

Coordination Committee Meeting  
*February 3, 2010*

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**  
**Coordination Committee Meeting**  
3 February 2010 Meeting – 1:00 PM - 4:00 PM  
Bureau of Reclamation

**Meeting agenda – 02/03/10 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM**

- Introductions and Agenda Approval
- Approval of 01/20/10 CC meeting summary\*
- Action Item Review (see below)
- FY09 Activities Spreadsheet and Quarterly Expenditure Reports\*
- LTP contract update
- Annual report update (2008 and 2009)
- Program information from Oregon State University\*
- Update on River Restoration Workshop
- Agency Specific Code of Ethics Discussion\*
- Update: SWM's Climate Change Input to URGWOM SOW
- Next Meeting: February 17, 10 am – 4 pm

---

\*Read aheads

**January 20, 2010 CC Action Items:**

- ✓ Yvette McKenna will update the proposed LTP schedule by (1) adding EC updates on LTP progress at their monthly meetings; (2) adding known work group meetings; and (3) adding the agreed to 10:00am to 4:00pm meeting times with working lunch for the February 17<sup>th</sup>, March 4<sup>th</sup>, and April 14<sup>th</sup> CC meetings. The updated schedule will be distributed to CC members and posted to the Program's website. – *completed*;
- Yvette McKenna will make sure all work groups are informed of the request for their input in populating the LTP with current and future activities. The work groups will be asked to attend the joint meetings with the CC and will be asked to provide (1) a list of FY09 accomplishments as it relates to FY09 projects, (2) their 2010 work plans; and (3) considerations for future activities (next 5 to 7 years).
- ✓ Tetra Tech will provide Jenae Maestas with Lori Robertson's updated contact information. – *completed*;
- ✓ Kathy Dickinson will redistribute the FY09 budget/activity spreadsheet dated October 26<sup>th</sup> to CC members. – *completed as read ahead for 02/03/10 CC meeting*;
- Jim Wilber will ask Diana Herrera to update the FY09 financial report to include references to specific activity numbers (in order to correlate activities to the CC budget spreadsheet).
- Yvette McKenna will discuss the MRG River Restoration and Channel workshop with Robert Padilla to work on setting a date; it was suggested to delay the workshop until after the LTP has been completed and approved in June 2010.

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program  
Coordination Committee Meeting**

03 February 2010 Meeting – 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
Bureau of Reclamation

**Decisions**

- The January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.

**Recommendations**

- The CC recommended that the work groups use the “blank” cells in the Activity Number column found on Draft LTP Table 7 as a starting place for suggestions on specific future projects. *(The “blank” activities came from the recovery plan action plans and is what the Program is being told will need to happen to achieve recovery. For example, 7.2.A.1 Identify Minnow Flow Needs is a very broad category but there are more defined subcategories underneath. The Science work group could consider this direction and design studies or research to address.)*
- The CC recommended that the Congressional Representatives be specifically invited to participate in the LTP process and provide feedback on the draft versions of the LTP. It was suggested they could be provided with the LTP meeting schedule. Their input should be incorporated early to help determine if the development is on track or not.
- It was recommended that the new LTP development module on the Program’s Library website page include a section for the initial “conceptual” draft LTP with the December date. It was also suggested that the references on similar program’s (provided by Tom Pitts) also be included (Upper Colorado, San Juan, etc.) on the LTP library page. For the Lower Colorado Multi-Species program it was suggested that a link to their site would be more appropriate than actual posting documents.
- The CC recommended that the list of accepted Program meeting ground rules be included with the work group annual charters. The CC also supported the production of several ground rules posters to be developed for use as each group sees fit.

**LTP Suggestions**

- The CC asked for clarification describing the differences or changes between the newest version of Attachment 4: How to Document Past Activities and the previous version provided. *Additional guidance in the field “Name of Project” was added to the newer version.*
- For consistency, it was requested that the order of fields in Attachments 4 and 5 (past and future activities) match the order of columns in the LTP Table 7.0 (i.e., make them identical in order and titles where appropriate).
- It was suggested that the field “2003 BiOp Requirement” be rephrased as “Compliance Requirement or Recovery Objective” as a more general term; this request stemmed from the concern of specifically referencing an older BiOp in a document intended to inform the new BiOp.
- The CC discussed the formatting of Table 7 and agreed that while including *all* activities (past, present, and future) into one table is acceptable for the development process it is overwhelming and not appropriate for the actual LTP document especially if the individual projects are to be included under each. It was suggested that there be at least two separate tables – one for all past activities and one for future activities.
- The CC discussed either: (1) omit the “multi-species” categories, leaving just a minnow and flycatcher category, and list projects that benefit both in both places with a notation that indicates the project can be cross-referenced as benefiting the other species as well (i.e., multiple project listings as appropriate ); or (2) keep the multi-species category that includes all projects that have

some benefit to both species, but then list the smaller number of projects that only pertain to the minnow or flycatcher under their separate category (ex. monitoring, O&M for hatcheries, fish passage are strictly for the minnow).

- It was requested that descriptions or clarification be added to the Guidance Document explaining what the recovery plan priorities are and how they are defined (ex. how is priority 1 defined, how priority 2 defined, etc.) since the priorities are all mixed under the categories in Table 7.
- See Kathy Dickinson's emailed suggestions (below, in italics) for more edits and a revised Attachment 2 at the end of the meeting summary following the attendance list.
  - Attachment 1:
    1. *Delete the multi-species subsections. It will be easier for the Service to determine sufficient progress towards recovery if we list projects that benefit both the RGSM and the SWFL twice in the plan – once in the RGSM sub-section, and again in the SWFL sub-section. We could use a footnote to denote activities that benefit both species.*
    2. *Add an "other" subsection to sections 7.5.A and 7.5.B.*
  - Attachment 2: *see attached revised document for corrections and suggested additions*
  - Attachment 4 and 5:
    1. *Reorder the sections to correspond to the order of the columns in Table 7.*
    2. *Change the title from "2003 BiOp Requirement" to "ESA Compliance Requirement". This field could be filled in with a 2003 BiOp RPA or RPM, 2001 RPA or RPM, or a Recovery Plan Element.*
  - Attachment 7:
    1. *Make a global change of all "LPT" to "LTP".*
    2. *Page 4, Section 6.1. Include definitions for RGSM priorities 1 – 3, and SWFL priorities 1 – 3.*
  - Attachment 6 (Table 7): *Consider separating out the past activities from the future activities to make it more clear what has already been accomplished vs. what the future plan of action is.*
  - Discussion Topics for Feb. 17: *How far back do we want to go with past activities? How can we clearly show measurable goals and benchmarks (interim goals) in the LTP as requested by the Congressional staff?*

## **Actions**

- Lori Robertson will distribute the link to the Federal Register Notice of the Final Revised Recovery plan.
- Yvette McKenna will add a "draft" watermark to the newest LTP attachments and will incorporate them all into a single document before distributing to the work groups. The email will contain a reminder that work groups are only expected to develop a list of future projects/activities that can be discussed and further developed during the working sessions with the CC.
- Yvette McKenna will invite work group members and agency experts to the PMT meeting on Wednesday, February 10<sup>th</sup> for questions or guidance on how to formulate the future activities.
- CC members will further review the newest LTP documents prior to the February 17<sup>th</sup> working meeting.
- Yvette McKenna will forward today's CC's (02/03/10) suggestions and comments regarding the LTP to Tom Pitts; it is expected that revisions can be made and documents can be posted as read aheads by February 10.

- Lori Robertson will assign the new FWS PMT Liaison (when officially hired) to draft an initial scientific guidelines/scientific integrity document which will then be distributed to the work groups and CC for review.
- Amy Louise will incorporate the SWM suggested changes to the Climate Change to Input to URGWOM SOW and will distribute to the CC as a read ahead for the February 17<sup>th</sup> meeting for final approval.
- Yvette McKenna will contact Reese Fullerton about possible facilitation of the February 17<sup>th</sup> CC/work group working meeting.
- Yvette McKenna will check with Jericho Lewis about the CC request to change the San Acacia A&R Peer Review Presentation meeting to February 25<sup>th</sup> (instead of February 24<sup>th</sup> as there is conflict with the Engineers Advisor's meeting on February 24<sup>th</sup>). *The contractor informed Jericho that they've already purchased non-refundable flights and hotel rooms. If there is a need to re-schedule, we'll need more funds to cover any and all expenses they've incurred and possibly more due to the postponement. The PM and CO recommend not rescheduling the Peer Review Presentation.*

**Next CC Meeting: February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2010 from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm at Reclamation; please back a brown bag lunch**

Tentative Agenda items: LTP future activity development and discussions; approval of SWM Climate Change Inputs to URGWOM SOW; schedule regular upcoming CC meetings; discuss how far back we want to go with past activities and how we can clearly show measurable goals and benchmarks (interim goals) in the LTP.

### **February 3, 2010 CC Meeting Summary**

- **Introductions and Agenda Approval:** Amy Louise called the meeting to order and introductions were made around the table. The agenda was approved with no changes. In a brief announcement, it was shared that the Revised Recovery Plan was going to be published in the federal registry and was expected to be finalized soon.
- **Approval of 01/20/10 Meeting Summary:** The January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010 meeting summary was approved with no changes.
- **Action Item Review:** All January 20<sup>th</sup>, 2010 CC meeting action items were completed.
- **FY09 Activities Spreadsheet and Quarterly Expenditure Reports:** The FY09 Activities Spreadsheet and Quarterly Expenditure Reports were provided as read aheads as requested for today's meeting. The FY09 Spreadsheet is 2 pages in length thus clarifying why there might have been some confusion at the last meeting (only one 1 page had been printed). The FY09 financial report was revised to include a column linking the project to specific activity numbers. Every quarter, as it becomes available, the quarterly expenditure reports will be provided to CC members.
- **LTP contract update:** At the January 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, the CC delegated authority to Jericho Lewis (Contracting Officer) and Yvette McKenna (Interim Program Manager) to negotiate revisions to the Long-term Plan (LTP) task order with GenQuest and Tom Pitts; negotiations are still pending. However, the revised LTP schedule proposed on January 20<sup>th</sup> will be maintained. The read aheads provided by Tom Pitts and posted late yesterday adhere to the LTP schedule.
  - The 7 attachments (read aheads) provided late this week by Tom Pitts are intended as recommended guidance on how to best populate Table 7 (which is the "meat") of the LTP.
  - The CC reviewed each attachment in numeric order.

- *Attachment 1: Program Sections and Subsections (or Table 7 outline).* This document lists the major categories that Tom recommends and has presented before. He has extended the subcategories and included more specific breakouts of Program sections and subsections. It was clarified that there is a 1-to-1 relationship between Table 7 and the Attachment 1 categories; Attachment 1 is a “cheat sheet” showing how all the categories in Table 7 were laid out.
- *Attachment 2: Parties Conducting Program Projects/Activities (or the Who List)* is an initial drafting of involvement. It is recognized that this list is not complete as it does not contain all signatories, entities with funding, or Pueblos. The CC discussed whether or not this document should contain all contractors as well as there is work being funded by the Program through contractors without a specific lead agency (i.e., monitoring work, administrative support, etc.). The CC also revisited the discussion of how to include agencies that are not in the Program but are doing work that ultimately contributes to recovery and the policy issues that have to be addressed.
- *Attachment 3: Category List for Table 7.0:* This document provides category definitions and explanations. The CC discussed the need to have the term “management” be used consistently throughout all the LTP documents including the use of “water management” when appropriate. The categories can be expanded and made more specific as the Program sees fit.
- *Attachment 4: Format for Documenting Past MRGCP Activities:* This is an updated version on a previous recommendation document for the CC and work groups to use as a tool on how to document past Program activities. The CC discussed how this is the Program’s LTP and it needs to be useful to us for compliance and as a management document. The Program is free to manipulate it and change it as needed to make it as useful and appropriate as possible.
  - Some of the past activities are already documents in the various places already, such as the activity summaries and annual reports.
  - The CC discussed the possible need to better define the 2003 Biological Opinion (BiOp) requirements versus the activities that the Program supports that are not required but are necessary for success. Attendees also discussed the concern of embedding references to the old BiOp (including RPAs and RPMs) in the LTP which will in turn be used to guide the new BiOp. It was suggested that specific references to the “2003 BiOp” be rephrased as “previous compliance documents” or “previous Recovery Plans” as a more general term.
  - The CC discussed how far back the LTP needs to cover (i.e., determining the “cut off” within the LTP). The question is how many years need to be included to be considered comprehensive? The official Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) forming the interim Program started in 2002 but the Program has actually funded work beginning in 1999. Cost share reports were requested back to 2001, corresponding to write-in funds.
    - Tom Pitts recommends capturing as much historical project information as possible in order to help with future planning and avoid any duplication of effort (or repeated work). Some of the history could be captured in text or narrative form instead of having to be included in the tables or a timeline or outline of what was done by year could be created more easily. It was cautioned that the value

of man-hours needed to recreate past activities needs to be weighed against the value of included those.

- The CC discussed how the current format of LTP Table 7 was overwhelming since it includes *all* Program activities (past, present, and future). It was suggested that there be at least two separate tables – one for all past activities and one for future activities. It was also suggested that if Table 7 were to contain both past and future activities that it be limited to project heading only and have a corresponding 1 page description that would provide the detailed information on that activity.
- The CC discussed the need for the LTP to meet Congressional needs and recommended that the Congressional Representatives be specifically invited to participate in the LTP process and provide feedback on the draft versions of the LTP. It was suggested they could be provided with the LTP meeting schedule. Their input should be incorporated early to help determine if the development is on track or not. Since the draft narrative of the LTP is very similar to the old LTP, it is assumed that similar issues will be raised by the congressionals: tables are overwhelming (formatting issues); want more specific benchmarks and milestones; want more of a progress report with specific solutions; etc.
- The CC discussed the work group assignment to help develop future activities for inclusion in the LTP. Tom has included the Recovery Plan Criteria into Table 7 but they are very broad; the work group's expertise will be needed to narrow down the research and projects to elements that could be addressed within the next 5 to 10 years. Work groups have been instructed to come to the February 17<sup>th</sup> joint meeting with an initial list of future project titles.
  - Concern was raised with the “multi-species” category that houses projects that benefit both species – it makes the specific minnow and flycatcher categories look “empty”, like the Program has not been doing much in those areas. The CC discussed either: (1) omitting the “multi-species” categories, leaving just a minnow and flycatcher category, and listing projects that benefit both in both places with a notation that indicates the project can be cross-referenced as benefiting the other species as well (i.e., multiple project listings as appropriate ); or (2) keeping the multi-species category that includes all projects that have some benefit to both species, but then listing the smaller number of projects that only pertain to the minnow or flycatcher under their separate category (ex. monitoring, O&M for hatcheries, fish passage are strictly for the minnow).
  - The work groups will be provided with the LTP attachments that the CC reviewed today.
  - A new page has been created on the Program website to house all LTP development and related documents in one place (and for those who's email will not accept 7 attachments). Special login is not required – regular work group and CC login will grant access. It was suggested that documents from other programs (i.e., San Juan, Upper Colorado, etc.) also be posted to this page.

- Work group members and agency experts are invited to come to the PMT weekly meeting on Wednesday, February 10<sup>th</sup> for one-to-one consultation or questions on the development of the LTP future activities.

**Action:** CC members will further review the newest LTP documents prior to the February 17<sup>th</sup> working meeting.

**Action:** Yvette McKenna will forward today's CC's (02/03/10) suggestions and comments regarding the LTP to Tom Pitts.

**Action:** Yvette McKenna will invite work group members and agency experts to the PMT meeting on Wednesday, February 10<sup>th</sup> for questions or guidance on how to formulate the future activities.

**Action:** Yvette McKenna will make the suggested changes to the LTP attachments and distribute to work group members and CC members.

- **Annual report update (2008 and 2009):** Jericho Lewis and Yvette McKenna have been discussing issuing a Task Order to GenQuest to compile all the past Program activities for inclusion in the LTP. Since GenQuest staff will be involved in collecting and gathering the past information, it would be reasonable to include preparing the annual report (2008 and 2009) as part of that task order. There will only be one report covering the 2 calendar years. It is expected to be completed by September 2010.
- **Program information from Oregon State University:** Yvette McKenna requested the PowerPoint presentation from Dr. Wolf for PowerPoint. There is a lot of interesting information in the attachment. It appears that Reclamation will be able to offer the training again but the date is still unknown. The training will be the same as the previous one thus accommodating individuals who expressed interest in the first training but couldn't attend due to limited space. More details will be provided once it is set up.
- **Update on River Restoration Workshop:** Yvette McKenna discussed the River Restoration Workshop (prefunded from last year) with Robert Padilla. Originally, the targeted date for the workshop was April. However, since the LTP is the Program's priority and maximum participation in its development is desired, it was proposed that the work shop be held later in the year. Suggested dates included July 20<sup>th</sup> or August 17<sup>th</sup>. Both dates are the 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday of the month allowing the work shop to replace the normal Habitat Restoration (HR) meeting date. The work shop will be open to all who wish to participate.
- **Agency Specific Code of Ethics Discussion:** The Corps has provided their draft 2009 Civil Works Review policy document. It is more complex than the FWS guidance. The FWS guidance that Reclamation is considering adopting is currently undergoing review in DC.
  - It has been suggested that all the provided agency guidance documents be posted to the Program's website for reference instead of formulating one for the Program at this point. UNM guidance documents for scientific integrity and research are available in multiple places (ex. faculty handbooks, posted online, etc.) however it is recommended they be reviewed for Program appropriateness before just posting them to the website. A concern was raised that it would be counterproductive to just "dump" all possible guidance documents into the website considering many of them might not be useful or applicable to the review the Program does. Instead it was suggested that a 1 page review reminder can be easily developed that can be distributed with the comment review forms every time they are sent out.



- The underlying concern was clarified: there have often been times when comments received on draft documents are blatantly worded unprofessionally or are downright denigrating to the scientific integrity of the author.
  - Since this unprofessional behavior is occurring at the work group level, it was suggested that the work groups be responsible for developing a review policy guidelines that their reviewers will adhere to. Work group co-chairs expressed concern with having to be the “enforcers” or “whistle blowers” should a review not follow the designated policy.

**Action:** Lori Robertson will assign the new FWS PMT Liaison (when officially hired) to draft an initial scientific guidelines/scientific integrity document which will then be distributed to the work groups and CC for review.

- The CC also discussed the intent to capture all meeting ground rules that have been developed and having the Public Information and Outreach (PIO) work group prepare poster sized meeting ground rules that could be displayed during meetings. After discussion, the CC agreed to make meeting ground rules an addendum to each work group charter and to have the posters developed for reference and allow each group to decide how to best use them (ex. refer to at the beginning of each meeting, park in the corner for reference only, etc.). Reese Fullerton will be asked to review the ground rules list before it is finalized.
- **Update: SWM’s Climate Change Input to URGWOM SOW:** MRGCD provided comments and ISC provided responses to those comments. The comments and suggested revisions were discussed at the SWM meeting today where the work group made a few additional minor changes. There is now work group agreement to move forward with this project as written. Amy Louise will incorporate the suggested changes and will send the revised scope to CC members for final review. The work group also discussed reprioritizing their projects based on the scope revisions but the order remained the same with Climate Change Input to URGWOM as the first priority, and the Riparian Model as the second priority.
- **Next Meeting: February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2010 from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm at Reclamation; please back a brown bag lunch**
  - Tentative Agenda items: LTP future activity development and discussions; approval of SWM Climate Change Inputs to URGWOM SOW;
- **Future Meetings:**
  - There is concern that the February 24<sup>th</sup> San Acacia A&R Peer Review presentation conflicts with the Engineers Advisor’s meeting that same day. This would limit the amount of participation from ISC and FWS.

**Action:** Yvette McKenna will check with Jericho Lewis about the CC request to change the San Acacia A&R Peer Review Presentation meeting to February 25<sup>th</sup> (instead of February 24<sup>th</sup> as there is conflict with the Engineers Advisor’s meeting on February 24<sup>th</sup>).

### CC Meeting Attendees 03 February 2010

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Susan Bittick	COE	342-3397	P	susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil

Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3642	O	ymckenna@usbr.gov
Amy Louise	ISC	383-4057	A	amy.louise@state.nm.us
Monika Mann	COE	342-3250	O	monika.mann@usace.army.mil
Kathy Dickinson	Reclamation	462-3555	O	kdickinson@usbr.gov
Jenae Maestas	GenQuest/Reclamation	462-3600	O	jmaestas@usbr.gov
Lori Robertson	FWS	761-4710	P	lori_robertson@fws.gov
Grace Haggerty	ISC	383-4045	P – Vice Chair	grace.haggerty@state.nm.us
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	P	rbillings@abcwua.org
Hilary Brinegar (by phone)	NMDA	575-646-2642	P	hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Hector Garcia	Reclamation	462-3550	A	hgarcia@usbr.gov
Susan Kelly	UNM	277-0514	P	skelly@law.unm.edu
Terina Perez	COA	848-7174	A	tlperez@cabq.gov
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	O	marta.wood@tetrattech.com

1/30/10

**Attachment 2. Parties Conducting Program Projects/Activities**

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Agency</b>
ABCWUA	Albuquerque-Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority
AG	New Mexico Office of the Attorney General
APA	Assessment Payers Association of MRGCD
ASIR	American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers, LLC
BIA	Bureau of Indian Affairs
BOR	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
CoA	City of Albuquerque
CON	Contractor - Unknown
FWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
GQ	GenQuest
Icetech	Icetech
ISC	New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission
Isleta	Pueblo of Isleta
MRGCD	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District
NMDA	New Mexico Department of Agriculture
NMDGF	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
NMED	New Mexico Environment Department
NMSU	New Mexico State University
Ohkay Owingeh	Ohkay Owingeh
Respec	Respec
San Felipe	Pueblo of San Felipe
Sandia	Pueblo of Sandia
Santa Ana	Pueblo of Santa Ana
Santa Clara	Pueblo of Santa Clara
Santo Domingo	Santo Domingo Tribe
SWCA	SWCA Environmental Consultants
TT	TetraTech
UNK	Unknown
UNM	University of New Mexico
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey