

Policy meeting notes
February 4, 2021

Caucus updates:

- DNR update: A new Director of tribal relations that was hired, Glenda Bryler.
- Ray Entz: Job opening, Kalispell has a forester/silvicultural position open.
- Darin Cramer: Idea that is a desk top project to be helpful on the Type Np stream deliberations.

Meeting notes were passed

CMER request regarding ISPR of Smart Buffer Pilot study design

- Ray Entz: For this study to be considered they want it to go through the full CMER process. This offer was made and rejected. Eastside tribes don't think they can use this study if it doesn't go through the full CMER process.
- Mark Hicks: CMER wants to know how this is going to be used in the AMP. This will help us decide if we should send it through the ISPR process. If it's not going to be used in AMP then maybe we shouldn't spend time and resources on this.
- Darin Cramer: See this as different than the SFL template b/c this is a field project. Sounds like it doesn't matter if this goes to ISPR or not, Eastside tribes are not going to use this. Darin says this has not been looked at in the AMP so that's why they thought it would be useful to look at this. We designed and budgeted it a certain way. Lots of logistical and budget considerations. Taking the study off in different directions at this point is not possible, don't have the flexibility to change the approach of this study at this point. Can make comments but won't change the schedule or approach. Does the study as laid out and planned meet the objectives in the study design? That's what they are asking. If CMER wants to change this into something different and add things to it, we can't do this. Need to look at study as designed and if it's useful to the AMP.
- Brandon Austin: If a study design doesn't go through ISPR but a final report is, it sounds like that is a problem. It can create a problem if ISPR doesn't think study design was appropriate/sounds anyway. (Chris agreed, this is a problem and study designs need to go through ISPR). Why send this to ISPR if there isn't time or space to make changes anyway since already in implementation. This is called a pilot project. The intent of a pilot is not to inform rule decision making. Isn't a pilot project looking at if it is worth putting more resources to develop a full study that would then inform rule making? (Chris agreed, we don't usually make rule change based on this).
- Court Stanley: Sounds like ISPR would be good if it can fit within harvesting plans, but could go either way on this.
- Mark Hicks: Came as a proposal initiation and people agreed to bring this into the AMP process. Objectives were stated at beginning and accepted by Policy. This agreement is not holding but yet substantial work has began. Now people are questioning the objectives. CMER doesn't have a clear basis for sending these type of proposals through ISPR. They aren't treated equally and this needs to be resolved by AMPA and CMER co-chairs. Suggests we need a decision at this meeting so we can send this to ISPR and have no more delays. CMER has says we want to know

how you are going to use the results before we move this forward and if you don't answer this question not sure what we are going to do.

- Chris: Don't need to use ISPR to resolve disputes. Need to ensure we are not using ISPR in this way if people have disputes with this study design/study.

Motion: Policy's use of this study are uncertain. This uncertainty should be weighed by CMER members in determining whether or not they recommend it for ISPR review. Approved by all

- How is report going to be used when completed?
- Define intention of the study – inform Type Np rule?

SFL Dispute Resolution

- Received one proposal from RFQQ, Fulcrum resolution clinic from Spokane? We did hire them. There will be three mediators working on the project. Research phase, end by March 19th, schedule meetings, contacting policy reps for one on one meetings (completed by mid-March), after that holding 6 hour meetings by mid-April. Write up recommendations, then review, and then revise.

Type Np Workgroup update

Look at memo for update. Discussion about delay in delivery of Hard Rock and Soft Rock reports, also delays the delivery of the Type Np Workgroup report to Policy.

EMEP findings report

CMER Workplan: Heather briefly went through some of the high level changes that SAGs made to the plan.

Policy supports ISPR review of the project design to gain perspective of what can be used from the pilot