

22 October 2021

To: The TFW Policy Committee

From: Saboor Jawad, Adaptive Management Program Administrator

Chris Mendoza and Jenny Knoth, CMER co-chairs.

Subject: The CMER review of the Small Forest Landowner (SFLO) Template Proposal Initiation Scientific Justification resulting in Position Papers over disagreements.

CMER members and participants have worked together after receiving direction from the TFW Policy committee to review the Scientific Justification (SJ) and related documents through the following motion passed by the TFW Policy committee on July 14th, 2020:

“Policy will transmit the SFL Template Proposal Initiation Scientific Justification with the Cramer Fish Sciences review, and the ISPR documentation as supporting materials to CMER for the purpose of responding to the 6 questions for completed outside science. CMER shall return the answers to the 6 questions as soon as possible, within 90 days after receiving draft answers to the 6 questions or as soon as possible. If additional time is needed, CMER shall make that justification to Policy at least 30 days prior to the original deadline.”

The intent of this document is to provide a cover memo to Policy for Position Papers from CMER members. There are many points of agreement but seemingly more points of disagreement over how to review the SJ and supporting materials. Perhaps the most difficult obstacle is whether this is a procedural (policy) or technical dispute. The position papers attached detail those differences.

Following several months of review and key disagreements, Dispute Resolution was called by Harry Bell via email following the December 2020 CMER meeting. CMER held an informal meeting consistent with the guided decision-making process February 17, 2021. A dedicated subgroup of CMER members and participants met several times over 7 months to answer the Six CMER / Policy interaction questions as requested by the TFW Policy Committee. In spite of this effort the group was unable to come to consensus, particularly on answering questions 4a “What does the study tell us?” and 4b “What does the study not tell us?” This effort ended with the “Notice of Intent to Discontinue Participation in the SFLO 6-Questions Working Group”, dated July 8, 2021. Members of CMER agreed to wait for the AMPA position to be filled before proceeding to the next procedural steps since their role is instrumental in the guided decision-making process along with the CMER co-chairs.

After deliberations regarding the nature of the review of non-CMER science and where this specific task fits into the CMER PSM Dispute Resolution Process (Section 3.3.3); the CMER Co-Chairs and AMPA have agreed that the most appropriate next step for resolution at CMER is for the disputing parties to submit position papers. It is noteworthy that CMER members working on this specific review have been challenged with several obstacles, some of which were already forwarded to TFW Policy in a CMER review update memo dated February 17, 2021 from AMPA Mark Hicks and CMER co-chairs Chris Mendoza and Jenny Knoth. After over one year of meetings in response to Policy’s motion, it is clear that CMER could not resolve these differences leaving the AMPA and CMER co-chairs positioned to forward this memo to TFW Policy along with the position papers.