

CMER
August 24, 2004
NWIFC Conference Center
Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Butts, Sally	USFWS, BTSAG co-chair
Hayes, Marc	WDFW
Heide, Pete	WFPA
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE co-chair
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG co-chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER co-chair
McConnell, Steve	NWIFC, RSAG co-chair
McDonald, Dennis	DNR, Watertyping Project Manager
McNaughton, Geoff	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Palmquist, Bob	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Pavel, Joseph	NWIFC
Peterson, Pete	UCUT
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Quinn, Timothy	WDFW, CMER co-chair
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE co-chair
Roorbach, Ash	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Rowton, Heather	WFPA
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

June and July CMER minutes were approved as amended.

Review of decisions and tasks

- The ISAG Watertyping Model Field Validation Study Design – approach and procedures was approved with a request for modifications to the course of action to add more detail.
- CMER review procedures were approved with a request for clarification that the review is to be conducted pre and post SRC.
- The LWAG small mammal dissections request was not approved and a conference call was suggested to attempt to resolve the disputes.
Update: available freezer space has been found to store the mammals giving the group more time to resolve the dispute. The cost estimate for moving the animals

is \$1,500; project development funds have been approved for moving the animals. Peterson said that, it could be resolved in writing rather than face-to-face.

Action: LWAG will draft a document stating how the study will inform CMER regarding habitat quality and the associated landscape and will document how the study relates to the CMER workplan.

- The CMER workplan and budget were approved as submitted to FFR Policy.
-

SAG Requests

- **ISAG:** Water Typing Model Field Validation Study Design – Approach and Procedures. The course of action has additional detail as requested by CMER. McDonald explained changes to the group. McNaughton asked whether this course of action will be submitted to the SRC as documentation of how SRC comments will be addressed. (SRC continues to ask how their comments are being addressed on the various reviews they have conducted.) Martin clarified that the course of action is to become part of the record and CMER has already agreed to this. A one paragraph introduction will be added to explain what the course of action is designed to do (i.e. address SRC comments). Pavel suggested that CMER formalize this procedure in the procedures manual and provide this information to the SRC so they know that CMER will respond to their comments and how that response will be delivered. CMER should also clarify that the comments from the editor are generally what CMER addresses. This course of action has also been discussed at FFR policy to ensure they are aware of the action ISAG is taking.

CMER Consensus: This request was approved as submitted. McNaughton agreed to draft the cover paragraph and submit the course of action to the SRC; the CMER co-chairs will review this paragraph.

- **ISAG:** Response to SRC Review of Water Type Validation Study Plan. This request is for authorization of \$9,000 to hire a contractor to address comments from SRC. McDonald said that, in the future, other SAGs should budget funding for response to SRC review should that be necessary. ISAG is seeking additional funding through the project development fund for SRC response at this time. Mendoza added that, when a contractor does the study design, they are the most qualified to respond to the SRC review comments. Quinn agreed and said that future study design proposals should include this aspect in the original contract. This will be added to the Protocols and Standards Manual along with other important aspects of contract management. A suggestion was made that this money be payable to the contractor upon SRC and CMER approval of the study design. there was discussion about this issue and it was determined that there is no way to anticipate what CMER will do when the study design comes back so this money covers only the revisions in the study design that are requested by ISAG.
CMER Consensus: this request was approved as submitted.

- **PSMWG:** this request is for an additional \$5,735 in project development funds to allow the contractor for the Protocols and Manual to complete a third round of editing on the document and provide two CMER training workshops prior to CMER approval of the manual. The first workshop could be as soon as September 28th, the next regular CMER meeting. There was concern that the amount of money being spent on this manual is significant and people have not had a chance to review the manual as drafted to date since June 2003.
CMER Consensus: this request was approved as submitted.
-

Budget Update: McNaughton said the budget sheet has not changed much this time. Some of the older budget estimates will change and will result in an additional carryover.

Workplan and Budget Approval Update: McNaughton said the CMER budget and workplan has been approved by CMER and Policy. The FPB does have a copy of the workplan and budget but the August meeting was cancelled so FPB approval is still forthcoming. It is unclear whether the FPB will meet before November.

Project Management Proposal: McNaughton said that a \$6 million budget has been approved by CMER and Policy for 2005. There are 34 projects on that list scheduled to be in progress or beginning this fiscal year. This indicates a strong need for project management. There have been issues with ongoing projects to date and a stronger focus on project management at the CMER staff level may help with this. If CMER cannot identify a project manager for each project, paid project managers will be necessary. CMER may need to look at increasing funding for CMER staff and increasing the emphasis on project management to accommodate these increased project management needs.

There were three distributions accompanying this discussion item. One of those distributions was not e-mailed prior to the meeting and outlines the responsibilities of a project manager; Martin reviewed this document with the group. That document is attached to these minutes.

Discussion then ensued. Quinn said that there are many ways to manage projects and this proposal is not designed to preclude any type of project management. The proposal simply states the primary need for a project manager for each individual project. Barreca asked if co-managers would be appropriate. Quinn said that co-management is fine but one person should ultimately be responsible for project management. Heide pointed out these are state contracts and the responsible party is McNaughton and this is a tremendous load for one person to take. There are legal issues associated with fiscal management and McNaughton needs to be confident that a project manager is managing these individual projects in a fiscally responsible way.

Pleus said that we need this for two reasons: 1) technical tasks and 2) communication. Knowing who to talk to if there are questions is critical to timely completion of projects. Hunter asked if there are legal issues associated with having the PI and project manager be the same person; the general response was no, there are no issues with that arrangement. Quinn said that having the PI be different than the project manager would be preferred. Martin supported one project manager in the future for each project; not co-managers. Butts said that one project manager works well for small and moderate projects, but for bigger projects, more than one person will be needed or the person will need to be paid. She also said that you can set up a system where there is one primary contact person who is then free to manage the project with the help of others if they need too. Mendoza said that the SAGs are taking the brunt of this duty at this time and it works well in many cases. The problem arises when there are not people to take on these responsibilities. Roorbach suggested that the project management aspects need to be defined during the study design; if it is a cost item, it should be identified there.

Martin said that another part of this proposal is to engage CMER staff as project managers and that should be their primary role. He added that there is one empty staff position at CMER now that could be filled with a person who would serve in a project management role. Roorbach asked, for those studies that are not literature reviews, how much field visitation and QA/QC will be the responsibility of the project manager. Martin said that it will depend on the specific project and suggested adding the QC component on the list. Pleus suggested that the key reason to identify one project manager needs to be better defined; they are not responsible for all the tasks on the list but are responsible for ensuring that they are done. Sturhan said that project managers have always been important to CMER. She also said that there are not many people who have the time commitments available to be project managers; many volunteers do not have specific time allocated to CMER. Sturhan also noted that the UW civil engineering school is offering a course in project management in Lacey in October and CMER members should consider attending; Sturhan will forward the announcement to CMER.

Assignment: CMER members and SAGs are asked to review the proposal and the list of project managers and submit comments to Rowton by September 17th. Rowton will forward the project manager responsibilities to CMER. CMER will discuss this proposal again in September.

CMER Monthly Report to Policy: Martin said that the CMER monthly report to policy last month included an update on the water typing validation study. Policy indicated that they would not move ahead with appointing a new CMER co-chair without a third candidate.

CMER agreed to the following statement for policy: a third candidate cannot be located and we strongly suggest that Policy move forward to select a new CMER co-chair through the nomination committee.

September CMER monthly report to Policy:

- Forward statement from CMER regarding appointing a new CMER co-chair.
 - Discuss DFC proposed course of action. The six questions are ready to be answered for this study. Policy will then be asked for a decision. Policy needs to understand the implications of gathering additional data as suggested by the SRC review. Policy guidance is needed before a technical approach can be decided upon by RSAG and CMER. Representatives from RSAG will be available at the Policy meeting to answer these questions. McConnell said he would forward a draft to CMER by Thursday so they can brief policy representatives.
 - Project management will be mentioned as a next up in the pipe line.
-

SRC Update: McNaughton reported that the Scientific Review Committee review of the CMER PIP report had come back just last week, and was distributed to the report authors and UPSAG. UPSAG is currently reviewing the comments.

The interactive portion of the SRC review for the roads basin-scale effectiveness monitoring study design is scheduled for this Friday August 27. UPSAG will participate with SRC reviewers via teleconference to discuss early first-look SRC concerns.

SAG Issues

- UPSAG: Jeffery Clark is having medical problems and will not be able to continue as UPSAG co-chair for an undetermined amount of time.
 - BTSAG: Boise will be selling its lands soon, and BTSAG is concerned that Steve Toth (funded by Boise) will not be able to continue his project management duties for the Bull Trout Overlay project after this autumn. BTSAG will bring CMER a proposal for continued project management.
 - BTSAG: A field trip is scheduled for September 16 to visit various study sites in eastern Washington. All are invited.
 - SAGE: The Disturbance Regimes literature review only has 2 of the 3 CMER reviews back despite having taken 2 ½ months so far. A similar review will be requested for the LWD literature review. SAGE will need a faster review for this document since it is much more time sensitive. Discussion followed about what to do when reviews are late, whether to go ahead and send to SRC or wait for the third. CMER decided to maintain the need for 3 reviews, and to add this task to the list of project manager responsibilities.
 - SAGE: CMER and SAG comments on contractor products may change the documents and conclusions enough that authorship issues may arise if the original authors disagree. CMER recommended that unresolved issues be included as an appendix to the document.
 - RSAG: A second co-chair is still needed, with no willing candidates stepping forward.
 - RSAG: Discussion concerned the use of site class maps for DFC determinations.
-

Science Topic for Next Meeting: Protocols & Standards manual was proposed, but today's afternoon session may provide a better topic for the next CMER meeting.

Doug Martin distributed a recent opinion article about the importance of separation of science and policy.

Afternoon Session:

Hardwood Conversion Study: McConnell presented an update on the hardwood conversion study via PowerPoint. For copies of the presentation, please contact Steve McConnell at 360-438-1180.

Intensive Monitoring Prioritization: Ehinger presented information on the current status of intensive monitoring via PowerPoint. For a copy of the presentation, please contact Bill Ehinger with Ecology at 360-407-6416.

CMER discussion of the most important inputs/issues for intensive monitoring ensued. There was discussion that CMER should focus on 2-3 key issues with the potential to affect forest practices rules and move forward. Schuett-Hames distributed a document outlining potential intensive monitoring projects. CMER now needs to spend some time and decide what the most important projects are.

Assignment: Rowton will resend the Intensive monitoring scoping report that Schuett-Hames sent out in early June. CMER is asked to review the list and come prepared to discuss and prioritize the top three needs of CMER based on the goals of Forests and Fish.

The next CMER science session will focus on the discussion and prioritization of intensive monitoring for CMER.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.