

PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN

Defining default physical criteria (DPC) for fish-bearing streams in forested landscapes in Washington State

June 23, 2026

PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN OVERVIEW

The Project Management Plan breaks down project work into logical steps to help provide a framework to efficiently allocate resources, reliably estimate project costs, and help guide schedule, budget development and project scope. Previously in the CMER Protocols and Standards manual (PSM), this document was titled an implementation plan. The Project Management Plan documents and tracks the progress of a CMER project through its various stages. The contents of the Project Management Plan will vary depending on the type and complexity of the project. The Project Team is the primary audience for the Project Management Plan; however, SAG/CMER members are encouraged to provide feedback on the plan.

OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Instream Scientific Advisory Group (ISAG)

BACKGROUND

In 2001, the Washington State Forest Practices Board (Board) approved a comprehensive set of new forest practice rules based on the Forest and Fish Report (FFR). One of the goals of these rules is to protect water quality, including aquatic life, in streams on non-federal forest lands in Washington State. In concurrence with the approval of the FFR, the Board adopted a Forest Practices Adaptive Management Program (AMP). The purpose of the Forest Practices AMP is to “provide science-based recommendations and technical information to assist the Board in determining if and when it is necessary or advisable to adjust rules and guidance for aquatic resources to achieve resource goals and objectives”. To provide the science needed to support adaptive management, the Board established the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research (CMER) Committee which has been tasked with performing research in support of the AMP.

In 2016, a Board-designated science panel produced a rough outline for a potential DPC study design, with the consideration of combining it with the Potential Habitat Breaks (PHB) study. ISAG reviewed and provided comments on the draft, however, no final/approved study design was produced. The Board then created a special Water Typing Subcommittee to provide recommendations on next steps. Per recommendation of the Water Typing Subcommittee, in November 2019 the Board recommended that CMER develop a “Default Physicals Criteria” study design. CMER then voted that ISAG should have the lead in responding to this Board motion. ISAG presented the Board with a strategy outline to develop water typing study designs in May 2020, and initiated work on revising the PHB study design. Following CMER and ISPR approval of the PHB study design in May 2023, ISAG initiated work on the Default Physical Criteria (DPC) study design. The DPC study design was approved by CMER and ISPR in May

2025. The PHB and DPC studies will use data from the same field sites but use different analyses to answer the questions specific to each.

In 2025, the Board adopted a permanent water typing rule, with an effective date of March 1, 2026. The existing default physical characteristics from the interim rules were not changed as part of this rule revision. The results of this study will inform the AMP participants regarding the performance of the current and possible alternative DPC.

PROJECT MILESTONES AND TASKS

		Estimated Dates of Completion						
Project Milestones	Responsible Party	FY24	FY25	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY29	FY30
Study Development								
Charter – TFW Policy approved	Project Team	Sep-23*						
Study design – ISAG approved	Project Team		Dec-24*					
Study design – CMER approved	Project Team		Dec-24*					
Study design – ISPR approved	Project Team		May-25*					
Field Implementation								
RFQQ for field implementation	Project Manager		Sep-24*					
Site Selection and Field Reconnaissance	Project Team/ Contractor		Mar-26*					
Data Collection	Contractor		Dec-27					
QA/QC	Contractor		Jan-28					
Data Analysis and Reporting								
Data analysis	PI/Contractor		Apr-28					
Final Report – ISAG approved	PI/Contractor						Jan-29	
Final Report – CMER approved	PI/Contractor						Jan-29	
Final Report – ISPR approved	PI/Contractor						Jun-29	
6 Questions Document	PI/Project Team							Sep-29
Board delivery	AMPA							Nov-29
Publication to DNR and CMER Websites	Project Manager							Nov-29
Written and verbal updates to the Board and CMER	PI/Project Manager	As needed						

*Actual dates

PROJECT DELIVERABLES

Deliverable	Responsible Team Member	Completion Date (Actual* or Estimated)
Project Charter	PM	September 2023*
Final Approved Study Design	PT	May 2025*
Prospective 6 Questions	PT	May 2025*
Update Project Management Plan	PM	June 2026
Site Selection and Field Reconnaissance	PM, CMER Scientist, PI	March 2026*
Field Data Collection	PI	March 2025-December 2027
Field Protocol Manual and Quality Assurance Plan	PI	April 2025* Updated: April 2026* Updated annually, as needed
Acquire Sampling Permits	PI	Acquired annual prior to spring sampling
Annual Summary Report	PI	March 2025* Annually in February
Annual DPC Analysis	PI	Annually in April
Draft Final Report to Project Team	PI	May 2028
Incorporate PT Edits and Provide Final Report for CMER/ISAG Review	PI	October 2028
Incorporate CMER/ISAG Edits and Provide Final Report for ISPR	PI	January 2029
Incorporate ISPR Edits and Provide Final Report for Final CMER Approval	PI	June 2029
Final 6 Questions	PI	September 2029

*Actual dates

PROJECT TEAM MEMBERS

Name, Title, Affiliation, Contact Info	Roles and Responsibilities
Project Manager: • Anna Toledo anna.toledo@dnr.wa.gov	• Monitors project activities and the performance of the Project Team. • Communicates progress, problems, and problem resolution to the Adaptive Management Program Supervisory Project Manager and Administrator (AMPA), and CMER. • Works with ISAG/CMER, and Project Team to help develop Project Charters and Project Management Plans, and keep them updated as needed over time. • Works with ISAG, CMER, and Project Team (including PI, contractors, and other Team members) to resolve problems and build consensus.

	• Works with PI and Project Team members to develop interim and final reports. • Ensures communication between all team members is clear, concise, and consistent. • Maintains contact and processes access agreements, once site access is granted. • Ensures coordination between ISAG/CMER, Project Team and landowners. • Coordinates all technical reviews and responses in a timely fashion. • Facilitates archiving of all data and documents. • Works with PI to manage documents on SharePoint Online. • Works with the AMPA, ISAG/CMER, and Project Team to develop and review proposals, RFPs or RFQs, review contractor proposals, monitor contract performance, and provide input on budgeting, schedule, scope changes, and contract amendments. • Sees that contract provisions are followed. • Provides direction and support to the Project Team to achieve clear and specific scopes of work, schedules, and budgets within approved contracts. • Communicates and/or authorizes communication with all project-related contractors. • Maintains sole responsibility for all aspects of project management even if other individuals are completing or helping complete parts of the project.
Principal Investigator(s): Phil Roni, Cramer Fish Sciences phil.roni@fishsciences.net	• Oversees the technical aspects of the project including protocol development and refinement, site selection, data collection, analysis, and reporting. • Works with PM and field manager in overseeing data collection by field crew. • Oversees and conducts data analysis and QA/QC of data provided by field staff. • Leads in developing, writing, and preparation of the final report. • Serves as lead author of findings report. • Responds to comments by reviewers of reports. • Prepares quarterly summary and progress reports of project status, as needed. • Presents technical findings to ISAG, CMER, TFW Policy, and the Board as necessary. • Participates as a member of the project team. • Communicates concerns or issues that arise with PM. • Attends ISAG and Project Team Meetings.
Project Team members: • Douglas Martin doug@martinenv.com • Christopher Mendoza	• Develop project documents, including study designs and site selection and data collection document. • Provide expertise as necessary for successful completion of project.

cmendoza2@comcast.net • John Heimborg John.Heimborg@dfw.wa.gov • Jenelle Black jblack@nwifc.org • Jason Walter Jason.Walter@weyerhaeuser.com • Emma Greenwood emma.greenwood@spokanetribe.com • Mark Meleason consultmeleason@outlook.com	• Assist PI for addressing technical and scientific questions/issues. • Assist PI with communications, data analyses, and reporting, as needed. • Provide timely review and constructive feedback on project documents and the final report. • Participate in completing site selection. • May assist contractor and PI with training of field crews. • Help implement QA/QC protocol. • Work with PI and PM to develop contract work scopes and review/select contract bidders. • Attend Project Team and ISAG meetings.
Contracted Field Manager: Jason Shaffer, Cramer Fish Sciences Jason.Shaffer@fishsciences.net	• Works with PI to coordinate field activities. • Provides primary oversight of field crew schedules, logistics, and needs. • Works with PI to provide training to field crews. • Communicates implementation status, changes, and needs to PI and PM. • Provides expertise as necessary for successful completion of project. • Provides timely review and constructive feedback on project documents and the final report. • Participates in Project Team meetings, as needed.
Contracted Field Crews: Cramer Fish Sciences	• Collect and QA/QC field data. • Maintain responsibility for field gear and equipment. • Transmit data to Field Manager and PI according to designated schedule.
Contracted Technical Lead Staff: Cramer Fish Sciences	• In coordination with the PI, oversees and conducts QA/QC of data provided by field staff. • Conducts project data summaries and analyses. • Assists PI with reporting. Helps prepare interim and final reports. • Responds to comments by reviewers of reports. • Creates spatial and tabular databases for all project data. • Participates in project meetings and conference calls, as needed.

PROJECT CONSTRAINTS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Schedule constraints:

- The DPC project timeline may be influenced by scheduling and deliverable milestones of other ISAG/AMP projects.
- The PM will revisit the project timeline with the Project Team at least one time per month. Changes to the timeline will be made in consensus. The PM will communicate any changes to the timeline to AMP within one week.
- Equipment procurement and replacement must occur in a timely manner to prevent any delays in field work. Equipment should be available for crew field training.

- There are inter- and intra-annual constraints on site visits. Sampling must occur at a frequency and timing as described in the final study design.

Budget constraints:

- The current project budget (below) is in-part, based on the assumptions from the Science Panel version of the study design and pilot study, and reflects the budget from the SOW determined through contract negotiations with the contractor selected for implementation.
- Project expenditures will be constrained to the final legislature-approved budget.
 - Expenditures above the project budget will require a request for additional funds.

Human resource constraints:

- The Project Team will support implementation of the study design and other deliverables (primarily) using resources within AMP. Roles are defined in the Project Team table above.
 - Changes to the Project Team may impact project development, execution, and reporting.
- A contractor was selected in 2024 for field implementation and reporting. Contract staff include a PI, lead field staff, field technicians, as well as technical staff to assist with oversight, data analysis and reporting.
 - The PI, lead field staff, and technical leads, will provide oversight for field crew training and data collection effort, ensuring QA/QC protocols are followed.
- The PM will facilitate successful execution of contracts.

Resource constraints:

Technical, study site, and equipment/supply constraints will be most applicable to the implementation phase of the DPC study.

- Field crews will require rigorous training in field protocols and equipment, including e-fishing, data entry on tablets, and stream measurements.
- Equipment and supplies will need to be procured within budget constraints. Replacement of lost or damaged equipment must occur in a timely manner to avoid project delays.
- Sites will be screened according to criteria from the study design. Availability of these sites may be constrained by land ownership, landowner willingness, and accessibility by road, accessibility by season, and/or any changes in accessibility.

Project assumptions:

Project assumptions largely reflect schedule, budget, human resource, and resource constraints.

Assumption	Risk	Mitigation
The Water Typing Strategy serves as a proxy for a scoping document.	1. Changes to scope without oversight committee approval violate PSM guidelines. 2. Changes to scope without adequate planning can adversely affect project outcomes.	1. Project Team will regularly revisit core objectives, timelines, and budgets to avoid “scope creep”. 2. Necessary changes to scope will be identified as soon as possible. 3. Changes to scope will be brought to CMER and the Board for approval.
Milestones and deliverables will follow the project timeline.	1. Deviations may affect timelines and budgets of other AMP projects. 2. Data quality (collection and management) might suffer in a rush to complete field work.	1. PM, in coordination with the Project Team, monitors timeline on a weekly basis and promptly communicate changes to SAG, CMER, and AMP. 2. Assess if additional crews would be necessary to achieve sample size goals. 3. Request CFS consider refilling CFS Program Manager position. 4. Last resort: Consider a supplemental contract and funding to hire additional field teams.
Project Team members will reach consensus on deliverables.	Non-consensus will delay study implementation or lead to termination of project within the SAG.	Project Team members will identify source of non-consensus and bring the issue to the SAG.
Project Team members will stay consistent throughout the project.	Project Team member turnover may result in inefficiencies to work flow. Loss of Project Team members increases workload for remaining members and may lead to delays.	1. Ensure Project Team time commitment is clear to all members. 2. Anticipate and communicate changes to Project Team in a timely manner.
The project will be developed with the full extent of expertise needed to complete all deliverables.	Knowledge gaps may produce deficiencies in the study implementation and reporting.	1. Identify necessary expertise. 2. Project Team may consult with someone within or outside of AMP who has appropriate expertise to bridge any knowledge gaps. 3. Report any assumptions and/or knowledge gaps in deliverables.
Expenses for field implementation will remain at or below the project budget.	Project may be delayed or compromised if budget gap cannot be filled.	1. Be proactive. See <i>Budget Constraints</i>. 2. Make additional funding requests in a timely manner.
There will be a sufficient number of sites available to meet minimum sample size requirements as defined in the study design.	If the minimum number of sites cannot be secured, the statistical power to detect an effect will be reduced.	1. Oversample during the site screening process. 2. If needed, revise and/or re-scope the project to accommodate a smaller sample size, if alignment

Assumption	Risk	Mitigation
		with original questions and objectives is possible. 3. Have a 3rd-party statistician (e.g., WEST) review any suggested changes to sample size and other aspects of project.
Access to sites will not change throughout the study.	Loss of access reduces amount of data collected for analysis.	1. Oversample during the site screening process. 2. Be prepared to use backup sites.
Field technicians will have sufficient skill to ensure consistent data collection among crews and years.	Inconsistent data collection will produce poor-quality data and compromise project.	1. Ensure crews are consistently and centrally-trained. 2. Produce well-defined data collection protocols, forms, and checklists. 3. Ensure robust QA/QC procedures. Identify and rectify inconsistencies in field crews quickly. 4. Implement field audits or shadowing to verify adherence to protocols. 5. Use calibration exercises at regular intervals (not just initial training). 6. Incorporate digital data validation tools (e.g., real-time error checks). 7. Track individual and crew-level performance metrics to identify training needs.

A separate Risk Management Plan will not be developed unless one of these constraints or assumptions occurs or if one is deemed necessary. The process for developing a detailed Risk Management Plan is outlined in section 7.11 of the PSM. A Risk Management Plan identifies potential actions to avoid, reduce, and/or mitigate impacts to a project.

DECISION-MAKING AUTHORITY

The Forest Practice Board (Board) has approval authority over proposed CMER projects, annual work plans, and expenditures. The Board manages the Timber, Fish and Wildlife Policy Committee (Policy), the Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research (CMER) Committee, and the Adaptive Management Program Administrator (AMPA) to assist with the Board's directives. Policy assists the Board by providing guidance to CMER and recommendations on adaptive management issues. CMER is responsible for understanding available scientific information that is applicable to the questions at hand, selecting the best and most relevant information and synthesizing it into reports for Policy and the Board. The AMPA coordinates the flow of information between Policy and CMER according to the Board's directives. Decision-making authority described in this section needs to be consistent with CMER process and ground rules per the Board Manual section 22.

Decisions related to science and/or technical items are the responsibility of the PIs and the Project Team. If needed, decisions for scientific and/or technical items could be expanded to include the SAG and CMER. Final documents will be prepared by the project team and then reviewed and approved by the SAG, CMER, and Independent Scientific Peer Review (ISPR). Although the PM will assist in the facilitation of the discussion and decision making process, the PM will not be directly involved in decisions related to science and/or technical items.

Decisions related to contractual (scope of work, RFQQ, contract process, contractor interaction, etc.) and budgetary items are the responsibility of the PM along with input from the Project Team. Requests for additional funding will be approved by the PM and Project Team and sent to the SAG and CMER for formal approval. Minor budgetary or contractual items will be handled directly by the PM with notification provided to the Project Team. Major budgetary or contractual items will be decided between the PM, Project Team, and AMPA. If needed, decision making for budgetary items may require CMER and/or Policy input and/or approval.

PROJECT RESOURCE NEEDS

This list of project resources is from the PHB and DPC Study Field Manual and Quality Assurance Plan, Appendix C. Quantities listed below are for each crew. Implementation includes 6 crews.

Equipment Needs for Electrofishing Surveys:

Project Resource	Quantity
Apex or LR-24 Electrofisher	1
Batteries for electrofisher	2
iPad (with data collection platform)	1
Charger for electrofisher batteries (in vehicle)	1
Bad Elf Flex GPS unit	1
SPOT (or other beacon)	1
Field Notebook	1
Car charger for iPad (includes cables)	2
Reflective vests	2
Helmets	2
Machetes	2
Gloves (canvas or other work gloves)	2
Flagging rolls	2
One-two gallons of water (in vehicle)	1
Fire extinguisher (in vehicle)	1
Shovel (in vehicle)	1
Headlamps	2
Spare headlamp batteries (set)	2
Maps	
Site packets	
Duct tape	
Leatherman or other multitool	
Sharpies	
Pencils	

Equipment Needs for Longitudinal Habitat Surveys:

Project Resource	Quantity
Laser/Sonic Rangefinder	2
iPad (with data collection platform)	1
Bad Elf Flex GPS unit	1
SPOT (or other beacon)	1
Data sheets (backup)	5
Monopod for gunner	1
Bracket and yolk for Laser Rangefinder and monopod attachment	2
Target (Sonic or Laser)	2
Small backpack	2
Graduated stadia rod (meters)	1
Calibrated depth rod (meters)	1
First aid kit (bring in field) - Containing: Antihistamines, EpiPens	1
Hip chains/tapes	2
Rebar (x2 per site)	3
Sledgehammer (4lb)	1
Reflective vests	2
Helmets	2
Machetes	2
Gloves (canvas or other work gloves)	2
Flagging rolls	2
Field Notebook	1
One-two gallons of water (in vehicle)	1
Fire extinguisher (in vehicle)	1
Shovel (in vehicle)	1
Spare Rangefinder batteries	2
Car charger for iPad (includes cables)	2
Hi-vis spraypaint for rebar benchmarks	1
Spare headlamp batteries (set)	2
Maps	
Site packets	
Duct tape	
Leatherman or other multitool	
Sharpies	
Pencils	

PROJECT BUDGET

This reflects a combined budget for the PHB and DPC studies, as they share a combined site selection and field effort. Numbers listed from FY17-FY25 are actual expenditures. Budget numbers from FY26-FY30 are projected estimates based on the current contract with Cramer Fish Sciences for implementation.

Budget/Cost Items	Expenditures FY17 – FY19 (Initial Study Design and Pilot Study)	Expenditures FY21-24 (Study Design Revision and Site Selection)	Expenditures FY25	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY29	FY30	Project Total
Cramer Fish Sciences (Service Contract)	\$0	\$0	\$805,045	\$1,246,000	\$1,228,000	\$419,300	\$59,500	\$10,000	\$3,767,845
Field implementation – Project Management, Field Manual, Site Selection, Permitting, and Reconnaissance	\$0	\$0	\$60,980	\$182,000	\$20,000	\$12,500	\$12,500	\$2,000	\$289,980
Field implementation -training, data coll. and mgmt.	\$0	\$0	\$744,065	\$1,026,000	\$1,170,000	\$314,000	\$0	\$0	\$3,254,065
Reporting	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$38,000	\$38,000	\$92,800	\$47,000	\$8,000	\$223,800
Service Contracts (PSCs)	\$319,076	\$132,872	\$45,258	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$497,206
Wild Fish Conservancy	\$3,950	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3,950
Cramer Fish Sciences (Pilot Study)	\$124,497	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$124,497
Cramer Fish Sciences (Study Design)	\$190,629	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$190,629
WEST (Statistician for Study Design)		\$113,989	\$2,633						\$116,622
NWIFC tech (Site Selection)		\$18,883	\$42,625						\$61,508
Expert Panel 2017-2019	\$76,293	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$76,293
Pete Bisson	\$3,680	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Jeff Kershner	\$36,377	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Patrick Trotter	\$36,236	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supply and Expense (On-going)	\$0	\$0	\$36	\$300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$336
Science Technician Supplies (Small Supplies, Tools)	\$0	\$0	\$36	\$300	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$336
FY Total	\$395,369	\$132,872	\$850,339	\$1,246,300	\$1,228,000	\$419,300	\$59,500	\$10,000	\$4,341,680

Project Total: \$4,341,680

PROJECT SITES

The site selection process, including the sampling frame, site identification, and site rejection criteria, are described in the DPC Study Design. Site selection was initiated in FY24. Sites are located throughout Washington State and require contract support for field reconnaissance and data collection. The data for both the PHB and DPC studies are being gathered simultaneously at shared sites.

COMPANION CMER DOCUMENTS

Document	Completion Date (Actual* or Estimated)
Water Typing Strategy	4/28/2020*
Project Charter	9/7/2023*
Study Design	5/27/2025*
Prospective 6 Questions Document	6/24/2025*
Field Manual	4/28/2025*
Project Management Plan	6/2026
Final Report	6/2029
Final 6 Questions Document	9/2029

*Actual dates

PROJECT COMMUNICATION OVERVIEW

Transparent and accurate communication between the different adaptive management parties (Project Team/SAG/CMER/AMPA/TFW Policy) is critical for the AMP to guide and oversee the work of the Project Team. This section provides a framework to manage and coordinate the communications needed for all phases of a project. If a separate Communication Plan is needed for a project, see section 7.6 of the PSM for detailed guidelines.

Two primary pathways exist for project communication to occur when working on CMER projects - 1) between the Project Team and project oversight committees (i.e. SAGs/CMER/TFW Policy), and 2) communication within the Project Team.

PROJECT OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE COMMUNICATION

This section covers communication between the Project Team and the project oversight committees (i.e. SAGs/CMER/TFW Policy). Project oversight communication includes three categories of documents/communication: 1) Project management documents that enable oversight committees to understand how projects will be managed, 2) Project tracking and communication to enable the oversight committee(s) to track project progress and provide guidance and approvals to move projects forward, and 3) communication with contractors.

1. Project management documents

The PM is the lead author for the Project Charter, Project Management Plan, and other project management documents. If the Principal Investigator (PI) has been identified at the

time of project launch, the PM will work with the PI to draft the Project Charter and Project Management Plan, in consultation with the oversight committee.

Project Management Documents*	Primary Author	Collaborators	Final Approval	Primary Audience
Project Charter	PM	PI and Project Team (if identified)	CMER and TFW Policy	Project Team, SAG, CMER, and TFW Policy
Project Management Plan (including communication and risk sections)	PM	PI and Project Team (if identified)	CMER	Project Team, SAG, and CMER

*For details regarding these documents, see PSM Section 7.6

2. Project tracking and guidance documents

The PM is responsible for ensuring that all reporting tasks are complete and provided on schedule. When preparing progress reports, the PI is responsible for providing detailed and comprehensive costs, schedule, and project updates, in writing, to the PM consistent with prior written agreement. The PM, in turn, is responsible for summarizing project update information into progress reports, and presenting these progress reports to the overseeing SAG and to CMER per the project schedule or as requested by the SAG or by CMER. The PM may delegate preparation or presentation of progress reports to the PI or other Project Team members, with their consent.

Project Tracking/Guidance Documents*	Primary Author	Collaborators	Final Approval	Primary Audience
Project updates	PM	PI	N/A	Project Team, SAG, CMER, and TFW Policy
CMER quarterly and annual project progress reports	PM	PI	N/A	SAG and CMER
CMER Requests	PM	Project Team	CMER	CMER
TFW Policy Requests/Check-ins	AMPA	Project Team	CMER	TFW Policy
Public Presentations	PI/PM	Project Team	N/A	Public

*For details regarding these documents, see PSM Section 7.6

3. Contractor Communications

In all cases, the PM is primarily responsible for facilitating open and transparent communication between contractor(s) and project oversight committee(s) members. Committee members should generally not directly communicate with the contractor(s) about substantive project elements outside of formally organized meetings, conference calls, or PM-facilitated group e-mail discussions, unless specifically authorized in pre-established

contract terms, or approved in advance to do so by the PM. The PM may verbally grant authorization, and the rest of the Project Team and oversight committee members should be informed when this occurs. The PM is responsible for informing the contractor(s) of this policy as well.

INTRA-PROJECT TEAM COMMUNICATION

The PM provides assistance to Project Team members by coordinating communication (e.g. one-on-one and group meetings, conference calls, etc.) when needed as well as maintaining the e-mail distribution list for the Project Team. The PM also ensures that any communication resulting in a formal decision about the project occurs in a transparent and inclusive way.

The PI is responsible for preparing and writing technical reports for CMER. How the PI communicates and works with other Project Team members to produce these documents will vary based on the nature of the project and dynamics of the Project Team. The PI works together with the PM to coordinate communication with other team members as needed.

Communication by individual team members includes participation at meetings and conference calls, providing feedback on draft documents, researching specific topics/issues, taking the lead on writing report sections, and/or acting as co-author(s) of CMER documents. The expectation is that Project Team members, including PMs and PIs, who communicate outside of normal project meetings, conference calls, and other venues will share substantive, project-related conversations they have with the rest of the Project Team. For additional details regarding project team communication see PSM section 7.7.15 and 7.7.16.

Communication structure

