

**CMER**  
**October 26, 2004**  
**NWIFC Conference Center**  
**Lacey, WA**  
**Draft Minutes**

---

**Attendees**

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Butts, Sally	USFWS
Fransen, Brian	Weyerhaeuser
Hayes, Marc	WDFW
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE co-chair
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG co-chair
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC
McNaughton, Geoffrey	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Peterson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE co-chair
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farm
Robinson, Tom	WSAOC
Roorbach, Ash	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER co-chair

---

**Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:**

A report on compliance monitoring is available as a handout though it will not be discussed today. If you would like a copy via e-mail, please contact Nancy Sturhan ([nancy.sturhan@wadnr.gov](mailto:nancy.sturhan@wadnr.gov)).

**CMER Consensus:** Minutes of the September 28, 2004 CMER meeting were approved as amended.

**Decisions and Tasks from September were reviewed:**

- Review of the Protocols and Standards Manual was requested and has been completed. Pleus will update CMER on the PSM group's progress in reviewing comments.

- Work on the project management sheet continues. ISAG, RSAG and SAGE were all to be contacted last month. An update will be provided later today
- The DFC workshop with Policy is scheduled for November 4<sup>th</sup>.
- UPSAG agreed to have a response plan for PIPs ready for CMER to review on October 26<sup>th</sup>. However, this is not available yet.
- Ranking of intensive monitoring projects was completed. Workgroups will now be assigned to delineate critical questions for the priority studies.

---

### **SAG Requests:**

- SAGE - Eastside Type F Program, Review of Available Literature Related to Wood Loading Dynamics in and Around Streams in Eastern Washington. SAGE is asking for CMER review of this document. The document has had SAGE significant review by SAGE and many of the eastside Tribes. This document is a synthesis of literature available on wood loading in eastern Washington. CMER review is to identify any existing gaps. The document will then be forwarded to SRC for review. Any changes to the document will be made by SAGE, not the consultant as the contract has expired. The document will be used to help frame the work needed to answer questions about wood targets in Eastern Washington. Martin stated a concern that the contract was completed before CMER reviewed the document. Schuett-Hames said this problem needs to be addressed when the contract is initiated, to ensure there is remaining funding to cover any comments made by CMER that should be incorporated into the document. Better communication between the SAGs and CMER will help alleviate this problem. Martin said that CMER may want to assign CMER reviewers early so those reviewers can get engaged in the process and ensure ongoing CMER review during the SAG process. Palmquist suggested CMER oversight of every contract.

**CMER Consensus:** The following people will review the literature review – Mark Hunter (WDFW); Doug Martin (Martin Environmental); Palmquist, Bob (NWIFC, CMER Staff). CMER will have 45 days to review the document and comments are to be submitted to Lynda Hofmann ([hofmalah@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:hofmalah@dfw.wa.gov)) by Friday, December 10<sup>th</sup>.

- UPSAG – Roads Sub-Basin Effectiveness Monitoring; request for review of post SRC proposed Action Plan. UPSAG has reviewed the SRC comments on the Roads Sub-Basin Effectiveness monitoring plan and is now seeking CMER approval of the action Plan. This was an interactive review and the response plan is based on the final SRC review of the document. Martin commented that this action plan was very well written.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER approved the action plan as submitted.

- LWAG – Type N Experimental Buffer Study Design Peer Review Request. LWAG requested that the Type N Experimental Buffer Study Design be forwarded to the SRC for review. This study design has gone through extensive CMER review and both

RSAG and LWAG feel it is ready for SRC review. This SRC review will be interactive. McConnell said that the SAGs believe the SRC will request substantive changes to the design. There have been a number of workshops on this study design. Risenhoover said that we may want to consider adding some reviewers to this process to address specific aspects of the study. Hayes said that LWAG is specifically requesting reviewers from each major area: genetics, aquatic ecology, and amphibians. Schuett-Hames asked how LWAG will handle questions for the reviewers; Hayes said that LWAG would structure questions for the reviewers. McNaughton added that, since this is an interactive review, formal framing of questions will not be as critical though it will still be necessary. Mendoza said that CMER has stipulated in the past that review questions must be asked up front and CMER must approve the questions.

**CMER Consensus:** The study design was approved to be forwarded to SRC for review but the review will not begin until CMER has had a chance to review the questions developed by LWAG. This process will take place through the e-mail and if there are no disagreements, the proposal will move forward to SRC without coming through CMER again. If there are disagreements, CMER will consider these disagreements in November. A statistician will be added to the list of SRC reviewers.

---

**SRC Update:** McNaughton said that LWAG is the only SRC project moving forward at this time. McNaughton has sent a letter to Dan Vogt expressing concerns with the review process and a meeting between McNaughton, Vogt, and Martin will be scheduled soon. Schuett-Hames said that CMER has requested information from Vogt regarding how the program is addressing conflict of interest – this issue will be addressed during the meeting. Others in CMER who have suggested agenda items for the meeting should forward those to McNaughton ([Geoffrey.mcnaughton@wadnr.gov](mailto:Geoffrey.mcnaughton@wadnr.gov)).

---

**Budget Update:** McNaughton said the budget has not changed since last month. It was forwarded to the FPB for review last week.

---

**Project Status Reporting:** Sturhan has drafted a document reflecting the major steps in getting a project approved and underway. Palmquist worked on this draft and identified a fairly clear time table for a project to get underway. The minimum time is 15 months and CMER's experience has been that it takes 18 months or more to get a project underway. This document will be distributed to CMER via e-mail and comments are requested and to be directed to Sturhan ([nancy.sturhan@wadnr.gov](mailto:nancy.sturhan@wadnr.gov)).

This document only reflects the time it takes to get the project contract ready. A suggestion was made that the document be shown to FFR Policy. Sturhan is also thinking of putting together a workshop for SAG co-chairs focusing on project management skills and tools and to discuss other workshops that may be helpful for SAG co-chairs. Schuett-Hames asked if there is any potential to streamline the process identified in the document.

Palmquist and Sturhan said that streamlining is possible, though it will not alter the timeline substantially.

**CMER Consensus:** This item will be on the agenda for CMER to consider next month. Please submit your comments to Sturhan by November 16<sup>th</sup>.

---

**Project Management:** A revised list of project managers was distributed to CMER. McNaughton received comments from LWAG, SAGE and others. The document has been updated as a result. Barreca is available to manage a project though her name has not been added to the list yet. SAGE offered additional suggestions to McNaughton, which he incorporated during the meeting. An updated project management sheet will be available at the next CMER meeting.

McNaughton also attempted to define a CMER project manager and a Principle Investigator. Pleus is concerned with the wrap-up phase and stated the sheet should reflect non-budget projects as well. For example, the PSM workgroup has a budget and Pleus is the project manager. Barreca said, with regard to Extensive Riparian monitoring, that when CMER decides whether they want an outside contractor or Ecology, a decision can be made regarding whether Barreca should serve as the PI or the project manager.

Martin said that the two biggest holes are under extensive monitoring. CMER still has not filled the fourth CMER staff position and may want to think about hiring this person with those projects in mind. If CMER can define the type of background this fourth staff person should have, the hiring process can move forward. Robinson suggested a project manager for these projects, not someone with a lot of scientific expertise. General skills should include: project management, contract management, general natural resource background, and site location skills. Sturhan and Martin did receive some e-mail comments regarding a new CMER staff person. Schuett-Hames suggested that CMER work on a job description. Robinson said that IT project management is similar to what we are looking for here and looking to that guidance would be helpful. There was much discussion of the geographical location of this person – Eastern or Western Washington.

**CMER Consensus:** A job description or options will be drafted by Schuett-Hames, McNaughton, Sturhan, Hofmann and Ray and submitted to CMER for discussion and possible approval at the November meeting.

---

**Protocols and Standards Manual Update:** Pleus said that CMER review of the PSM has been completed. The PSM group is now working to compile, incorporate and respond to these comments. No fatal flaws were identified; however, it is generally considered to be too long, too detailed and too redundant. The workgroup met last week and will meet again on November 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>. The group does not have a response plan ready today for this group and may not be able to get a final draft ready for November. There is enough flexibility in the contract to allow for a one month delay and final approval in December.

Heide suggested that CMER adopt the manual provisionally and it proceed through a trial period. If people test the manual, problems will be identified, the manual can be revised and good final version can be adopted at a later date. There were a number of concerns about the substantive changes that might be incorporated into the manual prior to proposed approval in December.

**CMER Consensus:** CMER would like to consider a document for provisional approval in November or December. CMER will then begin using the manual and it will be edited over some period of time and then adopted as a final document at a later date.

---

**Consideration of non-CMER Science:** CMER received a proposal regarding how CMER could consider guidelines for external science from Allen Pleus last week. This would be proposed for addition on the PSM at some point in the future. The Tribes are very interested in finding a way to incorporate external science into the CMER process. There is a need to set this guidance for issues such as the Tribal 2002 PIP study. This proposal is specific to external science as it applies to currently ongoing CMER studies. It must be scientific information that will support, modify or eliminate the need for a planned CMER study. In the later stages of a CMER study, it could support or oppose pending results and the usefulness of the study. This is different than studies that are being cited as references for ongoing CMER studies.

Heide said that he supports good science and CMER should evaluate and look at the importance of all relevant science and incorporate it into the synthesis process of CMER before going to Policy. However, if a group of individuals see a CMER study evolving and this group then produces additional information to impact the scientific discussions, that information could be suspect. If CMER is not addressing an issue, there should also be a mechanism for people to bring their scientific proposal to the table, fund it and run it through CMER for approval. To set up a situation where you invite people to come up with answers to support or oppose CMER science is dangerous. This type of situation would need to be extremely well-controlled.

McNaughton added that CMER barely has the ability to review internal documents, so adding this to the plate may cause more delay. Risenhoover said that studies are done based on a set of circumstances they were designed to address and when they are taken out of context, it discredits the science. CMER needs to make sure that science is used appropriately here if it is considered. Mendoza agreed with Risenhoover. Mendoza said that the literature review phase should capture most outside science that is available at the time; additional work that is done during the study that relates should also be used. Jackson said we all have different experiences with outside research and sometimes the outside research keeps coming back and people keep trying to use it even when CMER has determined that it is not useful to the studies CMER is conducting.

Fransen said the approach Pleus outlines is a bottom-up approach initiating with the SAG rather than a top down proposal from FFR Policy. Peterson said it is more time consuming and difficult to deal with this after it has been through Policy; if we ignore

work that augments the adaptive management process, people can go directly to the FPB. Running it through the process would be helpful. Mendoza reminded CMER that FFR Policy already has a heads up on this through the CMER framework document and will consider all relevant science. CMER must answer this question when the study is submitted to Policy for consideration (it is question 5).

**CMER Consensus:** CMER will review the document and comment to Pleus. The issue will be discussed again at the November CMER meeting. ([apleus@nwifc.gov](mailto:apleus@nwifc.gov)).

---

**CMER Monthly Report to Policy:** Martin said that last month CMER updated Policy on a number of items but requested no guidance. There is a DFC workshop scheduled for November 4<sup>th</sup> in the afternoon. Items for the CMER report in November are as follows:

- Exploring the growth and yield model under DFC was suggested as a topic for FFR Policy consideration (this will be part of the DFC presentation).
  - Lacking specifics, Sturhan, McNaughton and Martin will prepare some very general updates.
- 

**SAG Issues:**

- **BTSAG:** Butts passed a flyer that announced the November science session which is focused on bull trout radio tracking. For a copy, please contact Butts at ([sally\\_butts@fws.gov](mailto:sally_butts@fws.gov)).
  - **RSAG:** McConnell said that the hardwood conversion budget estimates to add the small landowner sites are moving forward. There has also been discussion about adding a modeling component to predict water temperature changes. RSAG is working on the technical aspects and a budget for this second component as well. Martin added that there will be a budget ramification that CMER will need to see regarding the addition of these small landowner sites. The technical design of modeling component needs to be reviewed by CMER prior to moving forward to FFR Policy. This directive for adding the small landowner sites came directly from FFR Policy and has given CMER the opportunity to review and possibly revise the study design to incorporate additional information. Hunter said that he is not sure that the data being collected from small landowner sites will inform FFR Policy in the way they want to be informed.
  - **Adaptive Management Science Conference:** Sturhan and Martin have discussed this briefly and SAGs should be thinking about what type of research they would like to highlight at the conference. Please come prepared in November to discuss this issue. The conference will again be held near the end of February. The Tribes have set up a conference for February as well; contact Pleus for details ([apleus@nwifc.org](mailto:apleus@nwifc.org)).
- 

**November Science Topic:** Bull Trout radio tracking.

