

February 17, 2021

To: TFW Policy Committee

From: Mark Hicks, Adaptive Management Program Administrator
Chris Mendoza and Jenny Knoth, CMER Committee Co-chairs

Subject: Update on CMER's review of the Small Forest Landowner (SFLO) Template Proposal Initiation Scientific Justification.

CMER was directed by the TFW Policy Committee (Policy) to review the Scientific Justification (SJ) for the proposed SFL template prescriptions through the following motion passed by the TFW Policy committee on July 14h, 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.”

A dedicated subgroup CMER members and participants met every two weeks for several months to answer the standard 6 CMER-Policy Interaction questions as requested by the TFW Policy Committee. In spite of this effort the group has been unable to come into consensus, particularly on answering key questions 4a and 4b; “What does the study tell us?” and 4b “What does the study not tell us?”

The intent of this document is to provide an update to Policy on some of the key CMER non-consensus issues given Policy's motion above to review non-CMER science.

The CMER small forest landowner representative (Harry Bell) triggered the dispute resolution process in January 2021 on CMER's assignment to answer the six questions. Factors leading to the lack of consensus agreement within CMER will be further discussed during the upcoming DR process and include:

- Length of time elapsed since the inclusion of the Proposal Initiation into the AMP and subsequent review of the best available science conducted by Teply;
- The SJ is non-CMER science and did not adhere to CMER protocols for scoping, literature review, best available science (BAS), or study design nor did it meet the same level of rigor.
- That the technical assessment provided by the SJ is based on modeled responses with limited input of empirical data as well as the professional judgement of the author;
- That the SJ is incomplete because the author did not respond to the Teply review;
- Studies have been published or completed after 2014 by CMER that indicate some proposed prescriptions will not respond as predicted in the SJ.

CMER's formal dispute resolution process will follow the Forest Practices AMP process outlined in FP board manual Section 22, and the CMER protocols and standards manual. The CMER co-chairs and AMPA will provide updates to Policy at their monthly meetings.