

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

Motions for July 27, 2021	
Motion	Second (Vote)
<p>Meeting Minutes</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Debbie Kay (<i>Suquamish Tribe</i>) moved to approve the June Meeting Minutes with amendments.</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Bill Ehinger <i>for Patrick Lizon (Dept. of Ecology)</i> Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Reed Ojala-Barbour <i>for Aimee McIntyre</i>, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Todd Baldwin, Mark Mobbs, Bill Ehinger <i>for Patrick Lizon</i>, Joe Murray <i>for Doug Martin</i> Down: none</p>
<p>Soft Rock Chapter 5</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Chris Mendoza (<i>CMER co-chair</i>) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 5 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Reed Ojala-Barbour <i>for Aimee McIntyre (Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife)</i> Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Reed Ojala-Barbour <i>for Aimee McIntyre</i>, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Mark Mobbs, Bill Ehinger <i>for Patrick Lizon</i>, Joe Murray <i>for Doug Martin</i> Sideways: Jenny Knoth Down: none</p>
<p>Soft Rock Chapter 6</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Mark Mobbs (<i>WTC Quinault</i>) moved to approve Chapter 6 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Harry Bell (<i>Washington Farm Forestry Association</i>) Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Reed Ojala-Barbour <i>for Aimee McIntyre</i>, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Mark Mobbs, Bill Ehinger <i>for Patrick Lizon</i>, Joe Murray <i>for Doug Martin</i> Sideways: Jenny Knoth Down: none</p>
<p>Soft Rock Chapter 7</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Reed Ojala-Barbour <i>for Aimee McIntyre (Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife)</i> moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 7 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: Debbie Kay (<i>Suquamish Tribe</i>) Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Reed Ojala-Barbour <i>for Aimee McIntyre</i>, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Todd Baldwin, Mark Mobbs, Bill Ehinger <i>for Patrick Lizon</i>, Joe Murray <i>for Doug Martin</i> Sideways: Jenny Knoth Down: none</p>
<p>Hard Rock Phase II Executive Summary</p> <p><u>Motion:</u> Bill Ehinger <i>for Patrick Lizon (Dept. of Ecology)</i> moved to approve Hard Rock Executive Summary</p> <p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	<p>Seconded: <i>Debbie Kay (Suquamish Tribe)</i> Up: Harry Bell, Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Reed Ojala-Barbour <i>for Aimee McIntyre</i>, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Todd Baldwin, Mark Mobbs, Bill Ehinger <i>for Patrick Lizon</i>, Joe Murray <i>for Doug Martin</i> Down: none</p>

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

<p>DNR Forest Practices Application Review System (FPARS) and FPA Data</p>	<p>Seconded: Todd Baldwin (<i>Kalispel Tribe of Indians</i>) Up: Julie Dieu, A.J. Kroll, Reed Ojala-Barbour for <i>Aimee McIntyre</i>, Chris Mendoza, Debbie Kay, Jenny Knoth, Todd Baldwin, Mark Mobbs, Joe Murray for <i>Doug Martin</i>, Bill Ehinger for <i>Patrick Lizon</i>, Harry Bell Down: none</p>
<p><u>Motion:</u> Joe Murray (<i>Washington Forest Protection Association</i>) moved to have CMER approve obtaining and holding a copy of the FPARS data and associated FPA PDF documents for the purpose of conducting research and monitoring.</p>	
<p><u>Motion Passed</u></p>	

Action Items for July 27, 2021	
Action Items	Responsibility
<p>Review audit and recommendations</p>	<p>CMER members are to review audit recommendations on website: https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board/cooperative-monitoring-evaluation-and-research</p>
<p>WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design with LiDAR methodology</p>	<p>The latest updated documents are to be sent out for review and comment.</p>
<p>SFLO Small Forest Landowner Six Questions Working Group</p>	<p>CMER co-chairs will wait to discuss issues and disagreements with the new AMPA before proceeding to next step.</p>
<p>CMER Meetings/Science Session Recommendations</p>	<p>CMER members are to send recommendation for speakers to co-chairs.</p>
<p>CPEACE Subgroup</p>	<p>The CPEACE Subgroup will summarize recommendations to be presented to CMER.</p>

MINUTES

Welcome, Introductions, and Old Business

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

Jenny Knoth opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. Two of the ground rules were read.

Updates:

Jenny Knoth noted the following:

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

- Jenny identified the proxies for the meeting: Reed Ojala-Barbour acting as proxy for Aimee McIntyre, Bill Ehinger acting as proxy for Patrick Lizon for the morning, and Joe Murray acting as a proxy for Doug Martin.
- She noted that the new Adaptive Management Program Administrator Saboor Jawad will start on August 5th.
- She noted that the Forest Practices Application Backup Acquisition Request was added as an additional topic to the agenda.

June, 2021 Meeting Minutes:

Debbie Kay (*Suquamish Tribe*) made the motion to have the CMER June Meeting Minutes as amended approved. Todd Baldwin (*Kalispel Tribe of Indians*) seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

SCIENCE SESSION – CPEACE

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) noted that the subgroup that was formed to compile charts and notes taken at the CPEACE training is still working on this and should have something to report by the next CMER meeting.

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) opened the floor for members to identify any ideas that would support their CPEACE training:

- Jenny Knoth noted that having a SAG member present their work at each meeting would help the CMER membership to get a more in depth understanding of their projects.
- Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) noted that their Project Type F Buffer on the west side could be presented in the next couple of months.
- Jenny requested that any suggestions on CMER meeting science sessions be emailed to the CMER co-chairs and they will create a schedule.

Soft Rock Final Report

Lori Clark (*DNR*)

Lori noted that Chapter 5, 6 and 7 of the Soft Rock have been approved by the ISPR editors and are up for approval today. She added they have also received the final versions of chapters 1, 2 and 3.

Decision: Approve Soft Rock Chapter 5 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 5 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report. Reed Ojala-Barbour acting as proxy for Aimee McIntyre (*Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*) seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

Decision: Approve Soft Rock Chapter 6 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report

Marc Mobbs (*WTC Quinalt*) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 6 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report. Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

Decision: Approve Soft Rock Chapter 7 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report

Reed Ojaloa-Barbour acting as proxy for Aimee McIntyre (*Washington Dept. of Fish and Wildlife*) moved to approve Soft Rock Chapter 7 of the Soft Rock Effectiveness Report. Debbie Kay (*Suquamish Tribe*) seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

Soft Rock Executive Summary:

Lori Clark (DNR)

Lori Clark noted that chapters 1 through 4 will go out in the next two weeks for review. She added that the Executive Summary is only on the agenda today for review. She noted this is a CMER decision and will not be submitted to ISPR for review unless CMER requests it. Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) noted that the default is that Executive Summaries are not sent to ISPR and added there was an exception with Hard Rock Executive Summary because the AE made a recommendation to the AMPA that they wanted to see this.

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) asked why the Hard Rock Executive Summary was requested to be sent to ISPR. Heather Gibbs (DNR) responded that the reason the Hard Rock Executive Summary was sent to ISPR was because ISPR requested to see a report on the changes that were made because of the large rewrite by the authors and the PI and the fact that the format was not workable.

Hard Rock Phase II Executive Summary

Heather Gibbs (DNR)

Heather noted that the Hard Rock Executive Summary was reviewed and the associate editor requested changes which were made. She added LWAG is asking for CMER to approve the finalized report and move it on to Policy. Heather added there will be an update with final edits from the authors and PI and there is an addendum for additional years of temperature data that will come to CMER by next spring. She noted that the Hard Rock Six Questions has been reviewed and will come to CMER in August for approval.

Decision: Approve HR Executive Summary

Bill Ehinger acting as proxy for Patrick Lizon (*Dept. of Ecology*) moved to approve Hard Rock Executive Summary. Debbie Kay (*Suquamish Tribe*) seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

WFPA Smart Buffer Study Design with LiDAR

Joe Murray (Washington Forest Protection Association)

Joe Murray presented the memo to CMER that is requesting approval for the revised version of the Headwater Stream Smart Buffer Design Project Study Proposal. Joe noted that Doug Martin presented the LiDAR methodology for shade estimation during the last CMER meeting and submitted an updated

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

version of the study design for review. He added comments were compiled in a matrix and Doug responded to the comments and produced an updated Study Design on July 14th. He noted that the LiDAR component is what was commented on in the matrix.

Bill Ehinger (*Ecology*) noted (*from chat box*) “*comments have not been adequately addressed when mainly looking for an unmodified full shade-shed treatment in order to be able to have a “clean” benchmark treatment, since this is a methods study and all other treatments will have subjective alterations.*” Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) noted that there are some comments that are not answered and asked if Doug Martin had responded to those as they did not show up in the matrix.

It was noted that the matrix document in the mailing was not the latest revised document where Doug Martin had responded to the remaining comments. Jenny Knoth asked if the reviewers were satisfied with the methods being presented in this study. She noted that CMER is not conducting this work. Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) asked about the difference between an effective study versus an exploratory study and noted that there is no treatment for full shade effect treatment. Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) noted that the purpose of this study was to measure full effective shade. Chris stated that the decision to approve the Study Design should be postponed until the next meeting so CMER has time to review the updated comments from Doug Martin. Jenny proposed having the decision for this be moved to the CMER August meeting in order to provide everyone time to review the updated comments.

SFLO - Small Forest Landowner Six Questions

Workgroup

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted that a workgroup was created to review the progress on the SFLO Six Questions document that had been invoked as a Dispute Resolution Process by Harry Bell. She added that the subgroup worked on attempting to reach agreement on the answers to the Six Questions in response to TFW Policy’s initial request, which resulted in two separate versions of the answers to the Six Questions and a memo highlighting the major differences between Cramer, Scientific Justification (SJ) and ISPR. She noted that some members of the workgroup sent a memo with a notice of intent to discontinue participation in the SFLO Six Questions workgroup.

Jenny requested the workgroup present their memo and the reasons for their decision to discontinue participation in the SFLO Six Questions workgroup.

Workgroup Responses:

Todd Baldwin (*Kalispel Tribe of Indians*) noted that the workgroup kept running into the same issues and weren’t able to come into an agreement. He added that the group reached a consensus that this should go back to the dispute process and recommended that Policy get an outline of where the workgroup agreed and where they didn’t agree. He added that the SFLO have an agenda that helps their membership and they don’t feel it will have a large impact. He added that this is a Policy document and a Policy decision and it doesn’t fit the CMER process.

Jenny Knoth noted that the process was originally circumvented by the AMPA at the time, not by the small forest landowners.

Patrick Lizon, (*Dept. of Ecology*) noted that the Scientific Justification (SJ) was not meeting CMER science standards because it was incomplete and never revised in response to the criticisms of the methodology.

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

Debbie Kay (*Dept. of Ecology*) noted that the workgroup's trajectory was further apart from where they started concerning what needed to be said, what were the facts, and what needed to be stated.

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) asked if the next step in the Dispute Resolution Process would be to hire a facilitator. He noted that the SFLO agenda is to have some prescriptions that maybe less effective on a site specific basis taking into account that SFLO have a smaller timber harvest and recognizing by legislature that SFLO is asking for special treatment in having some prescriptions that are lesser effective on a site specific basis. He suggested we look at the differences between the prescriptions and the rules that have been identified and have a discussion on this. He added that our mission here is not to look for equivalence of protection.

Comments:

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) proposed that they take recommendations from the workgroup, have CMER make comments on the items that are being disagreed on and then give it to Policy. He added they should receive comments back in the next 30 days. Todd Baldwin (*Kalispel Tribe of Indians*) suggested giving Policy a memo and/or two sets of questions that outlined the concerns and the comments that we couldn't reach an agreement on.

Jenny Knoth noted from the chat box: (*The Associate Editor and reviewers have presented their comments relative to the 11 questions for ISPR's reviews of the initial review of the Alternate Plan Template. In synthesizing the reviews, the AE stated that all the reviewers and he concluded that the review by Cramer Fish Sciences "...was technically sound and unbiased.*)

Jenny Knoth proposed constructing a document that says CMER respects the findings from ISPR, the work that has been done and the questions raised by ISPR. She added the document should also include where we have identified the holes in the science and a proposal for additional studies that can fill those gaps.

Joe Murray (*Washington Forest Protection Association*) noted that the document should also mention that prescriptions on the landscape needed to be tested following the CMER process. Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) noted that he didn't agree that we recommend prescriptions on the document but instead provide a memo to serve as a template for the differences that can be commented on. Chris noted that he was not prepared to participate in a Stage II Dispute Resolution at this stage. He added that the best path forward would be to outline the differences and review the comments and then if we are not in agreement send this to Policy.

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted that we need to follow 3.3.4.1 of the Board Manual for this process and added that what we send to the Board is what needs to be worked on. She added we could have some mediation to help in creating a document that would be forwarded to the Board. She noted that we need to look at the fact that the work ISPR did on this is not being agreed on and she had a concern that this work would be disregarded. She asked if CMER would acknowledge that ISPR did review the review and did investigate the methods and techniques in the Cramer review and that the SJ did not meet the procedures in CMER. She added that the Cramer review was closer to following a process similar to CMER's and this is what it found and CMER could create a document that speaks to the differences.

Debbie Kay (*Suquamish Tribe*) asked what the process is when the two co-chairs don't agree on the next step in the dispute and there is no AMPA present who do we defer to?

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

Chris Mendoza (*CMER co-chair*) noted that the best path would be to create a memo that highlights the differences and present this to Policy and that would allow everyone to have a voice to show what they agree on and don't agree on.

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted that this has been in dispute and we can't revoke that it was in dispute and there has been a process for the past several months. The next stage does involve the AMPA.

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) suggested that they move to the next level of the dispute resolution process but he was open to meeting again in an informal process

Jenelle Black (*CMER*) noted from the chat box: *"IF the subgroup doesn't agree, doesn't it come back to CMER?"*

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted from the chat box: *"3.3.4.1 Step 2: Categorize and resolve the issue
If the issue/question cannot be resolved at the 'informal' meeting and there is no consensus to table the issue/question, then the disputing parties need to clearly articulate in position papers their interpretation of the issue/question and their positions. If the non-consensus is occurring in a SAG, the issue is elevated to CMER to continue the guided decision making process. The position papers should be submitted to the AMPA and CMER co-chairs within 14 calendar days after the decision to move forward, but no later than in time for the next CMER meeting mail-out if within the 14-day period, unless an alternate date is agreed upon by the AMPA. If a SAG or CMER participant(s) blocking consensus is unable or unwilling to provide this document in this time frame, it will be treated going forward the same as if the individual stood aside, and that consensus has been reached. If all parties submit position papers, the AMPA and CMER co-chairs will assign the issue/question(s) to one (or more) of four categories based on the position papers: Stylistic, CMER Process, Policy, or Technical."*

Jenny asked if we were entering into Phase II of the Dispute Resolution Process. Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) noted that he is willing to give the new APMA time to consider this before we move into Phase II. Chris Mendoza noted that non CMER Science doesn't go through this process. Todd Baldwin (*Kalispel Tribe of Indians*) noted that this is a conversation we need to have with the AMPA because we are in such disagreement about our path forward.

Harry Bell (*Washington Farm Forestry Association*) noted that he didn't think a CMER member needs CMER approval to move to Phase II of the dispute process and writing up our position papers is the next step concerning what each prescription does and does not do for each of the functions and what science do we have to support this.

Jenny Knoth, (*CMER co-chair*) noted that we have moved into an area that needs discussion between the AMPA and the co-chairs and if the workgroup would like to work on something she would support this.

TFW Policy Update

Mark Engel (*Policy co-chair*)

Marc outlined what Policy is working on:

- The Forest Practices Board will meet on August 11th.
- The WIP Tool Study Design will be presented to the Board with a recommendation from Policy that the Board not take any formal action and will also include a recommendation to promote this as a non-regulatory screening tool to the public.
- The eDNA Study Design will be presented to the Board with a recommendation from Policy that the Board not take any formal action and also to include a recommendation to encourage CMER to continue to develop using this tool and refine the methods.
- Policy has accepted the Np Buffer Workgroup Report and has begun a 180 day review.

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

- Policy received a PI request on the Np Buffer GIS based on the FPA's. Policy rejected the PI and it has gone into dispute resolution and Stage I has been initiated. He noted that the dispute is about the scope of inference questions regarding the manner in which Hard Rock was completed and the need to look at the broader forest landscape and the manner in which the study can be completed.
- The Extensive Monitoring Workgroup was to develop a strategy to be presented to Policy at the July meeting but it has been delayed to September. He added one of the questions before Policy is whether we need to reconstitute that workgroup.
- Policy will present their work plan priorities to the Board at the Aug 11th meeting and the actions Policy will take to address the audit recommendations #5 and #6.
- Policy will provide updates to the legislature according to their timelines.
- Policy is entertaining in person meetings that include field trips with the potential of an October two day Policy meeting in Eastern Washington and are looking to partner with CMER to develop a field trip.

DNR Forest Practices Application Review System (FPARS)

Jenelle Black (CMER)

Jenelle noted that DNR is upgrading the FPARS and needed justification to maintain documents after their regular retaining schedule. Jenelle asked that CMER approve sending an official request to DNR to obtain and hold a copy of the FPARS data and FPA PDF documents.

Joe Murray (*Washington Forest Protection Association*) moved that CMER approve obtaining and holding a copy of the FPARS data and associated FPA PDF documents for the purpose of conducting research and monitoring. Todd Baldwin (*Kalispel Tribe of Indians*) seconded the motion.

The motion passed.

CMER SAG Updates

WetSAG

Debbie Kay (*co-chair*)/ Harry Bell (*co-chair*)

Forested Wetlands Effectiveness Project:

Debbie noted that WetSAG has updated the project charter to reflect updates to budget estimate, project team, and timeline and it was approved by CMER in May 2021. She added that Policy did not approve the charter and motioned to compare the CMER Work Plan and FWEP Charter for critical questions differences in the verbiage. WetSAG is reviewing the discrepancies/changes and comments and are detailing in a cross reference document that will be included in the mailing materials for the August meeting.

UPSAG

Lori Clark (*AMP Project Manager*)

Deep-Seated Landslide Research Strategy

Lori noted that work is continuing on the study design development and will have a draft study design ready by the end on 2021. She noted that UPSAG is refining the budget and timeline.

SAGE

Todd Baldwin (*chair*)

Eastside Timber Habitat Evaluation Project (ETHEP)

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

Todd noted that the scoping document was approved at the June Policy meeting and SAGE has a project team that is developing a study design for Alternative 2.

Eastside Type N Riparian Effectiveness Project (ENREP)

Todd noted that the harvest began at the Tripp's site in mid-June but is progressing slower than anticipated due to operational restrictions due to the wildfire danger levels.

RSAG

Joe Murray (*chair*)

Riparian Characteristics and Shade Response Study

Joe noted that the study design was approved and sent to ISPR and the AE is currently collating the reviewer comments. He added that RSAG is discussing options for pursuing a related study or add on to the RCS or Type F studies to look at additional treatments and potential paths forward.

Westside Type F Riparian Prescription Monitoring Project

Joe noted that the project team will complete revisions to the Exploratory Report and submit it to CMER for 30-day review by August 2021. He added that RSAG will also initiate work on the Six Questions document and the Type F BACI study design.

Extensive Status and Trends Monitoring Workshop

Joe noted that RSAG recommended Policy move forward with developing an Extensive Project and including funding for it in the next MPS. He added that the recommendations were approved at the June Policy meeting.

ISAG

Jason Walter/ Cody Thomas (*co-chairs*)

Water Typing Strategy

Cody noted that the ISAG water typing subgroup is currently working on the PHB study design.

eDNA Pilot Study

Cody noted that the eDNA pilot findings report was passed at the July Policy meeting and will be presented to the Board in August.

LWAG

Reed Ojala-Barbour *for Aimee McIntyre (LWAG co-chair)*

Hard Rock Phase II

Reed noted that the Executive Summary for the final report was approved by ISPR and CMER approved July 27th. He added that comments on the Six Questions document were distributed to the PI's and the revised Six Questions document will be ready for CMER review in August.

Discontinuous Np Surface Flows

Reed noted that a draft scoping document will be delivered to CMER in March or April 2022 and an updated charter will be presented to CMER in August.

CMER OVERSITE PROJECTS:

ROAD PRESCRIPTION-Scale Effectiveness Monitoring Project Team

Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee

Tuesday, July 27th, 2021 using GoToMeeting

Meeting 9:00 am –2:38 pm

No updates

CMER Work Plan Improvement Group

No updates

UPSAG:

Unstable Slope Criteria Project Team

No updates

Small Forest Landowner PI

Discussion earlier on agenda

Public Comment

charles chesney asked Jenelle about the size of the FPARS and FPA GIS data base.

Conclusions

The motion and action items were reviewed, after which the meeting was adjourned.

List of Attendees

Attendees	Representing
§Baldwin, Todd	Kalispel Tribe of Indians
§Bell, Harry	Washington Farm Forestry Association
Black, Jenelle	CMER staff
Clark, Lori	DNR
chesney, charles	Member of the Public
Colton, Mary	DNR
§Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, Washington Forest Protection Association
Ehinger, Bill	Department of Ecology
Gibbs, Heather	DNR
Hooks, Doug	Washington Forest Protection Association
§Debbie Kay	Suquamish Tribe
§Knoth, Jenny	Washington Farm Forestry Association/ CMER Co-Chair
§Kroll, A.J.	Weyerhaeuser
§Lizon, Patrick	Department of Ecology
§Mendoza, Chris	Conservation Caucus – CMER Co-Chair
Miskovic, Teresa	DNR
§Mobbs, Mark	(WTC Quinalt)
Murray, Joe	Washington Forest Protection Association
Reed Ojaloa-Barbour	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Stewart, Greg	CMER staff
Cody Thomas	ISAG co-chair, UCUT
Volke, Malia	CMER staff