

CMER
September 28, 2004
King Oscar Hotel
Lacey, WA
Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Butts, Sally	USFWS, BTSAG co-chair
Colowick, Ann	Healthy Systems (PSM editor)
Grigsby, Sara	Healthy Systems (PSM facilitator)
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE co-chair
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG co-chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre, LWAG co-chair
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC, RSAG co-chair
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE co-chair
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farms
Roorbach, Ash	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

August CMER minutes were approved as amended.

The agenda was revised as follows:

- Item 2 - budget update
- Item 3 - PSM presentation
- Item 4 – SAG Request for PSM review
- Item 5 – Project management
- Items 6-9 – unchanged

Review of decisions and tasks

- CMER agreed with ISAG's proposed course of action for the Water Typing Model Field Validation Study Design. McNaughton agreed to draft a cover paragraph to submit to SRC with the course of action; the course of action has not been submitted to the SRC to date.
 - CMER authorized \$9,000 to hire a contractor to address comments from the SRC based on their review of the Water Type Validation Study plan. A contract has now been signed.
 - CMER approved an additional \$5,735 for a third round of editing on the Protocols and Standards Manual.
 - FPB approval of the CMER 2005 workplan and budget is expected in November.
 - CMER and SAG members were asked to review the project management proposal and submit comments to Rowton by September 17th.
 - CMER participants agreed to prioritize Intensive Monitoring projects in the afternoon session of today's meeting.
-

Budget Update: McNaughton said that budget has not changed much over the last month. DNR is attempting to accurately project when money will run out if no additional federal funds are approved.

Protocols and Standards Manual Presentation: Pleus said that the group has worked hard to develop a good draft of the Protocols and Standards Manual (PSM). This draft still needs work but many sections are substantially developed at this time. Grigsby presented an agenda to the group and walked people through the draft PSM to develop better understanding and orient participants to the draft. The Protocols and Standards Manual is attached for review by CMER.

Grigsby specializes in organizational development and Colowick's expertise is in editing technical documents such as the PSM. Organizational development is a challenge for all groups and CMER is no different. Decision-making is especially important to clarify. Pleus has served as the project manager for the group. There have been a few workgroup meetings and much communication through e-mail. The document has been through two rounds of editing at this time and is now ready for the third, which will involve CMER.

The workgroup has spent much time discussing the purpose and audience for this manual. These two items are significant and drive the way the manual is written. This has been specified in the introduction. The group has also made decisions about what belongs in this manual versus what belongs in the Adaptive Management Board Manual.

Colowick then reviewed the Executive Summary with the group and explained briefly the types of information that can be found in each chapter. Shaded text represents places where there are still questions or comments to address.

SAG Requests:

- PSMWG – Request for Review of the Protocols and Standards Manual. The PSMWG requested that the PSM forego SRC review and also requested specific reviewers for the draft. The deadline for review is October 19th. A response to the review will be available for the October CMER meeting and a final draft of the manual will be forwarded to CMER for approval in November. This manual represents guidelines only and is intended to be used by CMER. The manual will be revised formally once per year as-needed. The PSMWG is requesting three reviewers, two of which should be the CMER co-chairs and at least one of which should represent the Conservation Caucus. The group further recommends that Mark Hunter, Terry Jackson and Dave Schuett-Hames review the full draft as they have not been involved in development of the manual.

Schuett-Hames suggested that existing CMER project managers identified in the project management list review the project management chapter.

CMER Consensus: The PSM is not required to undergo SRC review.

CMER Consensus: The CMER reviewers recommended in the SAG request will review the document. All existing project managers will review the project management chapter. WDFW will provide one set of comments on the draft and Schuett-Hames may ask other CMER staff to help with review of the manual. Anyone else who wishes to comment is welcome to submit comments by October 19th.

The document will be forwarded electronically and comments should be provided in track changes format. Send comments to Allen Pleus at apleus@nwifc.org.

Project Management: Martin reminded CMER that a proposal for project management and a proposed list of project managers was distributed for review last month. McNaughton did receive some comments from Lenny Young, Kris Ray, Terry Jackson and Nancy Sturhan on the list and many of those have not been incorporated to date.

- The list will be updated and distributed electronically to the group.
- One comment received was that the list needs to be broken into individual contracts, rather than by program.
- Young's comments included his disappointment that it has come to this and there are not more project managers. Young also suggested changing the PI affiliation to contract holder: we need to differentiate between a PI and a project manager. The spreadsheet illustrates the need for project managers and the shortage of them. Different SAGs have different abilities to delegate project managers. McNaughton said that we need policy support to get more people to volunteer for project management positions.
- Sturhan said that UPSAG is going to set goals for each project for the year so they can track progress easier and revise accordingly. This exercise will also point out whether UPSAG has the capability to do the work they are proposing. Barreca said that Ecology has some priorities for UPSAG work and she will begin attending meetings.

- Schuett-Hames suggested thinking through the types of projects and data analysis that will be needed. Sometimes an independent PI will be best, but other times, CMER Staff or someone affiliated with CMER would be the better manager.
- Martin said that the final scope of work needs to have named project managers and principle investigators will be identified as a contractor or CMER staff/volunteer.

Martin suggested that CMER fill the fourth staff position with the NWIFC with a project manager. CMER also needs to work with the existing staff to prioritize work and identify project management tasks for those staff. Schuett-Hames suggested that CMER keep in mind that the existing staff was hired for their scientific expertise, not the ability to manage projects. There was positive discussion regarding a suggestion from Peterson that CMER keep the door open on an eastside CMER staff position.

Assignments: ISAG will be consulted in the fish passage discussions, RSAG and SAGE will provide some recommendations. Each of these SAGs will report back at the next CMER meeting. McNaughton will update the list and send it out next week.

CMER Monthly Report to Policy: Martin summarized the September CMER report to Policy as follows:

- Policy was informed that there were no additional candidates for the CMER co-chair position. Additionally, FFR Policy is recommending Pavel for the co-chairmanship of FFR Policy. This development left one CMER co-chair nominee. Pavel will accept the Policy co-chair position in October which will leave Sturhan as the remaining candidate for CMER co-chair. These decisions will be made formally at the October 7th FFR Policy meeting.
- A fish passage meeting has now been held and it was very productive. The issue is still unresolved, but is moving forward. Pavel added that the group is asking about what else is going on in fish passage research. Anyone with information on that type of research should forward that information to Rowton.
- McConnell presented information about the Hardwood Conversion study and the idea of including small landowners in that study; this proposal was initiated by DNR. CMER and McConnell will scope the budget implications of this requested change. Policy asked for a formal budget request for consideration at the October meeting.
- McConnell presented the DFC findings to date and identified concerns and issues that CMER has as a result of SRC review. On November 4th, Policy will extend their meeting and discuss the issue and the group has been asked to be prepared for decision-making on that date. Policy wants CMER to develop some options for how to proceed with DFC. The next RSAG meeting is October 19th and the group will be discussing these options at that time. The CMER co-chairs and McConnell will develop an agenda for the November 4th session. CMER will review a brief summary of the alternatives at their October meeting. That summary will then be forwarded to FFR Policy.

The focus of the October CMER report will be an update on the following three projects:

- Fish passage
- Extensive monitoring and roads
- PIP

Barreca suggested an update on the compliance monitoring development at the next CMER meeting.

SRC Update: McNaughton said that a successful interactive roads monitoring review has been completed and final comments are in. Both PIP reports are now through the SRC review process and peer review response plans are being developed. McNaughton reminded CMER that the SRC is interested in receiving feedback on their reviews and in knowing how CMER intends to respond to those comments. Pavel asked if CMER could provide informal responses when formal responses will take time to develop.

SAG Issues:

- **SAGE:** Ray said that the time schedule is clumping up and CMER is likely to receive three projects for review at the same time. SAGE has not decided how to respond to the comments from CMER on the Disturbance Regimes Literature review. If it needs to go back and be reworked, then it will be seen as outdated. It may be better to just leave it as it is and consider it a final document. SAGE has also not determined whether this literature review should go to SRC for review. Martin asked SAGE to bring forward a request to CMER to forego the SRC review on this document.
- **RSAG:** McConnell said that RSAG has looked at some of the bull trout overlay study sites and has concerns about how the sites can be used for RSAG studies. The post-treatment times are a concern as are some of the statistical differences in how the sites are selected. RSAG is also still with one co-chair and is looking for an additional person to participate.
- **UPSAG:** Palmquist reported that the PIP SRC review has been completed. A group of volunteers from the original committee is reviewing the SRC comments. Since it was Policy that submitted this document for review, neither UPSAG nor CMER are clear about what concerns to address. UPSAG is concerned about the Pilot studies ability to address the success of the study in achieving the stated purposes and objectives. The SRC review is viewed as inadequate by all members in the sub-group. No background information was submitted with this report. Pavel said that these reports include introductory materials and background and that should be enough for the reviewers. Pavel added that the SRC needs freedom to operate. Others stated that guidance to the SRC is critical to get their review focused. Pavel asked whether this is a failure of CMER or the SRC. Pavel also raised an issue surrounding the AE and the responsibility of that person to ensure that the review is adequate; others agreed and this concern should be conveyed to the SRC. One suggestion was to convey to them that, in addition to their normal review criteria, CMER has specific review needs for various studies. A suggestion was made to send a letter to the SRC conveying that

CMER does not find their review of the PIP study adequate. Schuett-Hames suggested that this letter address all studies that have been done to date and highlight what was done well and what was done poorly. Palmquist then continued his report; one issue is that this was a pilot study, not a full study.

The group that discussed the results of the review speculated that an appropriate response would be to return the report to the reviewers with additional guidance for review and possibly it should be submitted as a final study. Some CMER members were not supportive of submitting the study as final studies. Palmquist added that there was good information in the reviews; it simply was not synthesized well by the AE. This has not been discussed at UPSAG yet either.

Martin suggested a slightly revised process. Since this was not our general process, we may want to defer to Policy to decide where they want to go with this based on the results of SRC review. We would normally do a course of action and we cannot do that at this time. We do need to provide a document stating the relevance of the reviews. Pavel reminded the group that this study went to Policy as a pilot with a statement that additional studies would not add value information contained in the pilot study. Peterson suggested that we run it through the CMER BAS criteria as well. UPSAG will have a response ready for CMER consideration at the October 26th meeting. Pleus asked if CMER would like to see the SRC review comments on the Tribal 2002 study and their peer review response plan before Policy does. Pleus suggested that CMER should provide recommendations on science issues that are going before Policy. Those in CMER who would like to see the peer review comments, should contact Pleus for a copy.

- UPSAG 2: the Joan Sias report is completed and ready for submission to be posted on the website.

Pavel reiterated the importance of an RSAG co-chair stepping forward because McConnell has other commitments on his time.

Next Agenda Science Topic: this will be decided later. In November, the science topic will be bull trout.

Afternoon Science Session

Dave Schuett-Hames presented the discussion paper concerning intensive monitoring studies. CMER discussed a range of study needs that included ten research questions. A straw vote was taken to prioritize the study needs. The group agreed to focus future discussions and project development around the top three study areas. The highest priority was given to studies that could validate the road sediment performance target. There is high uncertainty concerning the effects of road sediment on habitat, water quality, amphibian, and fish populations. The second and third research areas received

equal ranking and include the cumulative effects of sediment, and LWD loading/wood recruitment targets. A summary of the CMER discussion with project rankings will be distributed to CMER before the next meeting. The next step is to assign work groups that will delineate critical questions for the priority studies.