folder: Scoping Template and Guidance, Due Sept 6	CMER

Welcome, Introductions, & Old Business

A.J. Kroll, CMER co-chair

Natalie Church took roll call

Ground Rules

- Hans Berge read, “Be well prepared: Be familiar with agenda and objectives.”
- Welles Bretherton read, “Respect discussion leaders.”

Staff Updates

- AMP staff made a few corrections to the agenda after the first publication and email. The correction provided more clarity on the decision items. There are 4 decision items (besides the approval of the July meeting notes): Schedule L-1 Subject Matter Experts (SME) Process, Westside Type F Final 6 Questions, Scoping Template, and CMER Co-chair Vote.
- Welles Bretherton will act as Aimee McIntyre’s proxy for voting at the meeting today.
- Reminder that the September CMER meeting will be in Spokane in the meeting room at the Courtyard by Marriott hotel. The SDM workshop will be in-person only.

Public Comments

No public comments

TFW Policy Updates

Rico Vinh gave an update on what was discussed at the August 2024 Timber Fish and Wildlife (TFW) Policy Committee meeting.

Object-Based Landform Mapping with High-Resolution Topography Study Final Report

Theryn Henkel gave a brief introduction. Jenny Knoth expressed her concern on whether we are following the PSM with the concurrent review. Lori Clark explained that the Project Team and UPSAG agreed to the concurrent review. The missed timeline for the report delivery was due to unresolved issues. Lori explained that if the issues can be resolved over the next couple of weeks, then the report will be finalized and delivered. If the issue is a fundamental disagreement of opinions, dispute resolution will be initiated so that we have a process and timeline to work out the issue(s). The specifics of the concerns have not been clearly articulated. We are working with the Project Team members who have raised concerns to get clarity so that the co-PIs can address these issues.

Elise Freeman and Dan Miller gave a presentation. Natalie will share her PowerPoint presentation after the meeting. Doug asked about the SL1 target. Elise explained USC is full study and this is a subproject. Theryn Henkel asked for CMER reviewers. Chris Mendoza, A.J. Kroll, and Harry Bell volunteered to serve as reviewers.

Roads Project Interim Report

Charles Luce, Roads Project PI, and others of the Roads Project presented the second Roads Project Interim Report. This report contains detailed summaries of the project various major, and parametrization experiments as well as preliminary data analysis results. Many figures and graphs were shared both in the report and in the presentation which demonstrate the wide variety of data collected and preliminary conclusions of covariates for the empirical model in development.

Project elements discussed include but were not limited to Major Experiment, Ditch Line Hydraulics, Sediment Trap Efficiency, Short Time Scale Interactions, Road Microtopography, Model Development. Scientific elements discussed included but were not limited to grain shear stress, sediment transport, sediment reduction treatments, flow rates, magnitude/frequency of sediment transport, road topography evolution, road rutting depth over time, erosion potential index, rock degradation analyses, traffic rate regression analysis, sediment model performance, covariate interaction effects, short time scale turbidity concentrations, short time scale road pumping results, sediment trap efficiency, cost vs. maintenance survey results, traffic management practices, automated vehicle image classification tool, watershed characteristics mapping.

Riparian Literature Synthesis

Anna Toledo shared that the Riparian Function Literature Synthesis is within the CMER review process. There were three CMER reviewers - Jenny Knoth, A.J. Kroll, and Welles Bretherton. They provided their comments at the end of June. A general theme of the comments was some concern that the document lacked some elements of synthesis. The ask for today is for CMER to provide guidance to the authors on how to address CMER comments. Jenny Knoth expressed her concern that it wasn't a synthesis and is missing some elements. Recommendation is to acknowledge it isn't a synthesis and stop until we figure out what we want to do with it - whether it would inform a BAS document or something else. Welles Bretherton explained that he thinks that there is a lot of good information pulled but it is more of a review of the documents than a synthesis. Recommendation to state it is a literature review instead of a synthesis. Mark Meleason asked what they were directed to do and did they achieve what was directed in their contract. Anna explained that they did do what was asked which is answer the questions that went through SAG, CMER, and TFW Policy approval. Jenny explained what she thinks might have happened is the RSAG and PM definition of synthesis is not the same. Lori asked what the next steps should be in interest of funding and correcting this. Chris Mendoza explained that this was initiated in TFW Policy so certain

steps were not completed and there was discussion about changing the text, but we are not in a position to change any text. Suggested to send this to TFW Policy with the comments and they can have it and CMER can use it how they see fit. Lori Clark explained that she was under the impression that we would follow the regular steps, such as sending it to ISPR. Welles said that he isn't sure that sending this through ISPR would be a fruitful process. Anna explained that there are funds available to respond to comments. They could add a paragraph of synthesis to each of the sections addressing the focal questions, so it would not be a total rewrite. Chris said to make sure that Policy is okay with the authors responding to comments and then CMER approves it. Lori explained that given it was added to the MPS it would follow the regular process. Lori explained that she thinks it would be okay to call it a review instead of synthesis. A.J. suggested to have authors address comments not about "this isn't a synthesis", retitle it as a review/annotated bibliography and bring it back to CMER to approve to send it to TFW Policy and not ISPR.

Schedule L-1 Subject Matter Experts (SME) Process

Theryn Henkel gave a brief explanation of the memo and guidance document that needs to be approved by CMER. She explained that what comes out of the SME groups will go through the regular CMER and TFW Policy process. Chris Mendoza explained that the "Timber industry viability" was missed in the overview document. These two issues were addressed early on that they are not CMER issue is they are TFW Policy. With the absence of proper records. He thinks we can move forward the consensus questions and not the non-consensus questions should not move forward. Theryn explained that the disagreement is the guidance to the SME groups. Doug Martin explained that he is more concerned about the guidance documents. It is not helpful to send SME questions that don't have consensus. Should be clean directed questions without multiple questions within one question. He doesn't believe that they need to be familiar with CMER studies. We could have CMER participant help explain. Theryn explained that the guidance document would not be sent SME with non-consensus questions. Chris explained that they weren't expecting SME members to read CMER studies but more of a way to inform performance targets that need updating. Lori explained the intention was not to open a comment timeframe it was to get this approved. Chris suggested that we set a deadline for comments on consensus items and bring it back to CMER next month.

Westside Type F Final 6 Questions

Alexander Prescott shared the Westside Type F Final 6 questions CMER request and explained that the Final 6 Questions were approved at the last RSAG meeting and are up for approval at CMER today. Harry Bell asked about the buffer width with the eleven treatments. Joe Murray explained that all of his comments were addressed. Chris thanked everyone for their work and explained that the next step would be scoping a new study.

Scoping Template

Alexander Prescott explained that there were no substantial comments made to the scoping template and guidance document. Chris explained that Alexander's edit captures his comment on the BAS document. Harry Bell suggested to broaden "technical merit" to the alternatives analysis section. Alexander Prescott explained that he feels that that it is broad enough and if he would have made edits if the comment was made during the comment timeframe. Welles explained that Aimee had a comment about adding "optional" to the "testable research hypotheses". Alexander Prescott explained that he doesn't feel comfortable making edits at this time due to the fact that there have been two opportunities for comments and is not fair to others who came prepared to vote on this. An additional comment period will be offered now through September 6th to receive specific feedback, included written versions of feedback shared verbally in CMER. These documents are available in the CMER review folder.

CMER Co-chair Update and Vote

Lori provided the update on the CMER membership issues raised at the August 14th Forest Practices Board (Board) meeting. The Board approved the CMER voting membership roster and directed CMER to revise the PSM to include minimum participation requirements for voting members. Board-approved motion:

“I move the Forest Practices Board confirm the current roster of CMER voting membership as presented; affirm the Board’s intent that CMER voting members actively participate at all levels; and direct CMER to revise their PSM to reflect participation requirement which the AMPA will report back to the Board.”

The CMER Co-Chair election may resume.

As a reminder, at the May CMER meeting CMER completed the first step of the CMER nomination and selection process as identified in the PSM Section, 3.2.2.3. Two candidates were nominated and accepted the nomination: A.J. Kroll and Ash Roorbach. The nomination process is closed. CMER postponed the CMER co-chair vote until the Board provided clarity. Today CMER will have the vote.

Lori will work with the CMER co-chairs to draft language for the PSM edits on minimum participation requirements for voting members for CMER’s consideration at the September meeting.

Tally vote: 8 for Ash Roorbach, 4 for A.J. Kroll.

Welles shared a statement submitted by Aimee: “Consistent with the value and intent of the rotation schedule, I support Ash as my choice for co-chair. This was the same value that led me to support A.J. in the last CMER co-chair election. I have enjoyed working with A.J. as co-chair and believe he has provided fair and neutral guidance and moderation to our CMER membership, meetings, and products in his role. I do not believe that there was a process foul in either the nomination of A.J. for another term, or the acceptance of that nomination by A.J. Considering that both “terms” that A.J. filled as co-chair were one-year terms, I do not believe that electing him to another two-year term is in violation of the intent of the PSM that suggests that a co-chair should not be elected for more than two consecutive terms. My interpretation of the intent of that guidance was to minimize the chance of a single co-chair acting for more than 4 consecutive years. I am open to clarifying that with updated language in the PSM if needed, and we could do that in conjunction with opening up the PSM to define participation requirements for voting members in response to FP Board direction.”

CMER SAG Updates

Each SAG reviewed the CMER SAG updates document, which was updated live as needed.

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Bell, Harry	WFFA– Small Forest Landowners
§Berge, Hans	UCUT – Eastern WA Tribes (Proxy for Todd Baldwin for co-chair vote)
§Bretherton, Welles	Department of Ecology (Proxy for Aimee McIntyre)
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
§Kay, Debbie	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association
§Kroll, A.J.	CMER Co-Chair/Large Industrial Landowners
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Meleason, Mark	Counties Caucus

§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus
§Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Tribe
Belleveau, Lisa	Skokomish Tribe
Black, Jenelle	NWIFC CMER Scientist
Black, Tom	Roads Project Team
Church, Natalie	DNR – AMP Coordinator
Clark, Lori	Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Freeman, Elise	CMER Scientist
Greenwood, Emma	Spokane Tribe
Henkel, Theryn	DNR Supervisory Project Manager
Heimburg, John	WDFW Habitat Program
Istanbuluoglu, Erkan	Roads Project Team Member
Hooks, Doug	WFPA
Luce, Charlie	Roads Project Team Member
Mitchell, Robert	Member of the Public
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Pirot, Rachel	Weyerhaeuser
Prescott, Alexander	DNR Project Manager
Robbins, Jeff	Ecology
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Schofield, Jenny	DNR Project Manager
Toledo, Anna	DNR Project Manager
Vinh, Rico	Conservation/TFW Policy Co-chair
Walter, Jason	ISAG co-chair
Weekes, Anne	Conservation Caucus
Williamson, Tanner	CMER Scientist

§CMER Voting Member