

**Attendees:**

Stephen Bernath, Co-chair, Ecology  
Adrian Miller, Co-chair, Longview Fibre  
Darin Cramer, DNR  
Marc Engel, DNR  
Peter Goldman, WFLC  
Joseph Pavel, Skokomish Tribe  
Terry Jackson, DFW  
Marty Acker, NOAA  
Doug Hooks, WFPA  
Nancy Sturhan, NWIFC  
Jim Hotvedt, AMP  
Curt Veldhuesin, SRCS  
Pete Heide, WFPA  
Josh Weiss, WSAC  
Mary Scurlock, F&F CC  
Dawn Hitchens, DNR  
Kendra Smith Skagit County  
Jim Peters, NWIFC  
Chris Mendoza, CC  
Mark Mobbs, Quinault Indian Nation

**Agenda –**

Policy co-chair Stephen Bernath clarified for Policy members that the alternative proposal for the post-mortem dispute resolution was developed by the co-chairs as an outcome from the discussions held between co-chairs, conservation and landowner caucuses.

**Meeting Notes – May & June 2012**

The Policy meeting notes were accepted with one change in the June notes on page 5.

**Facilitation - Candidate Interview Process**

Jim Hotvedt reported the process of hiring a facilitator was well underway. Readers have been recruited to score and rank the nine applications that were submitted. He added Policy will weigh in at the interview stage on the finalists and he was working to have the facilitator hired by the November Policy meeting.

**Forest Practices Habitat Conservation Plan (FP HCP) Settlement Agreement**

Stephen Bernath reported the next work meeting on the FP HCP settlement agreement was scheduled for September 11<sup>th</sup>. The meeting will be held at the Department of Ecology – headquarters in auditorium room 32, from 2:00 to 5:00 PM. The focus of the work meeting will be to discuss issue #1: improvements to the Adaptive Management Program's process for making decisions. He added that the work meetings are scheduled to be completed by the end of fall quarter. Policy will present a proposal based on the outcomes from the work meetings to the Forest Practices Board in February 2013. This timeline will match up for the rule making deadlines.

**The Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project Report – Dispute Resolution**

The Policy co-chairs reminded Policy members about last month's discussion on the associate editor not being available as approved by Policy and the suggested review panel proposal developed by the AMPA. The conservation caucus did not have their Policy lead at that meeting

to decide on the review panel proposal. They were given two weeks to return to the Policy co-chairs with a resolution.

Adrian Miller added Policy attempted to informally resolve the dispute at stage one and did not have much success. In the interim, the conservation and the landowner caucuses held discussions and the Policy co-chairs worked with those caucuses to resolve conflict. He added the alternative proposal before the Policy members was an outcome of those conversations. This embedded document as developed by the Policy co-chairs, conservation and landowner caucuses, was distributed and discussed at the September meeting:



Draft Policy Response  
to Procedural Question

Adrian Miller reiterated the decision before Policy was to accept:

- Assembling an Arbitration Panel (Review Panel)
- Or
- Alternative Proposal from WFPA and Conservation Caucus

He asked the caucuses to weigh in and answer two questions: 1) Based on each caucus assessment of this issue– is the alternative proposal worth pursuing? And 2) what are the caveats?

Caucus	Alternative Proposal Support / No Support	Comments
Conservation	Support	Needed further discussion regarding the role of the AMPA; include the transmittal memo from CMER co-chairs as a part of the package; clarification of what the package would look like for public distribution; and suggested CMER hosting a workshop on post-mortem.
Landowner	Support	Concerned with the science and how it is presented formally to Policy and the broad audience; they did not want to word smith the alternative proposal document.
Federal	Support	Concerned divergent answers to the six questions will substantially hinder Policy discussion; they saw the value of having the AMPA's synthesis and acknowledged Policy already received it; preferred this proposal without the findings report.
Washington Association of Counties	Support	Preferred the review panel proposal as presented last month; & expressed concern with the merits of the science and presentation style.
Skagit River Cooperative Systems	Representative shared they supported moving forward with the alternative proposal and disclosed he was one of the authors of the report	The six questions have the potential to distill arguments; and wanted to understand the AMPA's role more clearly. In past meetings, it has been suggested to have the caucuses discuss the study and identify topics; the caucus saw this as a potential avenue to tackle some of the process issues. As far as a panel review goes, the six questions would help focus on the main issues, and help panel members in the review.
State Caucus	The state caucus was not enthusiastic about the proposal, but if there was consensus among Policy to move forward, they would go along.	Preferred to have an arbitration panel to have a tightly focused process; and identified using the existing ISPR process, as this is a blind review. Suggested providing ISPR with the all materials and have them evaluate if the ISPR comments were responded to. Policy would need to agree with the ISPR decision. If Policy does not want to submit all the materials, give ISPR v8 of report and the comment matrix.

**Action:**

Adrian Miller summarized there was agreement by the caucuses to move forward with the alternative proposal as developed by the co-chairs, conservation and landowner caucuses. Policy members wanted modifications made and were encouraged to provide comments about what the full package needed to include by close of business on Tuesday, September 11<sup>th</sup>. The co-chairs will have a near consensus document re-drafted in time for the October Policy meeting.

**CMER Update-**

- ♦ Caucuses were reminded to help CMER recruit for a co-chair.
- ♦ The Forest Practices Board adopted the Policy recommendations on the BCIF & Solar studies. The Forest Practices Board understood the solar study was part of another study that will be submitted to them at a later date.

*Meeting Adjourned.*