

# Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, April 27, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am – 3:40 pm

Motions for April 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2021	
Motion	Second (Vote)
<p><b>Meeting Minutes</b></p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Chris Mendoza moved to approve March 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting Minutes with amendments</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Aimee McIntyre Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay Down: none Absent: Patrick Lizon</p>
<p><b>Hard Rock Extended Study Phase II</b></p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Harry Bell moved to approve ISPR Review of Chapter 7</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Mark Mobbs Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, A. J. Kroll Down: none</p>
<p><b>Hard Rock Extended Study Phase II</b></p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Mark Mobbs moved to approve ISPR Review of Chapter 8</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, A. J. Kroll Down: none</p>
<p><b>Hard Rock Extended Study Phase II</b></p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Julie Dieu moved to approve ISPR Review of Chapter 9</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, A. J. Kroll, Mark Mobbs Down: none</p>
<p><b>WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design</b></p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Chris Mendoza moved to table the vote on approving the SB study design pending a presentation by author Doug Martin next month on the revised methods for estimating shade using LiDAR</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Patrick Lizon Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Chris Mendoza, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay Down: none Sideways: Todd Baldwin Absent: Aimee McIntyre, A. J. Kroll</p>

<p><b>Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP)</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Todd Baldwin moved to approve answers to the ETHEP 6 Questions</p> <p><b>Motion Passed</b></p>	<p>Seconded: Harry Bell Up: Todd, Harry, Deb Kay, Patrick Lizon, Mark Mobbs, Julie Dieu, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre Down: none Absent: A. J. Kroll</p>
<p><b>Wetland Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Tool Final Report</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Harry Bell moved to approve the WIP tool report</p> <p><b>Motion Passed</b></p>	<p>Seconded: Todd Baldwin Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, Down: none Absent: A. J. Kroll</p>
<p><b>Wetland Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Tool Final Report answers to the Six Questions</b></p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Harry Bell moved to approve the WIP Tool Answers to the Six Questions</p> <p><b>Motion Passed</b></p>	<p>Seconded: Aimee McIntyre Up: Todd Baldwin, Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Aimee McIntyre, Chris Mendoza, Mark Mobbs, Debbie Kay, Down: none Absent: A. J. Kroll</p>

<b>Action Items for April 27, 2021</b>	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>
<p><b>1. WFPA Smart Buffer Design Study</b></p> <p>Subgroup to be formed to review and document remaining concerns, clarify items in document, discuss acquiring outside technical review, and what the possible outcomes of that review would be.</p>	<p>Subgroup to include Mark Hicks, Jenny Knoth, Chris Mendoza, Patrick Lizon and Eszter Munes.</p>
<p><b>2. WFPA Smart Buffer Design Study</b></p> <p>Presentation of the Lidar-derived model for estimating shade will be presented at the May CMER meeting</p>	<p>Doug Martin</p>
<p><b>3. Wetland Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Six Questions Document</b></p> <p>Request to edit document for question 4 and 6</p>	<p>Eszter Munes makes edits to document</p>

<p><b>4. CMER's Role in PI</b></p> <p>Send comments</p>	<p>Knoth, Hicks, Mendoza</p>
<p><b>5. eDNA Six Questions</b></p> <p>Group members are requested to provide Jason with comments on the latest version of the 6Q document by COB (4/27)</p>	<p>eDNA DR workgroup</p>

## MINUTES

### Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

*Chris Mendoza, (CMER co-chair)*

Chris Mendoza opened the meeting. He thanked everyone for coming and two of the ground rules were read.

#### Updates:

Mark Hicks noted that the agenda item for the Hard Rock Study Phase II concerning the draft of the Executive Summary for the Hard Rock Study II was not up for approval today but was the deadline for comments for the revision that would be presented at CMER's May meeting.

### March 23 2021 Meeting Minutes:

After edits from the members, Chris Mendoza made the motion for the February minutes to be approved.

**The motion passed.**

### Science Session

*Robin Hale, Dr. Kenneth Pierce, Jr., Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*

Robin Hale gave a presentation that covered examining land cover changes in Washington State with high resolution imagery. Robin noted that The High Resolution Change Detection (HRCD) project data illustrates changes in land cover over time – specifically new development and/or tree loss in an area. The presentation covered updates from the GIS data loading project that was presented to CMER seven years ago by Dr. Kenneth Pierce, Jr. The update included how the HRCD project extracts information on changes in land cover for areas across Washington. Habitat monitoring using high resolution imagery was implemented. The data captured land cover changes in our area, riparian area with loss, tree canopy loss and impervious surface increase. Robin noted the importance of this work to compare acres of loss to acres of restoration and predict future changes. The Department of Fish and Wildlife funding sources for this project came from EPA/Puget Sound Partnership, WA Conservation Commission, RCO/LCFRB and the Coast Salmon foundation. Kenneth noted that the project doesn't track growth at this time but they will be incorporating the DNR's digital surface model that could allow for this kind of tracking.

### Hard Rock Extended Study Phase II

*Aimee McIntyre (WDFW)*

Mark Hicks noted that the deadline for comments for the draft of the Executive Summary for the Hard Rock Study II was today and that the revision will be up for approval at the CMER's May meeting.

There were no comments for Hard Rock Study Phase II Chapters 7, 8 and 9.

Motion to approve Hard Rock Study Phase II Chapter 7 (Channel Characteristics) – **The motion passed.**

Motion to approve Hard Rock Study Phase II Chapter 8 (Stable Isotopes) – **The motion passed.**

Motion to approve Hard Rock Study Phase II Chapter 9 (Amphibians) – **The motion passed.**

### **WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design (SBD)**

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

Eszter Munes gave an update to the SBD project of progress made since the previous CMER meeting. . Eszter Munes, Doug Martin and reviewers met in February and March 2021 to discuss questions and concerns about the study design. That version of the study design including recommendations made at those meetings and from comments submitted in February and March did not meet with approval at the CMER March meeting. Since then, Doug Martin made revisions based on additional feedback from Chris and Patrick and reflected in the April 19 version of the study design. Chris's comments are in the redline version of the study design with his name in the title. Patrick Lizon met with Doug Martin, and provided verbal feedback. As such, the comment matrix from March is the most recent version. Doug Martin clarified some changes in the document that came out of the meetings this month. *A statement was added to clarify that there is no regulatory target for shade in Np streams other than that an undefined level provided by current buffer rules. Therefore, the SBD shade response data was not intended to achieve any specific target, rather to provide context concerning the relative effectiveness of the SBD treatments, the findings from each SBD case study will be compared to findings from studies of Np streams that were harvested under current Forest Practice rules. This is simply context. The other change was in the Designing Smart Buffer Section. They had added that the objective of the design process is to find an optimal solution to achieve ecological, economic, and operational goals for timber harvest in headwater streams. Shade retention is a priority for SBD. However the levels of shade retained will vary among streams given natural variability and practical limitations.*

Chris Mendoza spoke to his comments relating to the language for the purpose of the study and what is not being measured. Specifically, Mendoza read the "shade retention is a priority" in the current version, and shared his concerns that shade is not a priority since it is being balanced with economics and operational costs determined by landowners. Additionally, Mendoza stated that one of the Policy-related Type N technical group's recommended options is use of the smart buffer study design, but their definition describes leaving all effective shade without balancing economics and operational costs. Mendoza stated that this discrepancy between definitions needs to be clarified for Policy since they are currently discussing the Type N tech group's recommendations. Patrick Lizon mentioned he wanted to see a significant change in the study design that would incorporate a treatment that tested a full shade shed buffer. He also noted that the design is not just testing prescriptions but testing methods for configuring a buffer.

Jenny Knoth mentioned that this study design has been in review for some time and has come together with the help of a lot of comments. Jenny noted that this study is coming through CMER but is not funded by CMER. The question should be "is this scientifically sound". She indicated that this is research, therefore, we need to keep in perspective what CMER's role is and how to make the most of our expertise in our evaluation and that it is not CMER's role to change the purpose or nature of the study

Chris Mendoza moved to table the vote on approving the SB study design pending a presentation by author Doug Martin next month on revised methods for estimating shade using LiDAR. **The motion passed.**

A subgroup was formed to address the concerns involving the shade shed target, measuring, and whether the rules would allow for an independent reviewer to look at the remaining issues and if it is needed at this point. This subgroup will include Mark Hicks, Chris Mendoza, Jenny Knoth, Patrick Lizon and Eszter Munes.

### **Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP)**

*Teresa Miskovic (DNR) and Todd Baldwin (SAGE chair)*

Todd gave an overview of the ETHEP project. CMER review of the ETHEP scoping document was initiated at the September 22nd CMER meeting. Comments were incorporated and the document came to CMER for approval at the February 25th CMER meeting but it was not approved. It was suggested that the CMER reviewers with remaining concerns work with the project team to resolve their issues. The scoping document was revised to address the remaining concerns and it was approved at the March 23rd CMER meeting.

The answers to CMER's prospective Six Questions were approved at the April 13th SAGE meeting. SAGE is requesting CMER approval of the answers to the prospective Six Questions.

Todd Baldwin put forward the motion to approve the ETHEP Six Questions and Harry Bell seconded the motion. **The motion passed.**

### **Wetland Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Tool Final Report**

*Eszter Munes (DNR) and Debbie Kay (Northwest Indian Fish Commission)*

Eszter gave a brief background on the WIP Final Report. Three CMER voting members provided review for the (WetSAG approved) WIP final report. The author made revisions based on their comments. The reviewers accepted the revisions and recommended the Final Report with edits be submitted to CMER for approval. There were no questions.

Harry Bell put forward the motion to approve the WIP Tool Report and it was seconded by Todd Baldwin. **The motion passed.**

### **Wetland Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Tool Final Report Answers to Six Questions**

*Eszter Munes (DNR) and Debbie Kay (Northwest Indian Fish Commission)*

Eszter Munes gave a summary. After the Phase II report was submitted to CMER at WetSAG, Megan Halabisky worked on the Six Questions document. WETSAG approved it with the exception of one comment where they asked for feedback from CMER. When approved they will be sending this to Policy as part of the findings report probably in June or July. The comment they would like feedback from CMER on is in regards to question 1 and whether it should be categorized as a "rule tool". It was noted that some thought term needs to follow a category in the CMER work plan, and others thought it may not be an accurate characterization. Debbie Kay suggested it could be categorized as a method tool. Joe

Murray suggested to call it a design tool. Chris Mendoza added comments about changing the wording of the questions. Harry Bell suggested to refer to it as a WIP Tool. It was decided to change it to WIP tool.

Harry Bell put forward the motion to approve the Wetland Intrinsic Potential (WIP) Tool Final Report - Answers to the Six Questions. Aimee McIntyre seconded the motion. **The motion passed.**

### **SFL Template Workgroup Update**

*Eszter Munes (DNR), Jenny Knoth (CMER co-chair)*

Eszter noted that the subgroup is working on the Six Questions document. She mentioned that they met a month ago and agreed to an approach that compares the various reviews of the SFL template. Harry Bell and Debbie Kay developed tables that compared these reviews by prescription and function, respectively. They will be working on a strategy to incorporate these tables and concepts in the document. Jenny added that they had an agreement to work on this document as part of the dispute resolution process and asked Mark Hicks what the next step would be after they have a workgroup consensus. Mark noted that it will come back to CMER for approval.

### **CMER SAG Updates**

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

Chris Mendoza asked that any additional comments on the version that was mailed out be submitted by project managers and the SAG co-chairs. Jenny added that she can present those updates at Policy next week. Joe Murray noted that there was no add on relating to mention of adding treatment prescriptions under a different strategy other than the RCS study. Chris stated we can add that to next month's meeting update. **CMER accepted the CMER SAG updates.**

### **TFW Policy Update**

*Mark Hicks (AMPA)*

Mark Hicks gave a summary of the following:

#### **Small Forest Landowner Dispute**

The SFL policy dispute resolution process has gone through Stage 1 with no consensus. A mediator was hired to help with Stage II process. They worked on this for three months with six meetings, but there was no resolution. The contractor that was hired, has just submitted a summary of their observations in the process. When Policy receives this summary they have one week to come back with clarifications or corrections to the draft and then they are to develop a majority and minority paper to deliver to the Board. The Board will decide what to do about the dispute. This could happen in August

#### **Master Project Schedule and Associated Budget**

Policy needed to approve the MPS Budget in order for it to go to the Board for their May 12th meeting. It was passed in non-consensus. The Eastern Tribal Representative voted the MPS down because their caucus ~~doesn't~~ believes that they should ~~ease the no longer~~ study of amphibians in this program, and they don't want the RCS study implemented on the Eastside. They provided a document outlining their reasons for voting "NO" and their concerns. This document will be given to Board along with the MPS budget at the May meeting. The Small and Large Landowners voted sideways for different reasons.

### Extensive Monitoring Group

Policy is trying to determine how extensive monitoring fits in with the Adaptive Management program. They are in the process of refining their objectives and purpose statements.

### Type Np Buffer Workgroup

Policy received a presentation from Policy type Np technical work group on alternative Np buffers to consider if Policy wants to strengthen the shade protection of the West side Np rules. They are looking at a draft report and they have two weeks to get back to the workgroup authors with clarifications and then the workgroup will incorporate changes into a final draft hopefully next month.

### Type Np GIS/FPI desk top analysis Proposal Initiation

Mark Hicks received a proposal for a GI desktop analysis of Np stream buffers and developed an assessment and recommendation report for policy. The proponent was not ready to have the conversation this month however, so he asked to move it to the next policy meeting.

Harry Bell asked why Policy did not go into dispute resolution (DR) over the MPS Budget. Mark Hicks responded that because they can't spend any money after June 30<sup>th</sup> without Board approval there is no time to go through DR. Megan noted that if this issue had been brought up earlier it could have been an option.

### **Proposal Initiation Discussion**

*Mark Hicks (AMPA), Jenny Knoth (CMER co-chair), and Chris Mendoza (CMER co-chair),*

Jenny Knoth noted that with the Proposal Initiations coming through CMER, there has been consternation about what constitutes science. She also noted that there is a lack of embracing the science that is out there and our discussion today should involve how we can clarify that. It is not clear what CMER's goal is in evaluating Proposal Initiations. Mark Hicks mentioned that there is a system for accepting proposals outlined in the Protocol Standards Manual and the Board Manual and that a white paper was created in 2012 that referenced how we handle outside science. The Proposal Initiation process outlines how different types of proposals are accepted and prioritized through consensus. Mark noted that the test for all science is to go through CMER. Jenny asked how the Pilot Rule gets through. Mark responded that it goes through the system to get prioritized. Todd Baldwin noted that there is a capacity issue and we have done a good job of using outside science to refine our study designs. Mark Mobbs noted that the first thing CMER does with a new project is to look to see if other people have done similar work. Mark Hicks added that the process that exists has the proposal submitted to the Policy or the Board, then to AMPA and then run through Policy who would generally bring their recommendations back to the Board. The process is designed so that approved PIs are considered in making annual adjustments to the work plan. After the discussion, Jenny requested that the members bring any questions or comments back to the co-chairs for further discussion.

### **eDNA CMER Six Questions Update**

*Eszter Munes (DNR), Mark Hicks (AMPA), Jason Walter (ISAG co-chair)*

Eszter noted that the Six Questions document is being worked by CMER as an agreed upon outcome in step 1 of the dispute resolution. Jason Walter is drafting a report that incorporates the comments from the CMER voting members and that they will be meeting next Monday. A revised copy should be available on the following Friday.

## Public Comments

charles chesney noted that in regard to the riparian buffers and channel corridor Forest Practices (FP) logging in stream channel corridors, ~~little work has been done on this little long term (15+ years) monitoring quantifying streamside forest conditions and channel wood dynamics has been done.~~ He noted that with the price of lumber being what it is, there is pressure on public resources for timber production and at the same time protecting public resources. He also noted that there is pressure at this time to move forest harvest from the uplands to the lowlands and stream channel corridors. ~~charles noted that in regards to the outside science discussion, in 2003 there was a move within the DNR FP science team to change the role of the DNR FP scientists. This did not happen as it was considered outside of the organization and the work went to the NW Indian Fisheries Commission. He stated that the gold standard was at that time and still is the US Geological Survey. With regard to CMER deficiencies, charles responded to the question from Harry Bell (“what is deficient?”). charles noted that in regards to the value of non-CMER science, talent management efforts within WDNR changed the role of the DNR FP scientists in 2003. Research and ‘outside science’ was actively discouraged. Such work went to personnel in the NW Indian Fisheries Commission. (This was an opportunity lost.) charles stated that the gold standard for two-tiered talent development (i.e., technician and scientist tracks), now, and at that time, is the US Geological Survey. (This HR structure partially explains the impetus for the ‘long term’ ecological monitoring work of charles as Principal Monitor of the Channel Reference Site Network and Wood In Small Streams Project, 1997-2019. Results from CRSNWISSP include measured rates of channel wood flux in some small, steep stream channels in the Columbia River Basin. Results measured, not modeled. CMER science is deficient with regard to channel wood dynamics in headwater stream channels [e.g., ‘CMER-science’ omissions of ALTOOZ in channel wood datasets-Architecture-Location-Type-Organization-Orientation-Zonation]).~~

## List of Attendees

<b>Attendees</b>	<b>Representing</b>
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Forest Protection Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER
Chesney, Charles	Member of General Public
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Hill, Robin	Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Hicks, Mark	Department of Natural Resources – AMPA
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Debbie Kay	Northwest Indian Fish Commission
Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ WSAC, CMER Co-Chair
Krausz, Eric	FNW
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
Maltz, Mark	



§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources
Mobbs, Mark	WTC Quinault
Munes, Eszter	DNR
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Pierce, Kenneth	Dept. of Fish and Wildlife
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER
Walter, Jason	ISAG co-chair
Volke, Malia	CMER

DRAFT