

**Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research (CMER)
MEETING MINUTES**

Tuesday, September 22, 2020 // 9:00 am – 12:15 pm

Held Remotely using GoToMeeting

Prepared for CMER by Jacob Hibbeln, AMP Secretary Senior

Motions September 22, 2020	
Motion	Move/Second (Vote)
Approve the August 25 th meeting minutes as amended.	Aimee McIntyre/Harry Bell (Up: Chris Mendoza, Ash Roorbach, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, Patrick Lizon, Todd Baldwin, A.J. Kroll; absent: Julie Dieu.
Table work on the Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM) for 3 months and revisit in January of 2021.	Ash Roorbach/Aimee McIntyre (Up: Chris Mendoza, Ash Roorbach, Harry Bell, Aimee McIntyre, A.J Kroll, Patrick Lizon, Doug Martin, Todd Baldwin; absent: Julie Dieu)

Action Items	
Action Item	Responsibility
Comments on the Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project Scoping document are due by November 16 th . Official reviewers are Chris Mendoza, Harry Bell, Ash Roorbach, and Aimee McIntyre	CMER

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

Jenny Knoth, co-chair

Knoth took roll call and asked caucus members if anyone had suggested additions to the agenda. No suggestions were made and the August 25th minutes were presented. Voting members suggested edits and the August meeting minutes were approved as amended.

Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP)

Malia Volke, Eastside CMER Scientist

Volke gave a presentation on ETHEP, after which voting members had the opportunity to ask questions. Questions on the scoping document were originally due on October 22nd. In an effort to get more reviewers, the deadline for comments was extended to November 16th. Official reviewers are Chris Mendoza, co-chair, Harry Bell, WFFA, Ash Roorbach, NWIFC (designated by Debbie Kay), and Aimee McIntyre, WDFW.

Mendoza then asked if the Best Available Science (BAS) document had come to CMER for review since it is part of the project scoping process. Mark Hicks, AMPA, responded that while the BAS did not come to CMER for approval as an individual document, the BAS should be incorporated into the decisions in order to clearly document how the science was used. Bell commented that the BAS document should be

looked at in order to adequately review the document. Knoth commented that the BAS should part of the review of the scoping document in order to understand where the alternatives come from. Knoth stated that CMER not previously approving the BAS document should not be viewed as a process foul.

Protocol and Standards Manual (PSM) Workgroup

Teresa Miskovic, DNR

Miskovic stated that since Chapter 8 of the PSM was approved in July, the workgroup has met and discussed possible options for more work. Miskovic went over the main points of the memo sent out to CMER which covered possible avenues for continuing work. Work could be postponed until the end of the month to accommodate people's schedules, although this would not be recommended by the workgroup.

Joe Murray, WFPA, asked what the disadvantages of temporarily halting work on this would be. Roorbach stated that while he understands that people are busy, some momentum would be lost if the workgroup were to pause now because people are currently engaged in the revision process.

Due to the present workload of CMER members, Knoth suggested that the PSM be revisited in a month or two. Hicks then suggested a 3 month break, resuming work in the New Year. Roorbach moved to table work on the PSM for 3 months, to be revisited in January of 2021. The motion passed and Mendoza suggested that everyone use this time to review the PSM as it currently stands.

Roorbach then asked if Chapter 8 should be presented to Policy. Miskovic stated that this will be covered in the CMER SAG Updates at the October Policy meeting.

Water Typing Projects

Eszter Munes, DNR

Knoth asked if the subgroup is asking for a mechanism to track how the progress of the projects and what the function of a charter would be. Since Water Typing Projects are not a typical task, there should be clear expectations of what documents are necessary. Munes stated that the Potential Habitat Break (PHB) project has a charter that can be updated and that a Project Management document is currently being worked on.

Hicks added that the Forest Practices Board (FPB) chose Water Typing projects as a priority and took on the role of Policy for these projects. For this reason, all approval of study designs must go through the FPB. A conversation with the FPB regarding project mechanisms has never been had, and so it is necessary to use the CMER process as effectively as possible to give the FPB recommendations on study designs.

Munes explained that a scoping document has not been created but a proposal might have been presented to the FPB at some point. It would be a heavy lift to produce a charter, scoping document, and work on two study designs. Mendoza contributed that charters would be helpful for the FPB and that any changes that deviate from prior study designs should be presented to the FPB.

Due to concern about workload involved with producing CMER documents, it was confirmed that the Project Management document would suffice.

Extensive Monitoring Workshop

Hicks

Hicks explained that the Policy co-chairs recently realized that they have not provided feedback on priority questions that they would want answered at the Extensive Monitoring Workshop. Currently, there is no budget for the workshop.

Murray stated that the workshop would be relatively inexpensive depending on the speakers. However, plans for any workshop would be preliminary until Policy gives firm direction. Mendoza agreed, stating that nothing can be done until Policy prioritizes questions.

Smart Buffer Proposal Initiation

Ben Flint, DNR and Doug Martin, WFPA

Martin stated that he is still working on comments and that many have caused him to rethink parts of the study design. Martin then clarified what the goal of the study is and explained the next steps for CMER. Typically, something like this would go to ISPR. However, CMER has done a number of similar exploratory studies that did not go to ISPR so it may not be necessary in this scenario. Comments CMER members have sent in have been extremely helpful. Once Martin finishes reviewing all of the comments and the study design is submitted to CMER, a possible route is to discuss how this study fits into the Adaptive Management Program (AMP).

Martin then asked if it would be a good idea for CMER to write a prospective 6 questions on this study design. Mendoza commented that the discussion is worth having even if a decision will not be made today. This could provide a vehicle for CMER to decide whether or not they want to send this to ISPR. Before this is decided, CMER needs to approve the document based on Martin's response to comments.

Roorbach remarked that deciding where this fits into the AMP is more of a Policy question. How the comments are responded to and presented is important as well. The 6 Questions format might be helpful once CMER receives feedback from Policy.

Bell reminded CMER that the PSM states that reports and articles not approved by CMER must be peer reviewed but is not sure how helpful Policy would be in this process.

Hicks stated that this document requires a CMER consensus or a Dispute Resolution. Regarding the 6 questions document, this was delivered with the Proposal initiation. Whether or not this should be sent to ISPR can be decided once all the comments are responded to. Since the 6 questions were incorporated into the study design, another 6 questions document can wait.

Mendoza stated that CMER should ask Policy for feedback and clarification and what they would like to do with the completed review of the study design.

CMER SAG Updates

Knoth

Knoth first asked if there was anything outstanding that anyone would like to bring up. Hicks stated that the ISPR review of EMEP is complete and the final section comments from ISPR on the Soft Rock study are almost complete. Various members went through their SAGs and outlined the status of current projects. Details can be found in the CMER SAG Updates sent in the mailing.

Small Forest Landowner (SFL) Proposal Initiation

Knoth

Knoth first stated that today was the deadline for comments. Knoth will organize the comments after which she will work on a second draft of the answers to the 6 questions. Currently, there are two workgroup meetings scheduled. Martin will be involved in these meetings. Some comments are not purely technical and are therefore harder to decipher.

Hicks clarified that the review is of the SFL PI in a 6 questions format. Although this format is not typical for a review, the notion that the reviewers are not reviewing the PI itself is false. The difference is that there are no track changes comments within the document, so review could be more cumbersome.

Report from TFW Policy

Hicks

Hicks gave updates on the TFW Policy committee, most significant of which included Meghan Tuttle, Weyerhaeuser, being confirmed as the newest co-chair and that there was an extension on the timeline for the Experimental Alternate Harvest workgroup.

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier
Ehinger, William	Department of Ecology
Flint, Ben	Department of Natural Resources
Hicks, Mark	Department of Natural Resources – AMPA
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ WSAC, CMER co-chair
Krausz, Erik	US Fish and Wildlife Service
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
§Martin, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§McIntyre, Aimee	Washington Department of Natural Resources
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	Department of Natural Resources
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Munes, Eszter	Washington Department of Natural Resources
Roorbach, Ash	Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission
Stewart, Greg	CMER
Volke, Malia	CMER