

CMER
September 27, 2005
NWIFC Conference Center
Olympia, WA
Minutes

Attendees

Barreca, Jeannette	Ecology
Black, Jenelle	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Butts, Sally	USFWS
Dieu, Julie	Rayonier, UPSAG Co-Chair
Heather Rowton	WFPA, CMER Coordinator
Heide, Peter	WFPA
Hofmann, Lynda	WDFW, SAGE Co-Chair
Hunter, Mark	WDFW
Jackson, Terry	WDFW, BTSAG Co-Chair
MacCracken, Jim	Longview Fibre, LWAG Chair
Martin, Doug	Martin Environmental, CMER Co-Chair
McDonald, Dennis	DNR, Watertyping Project Manager
McNaughton, Geoffrey	DNR, AMPA
Mendoza, Chris	ARC Consultants
Mobbs, Mark	Quinault Indian Nation
Pederson, Pete	Upper Columbia United Tribes
Pleus, Allen	NWIFC
Pucci, Dawn	Suquamish Tribe
Ray, Kris	Colville Confederated Tribes, SAGE Co-Chair
Risenhoover, Ken	Port Blakely Tree Farms
Schuett-Hames, Dave	NWIFC, CMER Staff
Smitch, Curt	Thompson Smitch, Facilitator
Sturhan, Nancy	DNR, CMER Co-Chair

Minutes, Decisions/Tasks Review, General Updates:

CMER Consensus: Minutes from the August CMER meeting were approved as amended.

Decisions and Tasks from August were reviewed as follows:

- Sturhan suggested that coming up with categories for disclaimers, fleshing out the list and running it past CMER again was a good approach.

- CMER Monitoring lands will be discussed during the afternoon science session
- There is a list of unfinished projects available that needs to be continually updated by SAGs working with Sturhan.
- SAGE's Stream Temperature Nomograph Report was retired to the file with comments noted.
- SAGE's request for final approval of the Review of the Available Literature Related to Wood Loading Dynamics in and Around Streams in Eastern Washington Forests was accepted as a final document
- WETSAG's requests for final approval of the Pacific Northwest Forested Wetland Literature Survey Synthesis Paper and Pacific Northwest Forested Wetland Literature Survey Annotated Bibliography as final documents to be posted on the website were approved.
- Rowton agreed to send a request to CMER to find out who is interested in participating in a subgroup working on Intensive Monitoring and who is interested in being kept informed.
- Black was named as the main contact between CMER and the DNR website administrator.

SRC Update: McNaughton said that there is one report in peer review Study Design for Riparian Extensive Monitoring. This review will be a little late as the associate editor backed because he did not feel that CMER was reviewing enough parameters. McNaughton is not happy with the back out but would rather have an editor that supports the study design and is willing to review it. The reviewers who commented on the SAGE LWD Literature review agreed to have their comments posted on the website as long as they remain anonymous.

Budget Update: McNaughton said the FPB approved \$4 million in CMER funding for FY 06. Hitchens has been busy initiating interagency agreements and contracts. There is a new emphasis on performance based management and it will increase the detail needed in the contracts and reports. McNaughton is required to provide a quarterly report to IAC that includes much more detail than was previously required. Spending categories now must be included for each project quarterly. McDonald asked if a template would be sent out and McNaughton said yes a template will be sent.

There was also a glitch in the budget; CMER approved \$30,000 to keep site selection going on the Type N Experimental Buffer project and the \$30,000 has been spent. McNaughton and many in CMER thought this was borrowing against 2006 money, but that was not the case. This error will need to be corrected and short of approaching the FPB for more money, the only way to resolve this is to take it from the Project Development fund. McNaughton said he is also working out a report on project development funds to account for spending under that category. Martin said he does not understand why project development funds are needed at this time when the approved amount of spending for FY 06 was quite large for this project. Martin asked if there is a potential that any of the 06 money will not be used, and if so, can we conserve the project

development funds until they are needed. Another way to proceed is to reimburse the project development fund if the money is not spent.

CMER Consensus: Policy will discuss this issue and will decide whether they want to ask the FPB to approve new funds for this project or take it out of the Project Development funds. After the meeting, the dissenting voters were approached and agreed to allow this expenditure if the issue of how to fund unexpected costs from projects underway will be discussed at Policy. Concerns are regarding using up the project development fund to cover unexpected expenses for projects underway undermining the purpose of the Project Development Fund to support projects getting under way.

Project Status Report: Sturhan distributed a list of ongoing projects and activities scheduled to occur in each quarter. Sturhan said SAGs should review this list and see if it is reflective of activities occurring in each quarter. If errors are identified, please inform Sturhan. Some of the uses for this document are that it makes it easy to tell what the workload is in the future and the types of staffing we need in SAGs and in CMER. The tool will be used for many purposes and must be as accurate as possible. The report will be updated quarterly. Part of the reason for bringing this up now is because CMER is discussing the 2007 workplan and CMER staffing issues. SAGs need to begin thinking about whether there are major changes to their workplan for 2007. If money will be spent on new projects, or ongoing projects, CMER needs to know that to complete the workplan.

Assignments: The tracking form needs to be updated by SAGs by next month for the CMER meeting. Sturhan said that she has a schedule for completing the CMER workplan that she will forward to CMER for review along with the tracking form distributed today. Ideas for the types of projects that could initiate in 2007 are also needed.

Document Issues: Sturhan said document issues that have been coming up include disclaimers, document classification, unfinished projects, and documents residing in SAGs.

Disclaimers: Jackson distributed a proposal for disclaimers language to CMER earlier this month. Jackson said she went through publications to review disclaimers and recommended that CMER work on disclaimers using these examples. It may be that different reports require different types of disclaimers. Jackson was providing examples of disclaimers that would cover each type of report that CMER generates. Some of CMER's problems are that there is agreement that a document should be a CMER document but individuals have concerns with parts of the document. Every piece of the reports does not need to be endorsed by each participant fully, but CMER needs to be able to say the document is scientifically credible. Dieu said we could be clear this is a consensus based process and that consensus means everyone can live with the publication, not that everyone fully endorses the report. Heide said CMER has the option

to ignore what the peer reviewers said or decide to do something else. The ultimate approval is CMER, Policy and then the Forest Practices Board. CMER needs to decide whether the science is good or not. Martin said a generic disclaimer statement that never changes would be best.

Pleus said that this discussion initiated because when a contractor drafts a report, CMER does not have the authority to make the contractor incorporate CMER change requests. However, in other situations it is more about describing our consensus process. McNaughton said he has mentioned consent versus consensus before. Consent with disclaimer is different than consensus. Pleus said one generic statement will not cover all the various issues CMER may have with any given report. Black suggested that when something is contracted out, the contractor not be allowed to draw conclusions; conclusions are drawn and drafted by CMER. Sturhan added that some of these issues are a result of the way things are stated. Pucci suggested that each report comes with a disclaimer as agreed to by the SAG and incorporating Jackson's recommendations. Martin said we cannot have unique disclaimers for each report; CMER either endorses the study or it does not and a generic disclaimer provides cover for any agency that needs it. Schuett-Hames suggested that the disclaimer state CMER agrees the science is sound but does not necessarily agree with the way the author has interpreted the data. Smith asked if the discussion of interpretation could be more explicit for each document. Ray stated that SAGE does have a disclaimer they adopted for one of their final reports. Mendoza said that if you use the PSM, there should be a framework in place for a difference of interpretation on a work product; if this is not resolved at the SAG level, CMER takes it over. This functions the same way at the SRC level. Something on the generic end could reference the PSM.

Assignment: Work will continue on this issue. Suggestions will be sent to Schuett-Hames and Jackson and they will discuss the comments and propose something for a decision at the October CMER meeting.

Document Classification Proposal: Martin distributed a proposal for document classification to CMER and has requested comment several times from CMER on this proposal. A revised document was distributed again for discussion at today's CMER meeting. Martin said the document classification proposal has been further refined and the guiding principle was to simplify what each document informs. Decisions will be made based on these documents and the purpose statement explains this. This classification proposal also explains that the documents are written for scientists and the scientific community, not the lay audience. A standard statement explaining the type of documents someone is reading is included in the classification proposal.

Jackson said she likes the proposal but is concerned with the title of the effectiveness report and suggested a different title explaining this document (i.e. adaptive management technical report). Barreca asked where a rule tool or additional information requested by Policy would fit in. Martin said it would fit into one of the classification categories depending on what it was. Barreca asked if an exception could be made for a rule tool;

Dieu suggested this is a project development report. Barreca asked if the project is a way to implement FFR, where would that fall. Martin said under category one. Butts said on the exploratory reports, we should be clear that these may change category depending on results. Dieu said the line about not including analysis or interpretation in category one is confusing; it should say may include a summary of data and results and recommendations for future research.

Pleus said he sees this as a way of describing the type of report or study you are doing and there numerous discrepancies. His other concern is that in the AM Board manual, effectiveness and validation are key questions, and asked if we are trying to link back to answering key questions for adaptive management. How this fits into the higher structure is important. Heide said under exploratory reports, he would remove “adaptive management” from the sentence and would remove the sentence beginning, “these reports may include...” Removing this sentence reduces the tension of the data. CMER should not discuss whether any of these reports require independent review; we should simply state whether it has had independent review. Black agreed with Heide on the data and the main difference seems to be the intent.

Assignment: Martin will incorporate comments made today and will take additional comments from anyone until two weeks before the next CMER meeting. At the October meeting, we will attempt to make a decision on this document.

CMER Unfinished Documents: Many documents are getting completed and work will continue on this. Sturhan will continue working with SAGs on this issue.

CMER Website Update

Jenelle Black stated that the project manager is ready to receive comments and recommendations on the overall reorganization of website. They will also consider other options and possibilities for website design, appearance, and function. CMER Study descriptions should be posted on the site. The site will link CMER studies to Word documents via PDF file. Black will extract the SAG study descriptions from the latest CMER Workplan unless otherwise contacted by the project manager. Long-term website planning should consider developing a new CMER website that references other related websites like DNR and Ecology websites. CMER should provide specific comments on what they would like to see on the website.

Geoff McNaughton stated that CMER documents are starting to pile up and we may want to split up reports by pre- versus post-forests and fish agreement. Black suggested separating the reports up by category as proposed in Doug Martin’s Draft document on document classification. Other considerations include Password protection and how that would be managed from an administrative standpoint. Comments and suggestions should go directly to Black. Jenelle suggested the utility of the website will extend to non-CMER users like Counties, PUDs, Contractors, etc.

Dave Schuett-Hames said website maintenance issues will need to be addressed to insure the site is updated regularly. Black said that Password protection issues would play a large administrative role in maintenance.

Heide suggested that someone be assigned to the task of updating the website. Black suggested that project updates from SAGs could be passed on to CMER at monthly meetings for website update purposes. Generic SAG updates would serve this purpose and should not increase the workload of the project manager.

Pleus suggested that the project descriptions be updated directly from the CMER workplan which would encourage the development of a more detailed and refined workplan. Pleus said he is unsure who would benefit from any more detail than what is provided in the CMER workplan. Black stated that potential contractors may benefit from this level of detail when considering whether or not to pursue a CMER project. Other non-CMER users may or may not need this level of detail.

Sturhan suggested that Black bring a more detailed proposal for the website prior to next month's CMER meeting and that CMER members review what is posted on the website. Black will be pulling project descriptions from the CMER Workplan unless she is asked to post something else by project managers before next month.

Intensive Monitoring Update and CMER Science Topic:

Martin suggested that CMER, and other interested cooperators, meet sometime in October to focus on the Intensive Monitoring Project scoping process. Martin will send additional pertinent information on scoping related to suspended sediment literature. This information must be reviewed prior to the meeting. Martin suggested that only two suspended sediment studies are pertinent to the IMP.

October Science Topic: The CMER October science session will be used to further scope the IMP study. Nancy stated that we need to build on the current studies in the literature and try to avoid recreating the wheel. Please read the materials Doug has been sending out so that we can have an informed discussion about what is already available from intensive-type studies and studies that we might use as models.

SAG Requests:

LWAG requested CMER approval of submission of the Seeps Methods Manuscript for publication in the *Journal of Applied Ecology*. This approach will result in a peer review of equal or greater quality than an SRC review, not cost CMER any money, and result in a CMER funded project appearing in a high quality international journal. McNaughton suggested that Policy will need to consider how to deal with CMER research that will be submitted for publication. Allen Pleus stated there is a critical distinction between the two types of peer review (SRC versus Journal peer review) and that by using a non-

CMER peer review we are side-stepping the SRC review process and final CMER review of the document; this will limit the ability of CMER to provide its usual review process according to PSM. Jackson asked if there is contract language that restricts the ability of the author to take ownership of the document.

Mark Hunter asked “What if the journal peer review takes us down a different pathway than the CMER / SRC pathway?” Mark recommended that the journal review at a minimum be required to meet the same standard as the CMER SRC process. Smith stated this discussion is very complex with broad implications for Policy and therefore, needs to be considered by Policy. Pucci proposed to delay the decision on outside SRC peer review until next month after Policy considers the subject.

Dieu recommended this sort of article be routed to the Journal due to the non-controversial nature of the material. More controversial studies may need further consideration. CMER should maintain the right to have first publication. MacCracken stated the CMER process should facilitate publication in referred journals, not prohibit it. CMER should not be in the business of telling a scientist what they can and cannot publish. Risenhoover stated the purpose of CMER is to evaluate the quality of CMER science, not to make policy decisions about how that information should be used. They are two separate issues.

Pucci suggested that Policy provide guidance on when it is appropriate for CMER members to go outside the CMER SRC process and use a peer reviewed journal process for the purpose of publication. Black stated that “double publication” may be a problem for CMER. Pleus stated that outside peer review (non SRC) violates the process of CMER reviewing the final document thereby leaving the journal article authors with final authority of deciding whether there should be a required level of scientific credibility. MacCracken suggested that CMER can be forwarded copies of the reviews solicited by the journal as well as the authors response to those reviews and thoroughly track the process, just as CMER does with SRC reviews. Pleus suggested that such documents first go through the CMER SRC process then consider journal review.

Pucci stated that there may be a time delay and a cost difference associated with a journal review and asked where CMER loses control of the document results. Black asked if the LWAG document up for consideration is a subsection of a larger CMER report.

Butts suggested that at the next policy meeting CMER ask Policy for their opinion on publication outside of the CMER process. CMER should not over-predict how each individual document may be handled under SRC. She asked which Journal is requesting publication. CMER should reserve the right for official final review and final posting on the website. Risenhoover suggested the Publisher could provide access to the CMER website. Curt Smith pointed out that you cannot charge to access CMER reports via a Journal articles. MacCracken stated that contacting the authors and requesting a reprint (free of charge) is an alternative to purchasing an article on-line from the journals web site. Heide stated that CMER should have the authority to decide which articles get journal reviewed or not.

Smitch suggested that CMER may be substituting Journal review for SRC review and that CMER may need to clarify the report type with the categorization document proposed at the meeting.

CMER Consensus: CMER decided that Policy should consider the issues related to publication of CMER funded projects in referred journals given the implications for CMER ownership and how that research may potentially be used to inform Policy's decision making process.

Pleus suggested that McNaughton explore options for different CMER studies and the implications for Policy. The LWAG request would not go through SRC regardless of outside peer review. Exploratory documents may be OK since they do not usually go through SRC review anyway. There should be different considerations for different categories of CMER research. Effectiveness projects would be different from exploratory projects. If CMER is OK with LWAG's request then finalize and move on.

CMER Consensus: CMER agrees that in this specific case the LWAG document is a final document, having been previously reviewed by at least 2 CMER members, and therefore it is appropriate for journal review. The LWAG report was reviewed by Sturhan, Heide, Hunter, Pederson, Risenhoover, MacCracken, and Mendoza.

CMER Consensus: It was agreed that further discussion on this issue should be tabled until next month so that we could move on with the agenda.

ISAG requested \$31,056 be added for the Seasonal variability study. The Contractor underestimated the extent of the field work needed to complete the study. RSAG asked the Contractor to divulge the details of the specific expenditures. This would take \$9,000 out of CMER developmental funds. Mendoza stated that ISAG had reviewed the details of the contractor's add-ons and agreed that some were unreasonable. ISAG then made a counter offer based on those reductions.

CMER Consensus: The Request for \$31,056 was accepted by CMER.

SAG Issues

CMER Staffing: Schuett-Hames stated that more CMER staff may be needed to address the short and long-term needs of SAGs. Palmquist is leaving and Tribal FFR staff may be losing funding for Steve McConnell, chair of RSAG and project manager for the hardwood Conversion study. A Proposal to add a new CMER staff silviculturalist position with funding being supplied through the current FPB approved CMER FY06 work plan budget was presented by Dave. To enhance CMER's capability to implement riparian vegetation research and monitoring projects.

Proposal summary, enhancing CMER's in-house capacity for riparian research and monitoring using a coordinated riparian sampling team approach:

1. Save CMER money – see proposal details
2. Increase CMER's efficiency – see proposal details.
3. Increase quality of work – see proposal details.

Schuett-Hames would like CMER and Policy to provide comments and feedback on the proposals as they address short and long-term staffing issues to support the FFR AM process. Schuett-Hames stated that if we do not have the staff to complete all the SAG projects listed in the proposal then project priorities will have to be designated. Smith posed the question that without federal money how are agencies and Tribes going to implement the AMP?

Schuett-Hames suggested that the money for staffing could come from existing project funds already allocated to CMER projects. Having CMER staff do the work would save increased project costs normally associated with contractors. Sturhan stated this discussion should be part of a larger discussion at the Policy level with CMER input.

ISAG: McDonald stated that ISAG has tabled the westside seasonal variability issue pending further discussion at ISAG on study design and methods. This will not interfere with the time table to get the project under way.

Sturhan and McNaughton will take the following issues to Policy next week:

1. The need for flexibility in funding for long-term, complex projects; use of the Project Development Fund
2. Publication peer review, CMER independent scientific peer review, publication of CMER studies outside CMER, access to CMER publications
3. We are working on document categories and disclaimer statements to help folks reach agreement to finalize documents despite minor wording or interpretation disagreements
4. CMER staff – Bob Palmquist retirement, replacement; proposal to add silviculturist
5. Web site update
6. Project status report, ISAG request \$9K over original budgeted amount; ISAG tabled west side seasonal variability; work plan schedule
7. October CMER science session will be on Intensive Watershed scoping, led by Doug Martin

Jeannette Barreca asked for review of the Hardwood Conversion study temperature modeling component.

CMER Consensus: Reviewers will be Doug Martin, Sally Butts and Mark Hunter.

Break for lunch until Afternoon Science session. Nancy will summarize the September Site Selection Science Session notes and Heather will send out along with the presentations and handouts.