

Coordination Committee Meeting
February 17, 2010

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

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

17 February 2010 Meeting – 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM

Bureau of Reclamation

Meeting agenda – 02/17/10 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM; *attendees please remember to bring your lunch with you.*

- Introductions and Agenda Approval
- Approval of 02/03/10 CC meeting summary*
- Action Item Review (see below)
- LTP Future Activity Development and Discussions (RGSM and SWFL)*
 - Physical Habitat Restoration & Management
 - Water Management
 - Predator/Non-Native Control
 - Population Augmentation/Propagation (RGSM only)
 - Water Quality Management
 - Research, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management
 - Policies and Laws
 - Education and Outreach
- Program Management Establishing Measurable Goals and Benchmarks
- Past Activities Discussion
- Regular CC Business
 - PVA/PHVA Update
 - Adaptive Management Update*
 - Approval of San Acacia Reach (SAR) Work Group Charter*
 - Update: SWM's Climate Change Input to URGWOM SOW*
 - San Acacia A&R Peer Review Presentation Update
 - Work Group 2009 Accomplishment and 2010 Work Plans*
 - Schedule Regular Upcoming CC Meetings
- Next Working CC Meeting: March 4, 10 am – 4 pm

*Denotes Read aheads

February 3, 2010 CC Action Items:

- 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 10th for questions or guidance on how to formulate the future activities.
- CC members will further review the newest LTP documents prior to the February 17th working meeting.
- Yvette McKenna will forward today’s CC’s (02/03/10) suggestions and comments regarding the LTP to Tom Pitts.
- 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 17th meeting for final approval.
- Yvette McKenna will contact Reese Fullerton about possible facilitation of the February 17th 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 25th (instead of February 24th as there is conflict with the Engineers Advisor’s meeting on February 24th). *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 interim PM and CO recommend not rescheduling the Peer Review Presentation.*

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

17 February 2010 Meeting – 10:00 AM – 4:00 PM
Bureau of Reclamation

Decisions

- With quorum present, the CC decided to have their agendas reformatted to follow the EC agendas with designated decision versus informational items. It was also agreed that the read aheads posted to the website be organized by agenda item and to have two separate read ahead modules: one for decisional items and one for informational items.
- With quorum present, the CC recommended the approval of the PHVA/Hydrology ad hoc work group charter and 2010 work plan with the correction of Paul Tashjian's name.
- With quorum present, the CC recommended the Climate Change Input to URGWOM SOW move forward in the RFP process for funding this year.
- With quorum present, the CC agreed to meet again on March 10th from 1:00pm to 5:00pm to conduct regular business. The following suggested meetings date for regular CC business meetings will be further agreed upon at the March 10th meeting: March 31, April 28, May 12 and May 26.

Recommendations

- CC members and agency representative were encouraged to be mindful of including the PIO work group in any individual agency symposiums, events, or actions that might tie into public outreach. It is up to the Program and Program members to help the PIO work group identify other activities they can support the Program in.
- It was suggested that a small group meet prior to the March 4th working meeting to review the compiled future activities tables to determine or address any recommendations, preliminary organization, or consolidation that could be done before March 4th. It was cautioned that items not be removed from the list but flagged or noted if similar or duplicates; it was suggested that nothing should be omitted until the activity descriptions are available.
- It was suggested, as a process, that the work groups send out regular updates on activity development to all work group members with request for quick turn around response time in order to try to offer the opportunity to provide feedback as often and by as many as possible.
- It was suggested that the CC have further discussions regarding the EC read aheads and improving read ahead formatting.

LTP Recommendations and Suggestions

- The CC approved the recommended suggestion that the future activity descriptions include a section for species benefit that would contain a few sentences describing how that project contributes to recovery, helps the species, or supports compliance with the recovery plans or BO. This will help with prioritization and linking of projects.
- The CC agreed that everything related to education, outreach, and public relations including the annual reports, quarterly updates, and website responsibilities will be housed under the PIO sections of the LTP.
- The CC agreed that there should be space holders in the future activities table(s) for recurring events/activities.
- The CC agreed to keep the "multispecies" category within the LTP for those projects that benefit both species; this avoids repeated listing of projects which could be confusing having them listed

twice and avoids having to write 2 separate activity descriptions. However, the category will be retitled to “minnow/flycatcher” instead of “multispecies” and it will be the first category listed.

- The CC agreed that all past activities and future activities be populated into 2 separate tables.
- It was suggested that hyperlinks to references be incorporated into the LTP and other materials to make the documents more interactive; links to materials on the website could be imbedded within tables/documents/text/etc.
- The CC agreed that the revised LTP will include activities as far back as 2001, as based on congressional appropriations as a reasonable break point.
- It was suggested that all work groups need to include implementation of projects while identifying future activities (i.e., consider how to get to the point of using resources to get projects going and completed to benefit the species as soon as possible).
- It was strongly recommended that the Recovery Plan Priorities be included in the draft Table 7.0 even if the Program wishes to reprioritize activities based on their own priorities.
- The CC agreed to use the project titles identified in Attachment 6 as headings or subsections within the future activities list with the work group identified activities listed underneath (in order to keep clear linkage to the recovery plans).

Remaining Questions for future discussion

- How to address/capture/include non-Program entity actions or activities in the LTP?
- How to get credit from the Service for non-Program actions/activities that further recovery efforts?
- How future activity descriptions will be assigned?
- How other columns in the future activities tables will be filled out completely?
- How will duplicate or nearly duplicate activities be addressed?
- Are the identified future activities listed under the right sections?

Future Activities Identified during working session

- *PIO Future Activities*
 - Legislative Tours – FY10 and future years as needed or identified;
 - SAR Work Group Field Trip Support – FY10;
 - SAR Work Group Public Forum Support – FY10;
 - SAR Work Group Brochure Development Support – FY10;
 - NMDGF’s Outdoor Expo – FY10 and annually in future years;
 - State Fair Display/booth - FY10 and annually in future years;
 - Host Program’s Open House - FY10 and in future years either annually or every other year as directed by the Program;
 - Festival of the Cranes Booth – FY10 and annually in future years;
 - Develop Program Media Binder – FY10; will be used as starting point to develop a Program Communication Plan;
 - Distribute Press Releases – FY10 and as often as needed in all future years;
 - 1000 Acre Habitat Restored Event – when 1000 acres has been restored;
 - Develop Program Communication Plan – FY11, FY12 with annual updates;

- Rio Grande Days at the Round House Booth – every other year (FY11, FY13, etc.)
- Public Website Upkeep/Updating – as needed;
- Annual Plan;
- Program’s Quarterly Accomplishment Updates – every quarter for every year;
- Improve the children’s section of the website for educational components; (i.e., integrating fun activities with learning);
- Produce documents and outreach tools in Spanish;
- To Reach out to San Juan/Chama contractors with information on the benefits of the Program and how to contact the Program;
- To identify and reach out to other non-Program entities in the valley to attempt to capture what they are expecting to do in terms of actions and activities that might benefit the species and thus be included or captured in the Program’s LTP;
- *PHVA/Hydrology Future Activities*
 - Continue Modeling Effort to Support the new BA/BO Efforts – FY10 and maybe in FY11;
 - Continue URGWOM Modeling Efforts to support ongoing Program Needs – FY10 and annually in future years; this project ties into the adaptive management plans and other water management scenarios, etc.
- *DBMS (database management system) Future Activities*
 - Ongoing database O&M – FY10 and annually in future years;
 - Additional DBMS Enhancements – FY10 and annually in future years as needed;
 - Recurring Hard and Software Updates – as required;
 - *Note that the DBMS will support both species.*
- *Science Work Group – Additional Future Activities Identified*
 - Peer Review of Genetics and/or Rescue Projects;
 - Analysis on Recruitment Flow Boundary Targets/Numbers (i.e., 3,000 cfs for 7 to 10 days);
 - *Note: on ScW future activities table, Row 91 needs to be specifically marked as a reintroduction element;*
 - *Note: Suggestion to include activities that would be needed to support establishing 10J populations elsewhere (lower Rio Grande, Cochiti, Pecos tributary, etc.) in the next 5 to 10 years; includes possible tasks as data gathering based on progress of Big Bend population; determining feasibility; working with the reintroduction biologist in determining what would need to be done depending on the reach;*
 - *Garner water quality recommendations from the ISC/Tetra Tech Water Quality report to determine if any studies or projects would have defined outcomes that would be useful for management or species benefit;*
- *HR Work Group – Additional Future Activities Identified*
 - Reach Planning Project – *still needs to be identified by the work group;*
 - Habitat Functions in Terms of Monitoring Projects – *still needs to be identified by the work group;*

- A&R project recommendations to be included in LTP – *still needs to be identified by the work group*;
- Enhancing of Recreational Projects with inventory, education, etc. with Program Information;
- Implement Habitat Restoration Projects - *need as a place holder even if not identified as specific by reach; suggested place holder titles included Implementing Prioritized HR Projects or Implementing HR LTP Activities*;
- **SAR Future Activities**
 - Tiffany Basin Feasibility Study;
 - RM 80 to 89 project;
 - RM 89 to RM 90 river channel transitioning feasibility study;
 - Floodplain encroachment;
 - Analysis of San Marcial and San Acacia Reaches;
- **SWM Future Activities**
 - Soil Moisture Monitoring Project;
 - SWFL Water Needs at Isleta;
 - Continue Riparian Model;
 - Investigate Aquifer Storage – *taken from the recovery action plans*;
 - Investigate Bank Storage – *taken from the recovery action plans*;
 - MRGCD Threshold Analysis;
 - Geomorphic Rehabilitation Projects – *suggested looking through LTP from 1999 or 2000 regarding geomorphic rehabilitation (will need to get the report from Robert Padilla or Drew Baird)*

Actions

- Tetra Tech will send Kathy Dickinson a list of all new future activities identified during the CC working meeting so that the combined future activities list can be generated by Monday, February 22COB.
- The PIO work group will add a contact page to the website that includes information on how individual agencies can contact PIO for assistance with outreach and education opportunities; and it will include Program tag lines, brief paragraphs, or boilerplate statements that agencies can “copy/paste” within their publications.
- Reclamation will work with the tribes to clarify and discuss options on different cost sharing scenarios.
- The non-Federal partners will generate a list of known non-Program agencies or entities that have projects or activities that benefit the species. It was suggested that the non-Program entity list originally developed for the 2006 LTP be as starting point for revisions and updates. The non-Program entity list should include entity name, project title, project description, project time frames, etc.
- Susan Bittick will send past activities to Jericho Lewis and Yvette McKenna.
- Susan Bittick will provide the DBMS charter and FY10 work plan to the CC for review and consideration.

- Stacey Kopitsch will elevate the CC request that a flycatcher expert from the Service attend or provide feedback to the Science work group regarding future activities supporting recovery of the flycatcher.
- The Habitat Restoration (HR) work group will need to identify (1) more specific reach planning future activities, (2) future activities in terms of habitat functions regarding monitoring, and (3) incorporate possible future activities as identified in the A&Rs for inclusion in the LTP.
- The San Acacia Reach (SAR) work group will need to incorporate all FY10 proposed activities on their LTP future activities list.
- Kathy Dickinson will provide section categories on the SWM, SAR, PIO, and DBMS future activities to Jean Burt.
- Within the next 2 weeks, the co-chairs of the work groups (lead by ScW, to include HR, MPT, PIO, PHVA, PVA, DBMS, SWM, SAR, etc.) will attempt to meet to do several first pass sorting on the compiled future activities list in an attempt to have a start on identifying duplicate activities, overlaps, joint projects, etc.
- The PMT, work group co-chairs, and any available CC members will meet on Friday February 26th from 8:30am to noon at Reclamation to begin sorting and editing the future activities table.
- Stacey Kopitsch will consult with Lori Robertson about having a Service representative present at the February 26th meeting and the March 4th working meeting to provide input on whether or not future activities are being sorted (categorized) appropriately.
- Jean Burt and Kathy Dickinson will incorporate the project titles identified in Attachment 6 as headings or subsections within the future activities list with the work group identified activities listed underneath.
- Tetra Tech will reformat the CC agenda items to follow the EC agenda format with decisional informational items specifically noted.
- Amy Louise will request a co-chair joint meeting lead by SWM to discuss or identify other water management goals and research for the LTP future activities.
- Yvette McKenna will ask Jericho Lewis if the CC has time enough to discuss peer review contract modifications to the River Mile 83 project at the March 4th or 10th meeting.

Next Steps

- The future activities list will hopefully be compiled (all inclusive) by Monday, February 22 COB;
- Work groups will have 2 weeks to refine, condense, and prioritize projects from the compiled list before the March 4th meeting; it is hoped that the version presented to the CC at the March 4th meeting is a final list of future activities;
- The Table 7.0 columns need to be filled out completely for each project; the recovery plan priority and recovery plan element column information can be found in the recovery action plans;
- The PMT, work group co-chairs, and any available CC members will meet on Friday February 26th from 8:30am to noon at Reclamation to begin sorting and editing the future activities table;
- Discussions to determine if future activities are categorized in the right sections;
- The merged future activities table will be provided to the CC prior to March 4th; the first half of the meeting will be to discuss comments/concerns and the second half of the meeting will be to approve the list (with any edits) so the work groups can start developing activities descriptions; the description process will need to be determined;

- Project descriptions need to be written; starting with the highest priority or FY11 activities; the activity descriptions are needed as read aheads prior to the April 14th CC working meeting.

Upcoming Meetings

- February 24th SA A&R Peer Review Presentation 9:00am to 12:00 noon at MRGCD.
- February 26th PMT/WG/CC meeting from 8:30am to noon at Reclamation to begin sorting and editing the future activities table.
- March 4th CC/WG/PMT joint working meeting from 10:00am to 4:00pm at Reclamation (remember to pack a lunch!)
 - Tentative Agenda items: (2) status of non-federal updating of non-Program entities list; (3) address how to fill out other columns within the future activities table; (4) determine how to address duplicate future activities; (5) determine how to assign activity description tasks; and (6) peer review discussion
- March 10th CC Business meeting from 1:00pm to 5:00pm at Reclamation
 - Tentative Agenda items: (1) determine future regular business dates (suggestions are March 31, April 28, May 12 and May 26); (2) FWS (Stacey Kopitsch) to update on status of code of ethics guidelines;

February 17, 2010 CC/WG/PMT Meeting Summary

- **Introductions and Agenda Approval:** Grace Haggerty brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was briefly reviewed and approved with the addition of a Habitat Restoration (HR) work group update under the regular Coordination Committee (CC) business portion of the meeting. A welcome was extended to Stacey Kopitsch, the new FWS Program Management Team (PMT) liaison.
- **Approval of 02/03/10 Meeting Summary:** The February 3rd, 2010 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.
- **Action Item Review:**
 - Lori Robertson will distribute the link to the Federal Register Notice of the Final Revised Recovery plan. – *complete;*
 - ✓ 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. – *complete;*
 - ✓ Yvette McKenna will invite work group members and agency experts to the PMT meeting on Wednesday, February 10th for questions or guidance on how to formulate the future activities. – *complete;*
 - While everyone has been invited specifically to the February 10th PMT meeting, Yvette expressed that anyone who has questions or is seeking guidance is more than welcome to drop in to any of the regular Wednesday PMT meetings at any time.
 - ✓ CC members will further review the newest LTP documents prior to the February 17th working meeting. – *complete;*

- ✓ 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. – *complete;*
- ✓ GenQuest employee, Jean Burt, will be addressing any administrative or editorial comments regarding the LTP. Tom will be a lead consultant role. Please follow the same process for submitting LTP comments.
- ✓ 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. – *complete;*
- ✓ 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 17th meeting for final approval. – *complete;*
- ✓ Yvette McKenna will contact Reese Fullerton about possible facilitation of the February 17th CC/work group working meeting. – *complete;*
- ✓ Yvette McKenna will check with Jericho Lewis about the CC request to change the San Acacia A&R Peer Review Presentation meeting to February 25th (instead of February 24th as there is conflict with the Engineers Advisor's meeting on February 24th). – *complete;*
- ✓ *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 on February 24th from 9:00am to 12:00 noon at MRGCD.*

• **LTP Future Activity Development and Discussions (RGSM and SWFL)**

- *Program Manager (PM) Status Update:* As the first of several joint working meetings, every attempt has been made to ensure that the appropriate people were included. The agenda has been divided to provide clarity between the working Long-Term Plan (LTP) sections and the regular CC business section. Everyone is encouraged to limit the jargon and acronym use. Please remember that a new website page has been created under the Library that is being used as a "warehouse" to house all related LTP documents and reference materials including compliance guidance documents, past presentations, and drafts of the LTP.
[www.middlerigrande.com Library>>Revised LTP Development
- The goal for today's discussion is to capture, to the extent possible, the most complete list of future activities. The activities table developed by the Science (ScW) work group will be built upon. Other work groups have provided similar lists. However, it is recommended that today's meeting be used to capture input from the work groups that haven't been able to submit anything in writing yet (ex. PIO, PHVA, PVA, etc.).
- The list of projects needs to be compiled to include all groups before it can be given back to the work groups to review, discuss, and prioritize with the recognition that all activities will have to be further developed into an activity summary and then eventually a statement of work. The attempt is to capture activities 5 to 7 years out from contractual and management standpoint. The activities identified need to be sequenced and phased in order to award with option years and task orders to help avoid the financial burden of having to issue contracts for each and every activity on a yearly basis (ex. modifications are easier than issuing a new RFP).

Recommendation: The CC approved the recommended suggestion that the future activity descriptions include a section for species benefit that would contain a few sentences describing how that project

contributes to recovery, helps the species, or supports compliance with the recovery plans or BO. This will help with prioritization and linking of projects.

- *Public Information and Outreach (PIO) Work Group Future Activities Discussion:*
 - The PIO chair updated the CC by explaining that the PIO future activity list is based on the FY10 annual list. PIO members need more guidance from the Program including knowing what the other work groups expect their future activities to be before PIO can develop more future tasks. The PIO FY10 work plan was reviewed.
 - PIO would like to host a legislative tour but needs guidance from the Program to accomplish this task. The Program video has been finalized; PIO members will be scheduling a visit with all work groups to show the video and organize a list of places to distribute. PIO will also be supporting the San Acacia Reach (SAR) work group in their outreach with brochures, public forums, and outreach events. PIO expects to attend several annual public events including New Mexico Department of Game and Fish's (NMDGF) Outdoor Expo, the State Fair, Festival of the Cranes, and Rio Grand Days at the Roundhouse (every other year). PIO has discussed hosting another Program Open House but needs guidance from the Program to determine how often the Program wants to host the event. Last year, PIO started developing a media binder and distributed questionnaires to EC members. The media binder is a starting place to build a media information repository for agency/signatory information including why it is important to be involved, agency contacts, agency perspectives, quotes, etc. and the binder is envisioned to be used as a basis for the communication plan. One of PIO's major responsibilities is to do press releases for anyone, at any time to share the good work and get the word out. This task is an on-going and as needed for all future years.
 - It was stressed that the PIO work group really needs CC and EC guidance and direction. In an attempt to keep PIO informed, they will be meeting with the PMT once a month.
 - CC members were encouraged to invite the PIO to any presentation, event, or activity that might be useful for PIO; the more PIO knows about the inner workings of the Program, the more they can suggest how to get that information to the public. CC members were also encouraged to allow their Public Affairs persons to attend and participate in PIO.
 - Attendees discussed where the Program's annual reports, congressional reports, and website responsibilities should be included in the LTP (ex. under administration or PIO or program management). Tom suggested that these tasks be centralized in the outreach portion of the LTP; it is good have PIO be the lead and provide the support service to the other groups because of their expertise, knowledge, and background.

Recommendation: The CC agreed that everything related to education, outreach, and public relations including the annual reports, quarterly updates, and website responsibilities will be housed under the PIO sections of the LTP.

- It was clarified that the communication plan will be used to promote the Program in the public's eye with the "good" news before the "bad" news happens; but it will also contain a plan of what to do in an emergency as a collaborative Program instead of separating into individual agency perspectives. It is a future goal, several years off, and will have to be updated regularly.

- It was also shared how the media or press release protocol for the Program currently worked. Members of PIO would be notified of the need for a media release and either Julie or Mary Carlson (PIO co-chair) would actually draft the release that would get final review and approval from both EC co-chairs. This is another reason that it is important to have a PIO representative from each signatory – for input and guidance on press releases.

Action: The PIO work group will add a contact page to the website that includes information on how individual agencies can contact PIO for assistance with outreach and education opportunities; and it will include Program tag lines, brief paragraphs, or boilerplate statements that agencies can “copy/paste” within their publications.

○ *Questions from the 02/03/10 CC Meeting:*

- (1) On 02/03/10, the CC discussed the “multi-species” category that had originally been included in the draft LTP. The discussion included how hard it was to separate projects and activities and get credit for both species. No formal decision was made: either delete the multi-species category and list activities that benefit both under each separate species category or keep the multi-species category.
 - Concern was expressed over the possible confusing of listing activities twice and having to write two separate activity summaries. The benefits to both species could be captured in the benefit section of the activity summary, with text describing contributions to the minnow and to the flycatcher. Another concern was that if even a single word was different in the minnow versus flycatcher activity list, there would be confusion if it referred to the same project or not.

Recommendation: The CC agreed to keep the “multispecies” category within the LTP for those projects that benefit both species; this avoids repeated listing of projects which could be confusing having them listed twice and avoids having to write 2 separate activity descriptions. However, the category will be retitled to “minnow/flycatcher” instead of “multispecies” and it will be the first category listed.

- (2) On 02/03/10, the CC discussed the possibility of having separate tables for the past and future activities. Past activities would be from whenever the group determines to 2010 and the future activities would begin with 2011. It had been suggested to capture past activities in a separate volume or appendix to the LTP. The CC needs to determine how to best address the past versus future activities in the LTP.
 - One concern raised was that while separate tables work for projects with specific end dates, projects that have overlapping or ongoing option years would have to be captured in both. This could be potentially confusing.
 - The purpose of capturing the past activities is to show what has been accomplished to date and for a reference point when planning and determining future activities. It also provides documentation of how funding has been spent. Maintaining a past activities list is a tool to show how the Program is moving toward recovery and accomplishing recovery activities during the timeframe of the LTP.
 - Attendees discussed other ways, besides tables, to present data or information: timelines, Gantt charts, etc.
 - It was suggested that once everything has been collected into the table or tables, the Program can decide how to separate out activities. However, there is a contracting issue in that “redoing” the work later is not covered in the current contract and would require more time and money.

Recommendation: The CC agreed that all past activities and future activities be populated into 2 separate tables.

Suggestion: It was suggested that hyperlinks to references be incorporated into the LTP and other materials to make the documents more interactive; links to materials on the website could be imbedded within tables/documents/text/etc.

- (3) It has yet to be determined how far back to include in the LTP: 1999? 2001? 2003? It has been suggested that 2001 is a good target since it corresponds with the first real Biological Opinion (BiOp) with requirements - even though Program has been active since 1999.
 - The Service was asked if they have a specific timeframe in mind or could speak to how far back credit could be given. The Service did not have any timeframe requirements but did state that when assessing sufficient process, anything that contributed to the status of the species would be taken into consideration. The more elucidated, the more helpful.

Recommendation: The CC agreed that the revised LTP will include activities as far back as 2001, as based on congressional appropriations as a reasonable break point.

- (4) Previously, the CC began discussions about how to include non-Program activities that contribute to the species. Since input is needed from the solicitor, this question might not be answerable today.
 - Attendees discussed how to approach a situation where the Program might only be able to meet 90% of a recovery requirement, but a non-Program entity can contribute the remaining 10%. How is the additional work to be evaluated and “approved” by the Program to be included in the reporting to the Service?
 - It was suggested that the “how funded” column of the LTP tables be used to clearly identify the source (ex. COE funded through 1138 Authority or other language making it clear not using the Program’s authority to fund). This suggestion raised that concern that with uncertain future funding, other authorities (such as COE) can’t make commitments in other documents.
 - Tom Pitts shared that for other programs, it doesn’t matter if a contributing agency is a member or not; entities don’t have to be a signatory to benefit the species or to get benefits from the program. Normally, if an entity wants to count toward ESA compliance, they request to be rolled into the program. It takes a public relations committee to reach out to those groups and to make sure that constituents are made aware. Tom reminded attendees that including a project in the LTP is not necessarily a commitment since the LTP is not guaranteed. It is a guidance document that will be reviewed annually and updated as needed based on funding, priorities, the Service’s input, etc. The Service will only be giving credit for completed projects. If there is a lack of funding, projects can get dropped from the LTP or moved down in priority to outlying years.

Future PIO Activity: To Reach out to San Juan/Chama contractors with information on the benefits of the Program and how to contact the Program.

Future PIO Activity: To identify and reach out to other non-Program entities in the valley to attempt to capture what they are expecting to do in terms of actions and activities that might benefit the species and thus be included or captured in the Program’s LTP.

- Attendees then discussed confusing regarding cost share tracking for both the money and activity outcome (i.e., acreage restored). The concern is with the potential for “double dipping” or counting cost share twice. In particular, the pueblo representation was specifically concerned with the having to limit cost share to just the Program - if the support cannot be counted elsewhere and is just limited to Program cost share, then the tribes won’t use it. Since the tribes are considered non-federal members of this Program they need to be considered in the cost share requirements.

Action: Reclamation will work with the tribes to clarify and discuss options on different cost sharing scenarios.

Action: The non-Federal partners will generate a list of known non-Program agencies or entities that have projects or activities that benefit the species. It was suggested that the non-Program entity list originally developed for the 2006 LTP be as starting point for revisions and updates. The non-Program entity list should include entity name, project title, project description, project time frames, etc.

Action: Susan Bittick will send past activities to Jericho Lewis and Yvette McKenna.

- *Population Habitat Viability Analysis (PHVA) ad hoc Work Group Future Activities Discussion:*
 - Continuing Modeling Efforts to support the new BA/BO Efforts (this item may only need 1 more year of funding);
 - Support URGWOM Modeling Efforts for Program Needs (ex., adaptive management plans, other water management scenarios, etc.). This is a longer-term, ongoing activity.
 - In response to the question of whether or not the PHVA group might dissolve and “roll” into the Species Water Management (SWM) work group, it was stated that that decision would be up to the Executive Committee (EC) but was eventually possible.
- *Database Management System (DBMS) ad hoc Work Group Future Activities Discussion:*
 - In an update on the DBMS work group, it was shared that the draft charter and draft work plan have been completed and need CC comment and approval recommendations before being elevating to EC for final approval.
 - Future DBMS activities include:
 - (1) Ongoing DBMS O&M;
 - (2) Additional DBMS enhancements;
 - (3) Recurring hard and software updates, as required.
 - The DBMS will support both species and is a very robust system that will link projects and geographic areas.
 - It is the current intent of the Corps, as part of their authority and recurring budgets requests, to pay for the continued support of the DBMS.

Action: Susan Bittick will provide the DBMS charter and FY10 work plan to the CC for review and consideration.

- *Current Future Activities Lists Review*
 - *ScW Future Activities Review*

- At their meeting yesterday, the ScW work group began attempting to prioritize the future activities list that was generated. Attendees were informed that the flycatcher portions are very inadequate because there is no flycatcher expert represented in the regular group membership.

Action: Stacey Kopitsch will elevate the CC request that a flycatcher expert from the Service attend or provide feedback to the Science work group regarding future activities support recovery of the flycatcher.

- The ScW co-chair walked attendees through the ScW first pass prioritizing of future activities. There are some sections that were considered overarching and not just limited to ScW decision making.
- Suggested continued (prioritized) activities included (but are not limited to): population monitoring, population estimation, rescue augmentation (including evaluating the feasibility and value), captive rearing and breeding, evaluating existing data (to get concrete information from we already have), peer review of genetics or rescue, continue water quality monitoring and evaluating what is already available and from there decide if any additional studies are appropriate to develop and pursue, fish movement, in-channel refugia, develop a “rule book” or guide for managing the system based on expected water supply, develop studies that can be ready to implement for any given water year, and determine how to get to the point of no longer needing to augment the MRG.
- Rows 65 through 67 (determine relationship between river drying and population dynamics; develop habitat relationship curves by life stage; and consider meso-habitat scale vs. reach-wide scale) are joint effort with HR and PVA. Row 77 (study sensitivity of population to recruitment flows vs. sensitivity to river drying) is also joint with PVA.
- Rows 67 to Row 70 (determine how best to integrate HR work so it benefits both SWFL and RGSM; develop criteria for better multi-species HR projects; and develop methods to determine the effectiveness of HR projects for both species) are joint with HR and/or other work groups.
- Rows 81 to 89 (develop adaptive management strategy and plan; determine how to link HR effectiveness monitoring results to science results; develop well thought out long-term HR development plan by reach; develop reach-wide monitoring plan – link it to long-term HR development plan; hold workshop focused on what we have learned from current HR projects/efforts; prioritize future HR projects; develop scientific studies to determine benefits of HR projects; continue efforts to develop/integrate water management strategies) could all be considered a joint effort between multiple work groups.
- Attendees briefly discussed the recovery implantation plan including the need for 2 self-sustaining populations outside the Middle Rio Grande (MRG) and how that requirement affects the Program (i.e., for the Program to achieve recovery we need to figure out how to get those populations established).
 - Tom Pitts reminded the group that this has to with the scope of the Program – whether it is their responsibility or not. The flycatcher recovery plan has criteria for other states as well. Other programs are designed to support recovery *in their portion* of the basin not everywhere.
 - There can be continued discussions if establishing 10J populations elsewhere (ex. in the Lower RG, Cochiti, and Pecos tributary) needs to be included in the 5 to 10 year future activities for the Program.

- Attendees briefly discussed fish population water quality criteria including the criteria established NMED based on recreational, drinking water, fish health, etc., Reclamation's surface water nutrient information from the reservoirs, Dave Van Horn thesis (2008 presentation) specific to nutrient loading, and Kevin Buhl's lab studies for effects of bio-disrupters on minnows
 - It could be a future science work group activity to determine if the Program needs to do any additional fish health or water quality studies/projects.

Action: The Habitat Restoration (HR) work group will need to identify (1) more specific reach planning future activities, (2) future activities in terms of habitat functions regarding monitoring, and (3) incorporate possible future activities as identified in the A&Rs for inclusion in the LTP.

Future ScW Activities: Peer Review of Genetics and/or Rescue Projects.

Future ScW Activities: Analysis on Recruitment Flow Boundary Targets/Numbers (i.e., 3,000 cfs for 7 to 10 days).

Future ScW Activities: Garner water quality recommendations from the ISC/Tetra Tech Water Quality report to determine if any studies or projects would have defined outcomes that would be useful for management or species benefit.

- *HR Future Activities Discussion*
 - In a work group update, it was shared that the work group spent the majority of last year working with and on the Analysis & Recommendations (A&Rs) which are still in process and being evaluated as guidance documents.
 - The HR list of future activities does not address the joint tasks that ScW identified and needs more in terms of reach planning and habitat functions in terms of monitoring. The HR group also needs to incorporate any appropriate A&Rs recommendations into the future activities.
 - Attendees briefly reviewed some of the HR identified future activities. Concerns were raised that there were no HR implementation projects; even place holders for those activities are needed even if the project specifics cannot be identified yet. It was suggested that the HR work group identify 3 potential projects a year to fund for planning or implementation.
 - Tom Pitts cautioned that it appears that most of the work groups have a lot of research emphasis, but for determining compliance, the Service will look to what is being done on the ground in terms of implementation of projects, providing water, etc. Everyone needs to consider how to get to the point of using resources to get projects going and completed to benefit the species as soon as possible. While planning and research is good, it does not get the on-the-ground results that the Service will be basing success on.

Action: The Habitat Restoration (HR) work group will need to identify (1) more specific reach planning future activities, (2) future activities in terms of habitat functions regarding monitoring, and (3) incorporate possible future activities as identified in the A&Rs for inclusion in the LTP.

- *San Acacia Reach (SAR) Future Activities Discussion:*
 - Tiffany Basin Feasibility Study;
 - River Mile (RM) 80 to 89 project;
 - RM 89 to RM 90 river channel transitioning feasibility study;

- Floodplain encroachment; and
- Analysis of San Marcial and San Acacia Reaches.
 - In response to a question regarding replacement of Elephant Butte Reservoir flycatcher territories, it was explained that there is a large flycatcher population in the Elephant Butte delta which is low (and has been low since 2002 or so). As the flows go up and the reservoir capacity is reached, the entire delta area can be flooded and the existing habitat will get drowned out. There needs to be nearby habitat that the flycatchers can easily move into.

Action: The San Acacia Reach (SAR) work group will need to incorporate all FY10 proposed activities on their LTP future activities list.

- *Species Water Management (SWM) Future Activities Discussion:*
 - Soil Moisture Monitoring Project;
 - SWFL Water Needs at Isleta;
 - Continue Riparian Model;
 - Investigate Aquifer Storage – *taken from the recovery action plans;*
 - Investigate Bank Storage – *taken from the recovery action plans;*
 - MRGCD Threshold Analysis;
 - Geomorphic Rehabilitation Projects – *suggested looking through LTP from 1999 or 2000 regarding geomorphic rehabilitation (will need to get the report from Robert Padilla or Drew Baird)*
- *Next Steps*
 - It is envisioned that the list of all future activities will be compiled by the end of this week. That will give the work groups 2 weeks to review, refine, and start setting priorities before the March 4th joint working meeting. The hope is to have an almost final list of future activities for the CC to review and discuss at the March 4th meeting.
 - The activity summaries are wanted as read aheads prior to the April 14th meeting.
 - Other next steps include discussing if the future activities have been listed in the right sections, how to assign the tasks of writing the future activity summaries, how to fill in the other columns in the table, and how to best address duplicate (or near duplicate) activities.
 - It was suggested that prior to the March 4th working meeting, a small subset of the group meet to look at the table to start on the preliminary organization or consolidation; the concern is that if this effort is not started sooner, it won't be manageable during the March 4th meeting.
 - It was cautioned that during the refining and revising process that no item or activity be removed from the table until the activity summaries are available; instead, an item can be flagged or noted for similarity.
 - Attendees briefly discussed when to incorporate possible activities that could be derived from the PHVA modeling process regarding practical, possible, and reasonable water management and flow scenarios. At what point do we start looking at activities that address those modeling results (ex. how to keep the minnow out of jeopardy and

determining what work could be done during the dry years to continue progress toward recovery?).

- The work groups need to consider what activities they could do during the dry years – we need to be prepared in advance for the poor water years. Those activities need to be included in Table 7.0.
- Strategies for wet/dry/average year's predictions need to be thought out; there are expected problems but how is the Program going to address those? While the Program can learn about what types of strategies work or don't, we still will need the Service to provide an idea of what the benchmark is. We need to have some known measure to compare the model results.

Recommendation: It was strongly recommended that the Recovery Plan Priorities be included in the draft Table 7.0 even if the Program wishes to reprioritize activities based on their own priorities.

Recommendation: The CC agreed to use the project titles identified in Attachment 6 as headings or subsections within the future activities list with the work group identified activities listed underneath (in order to keep clear linkage to the recovery plans).

Action: Within the next 2 weeks, the co-chairs of the work groups (lead by ScW, to include HR, PIO, PHVA, PVA, DBMS, SWM, SAR, etc.) will attempt to meet to do several first pass sorting on the compiled future activities list in an attempt to have a start on identifying duplicate activities, overlaps, joint projects, etc.

Action: The PMT, work group co-chairs, and any available CC members will meet on Friday February 26th from 8:30am to noon at Reclamation to begin sorting and editing the future activities table.

Action: Stacey Kopitsch will consult with Lori Robertson about having a Service representative present at the February 26th meeting and the March 4th working meeting to provide input on whether or not future activities are being sorted (categorized) appropriately.

Action: Kathy Dickinson will provide section categories on the SWM, SAR, PIO, and DBMS future activities to Jean Burt.

• Next Meetings

- February 24th SA A&R Peer Review Presentation 9:00am to 12:00 noon at MRGCD.
- February 26th PMT/WG/CC meeting from 8:30am to noon at Reclamation to begin sorting and editing the future activities table.
- March 4th CC/WG/PMT joint working meeting from 10:00am to 4:00pm at Reclamation (remember to pack a lunch!)
 - Once compiled, there will be one single, merged future activities table. It is hoped that the first half of the meeting will be focused on comments/concerns regarding the future activities and the second half of the meeting to be focused on approving the table (with any edits) so the work groups can start developing activities summaries.
 - Other potential discussion items include: (1) FWS (Stacey Kopitsch) to update on status of code of ethics guidelines; (2) status of non-federal updating of non-Program entities list; (3) address how to fill out other columns within the future activities table; (4) determine how to address duplicate future activities; (5) determine how to assign activity description tasks; and (6) peer review discussion.
- March 10th CC Business meeting from 1:00pm to 5:00pm at Reclamation
 - Tentative Agenda items: (1) determine future regular business dates (suggestions are March 31, April 28, May 12 and May 26);

- **Regular CC Business (around 3:00 pm)**

- **LTP Contract Update:** A new task order has been issued to GenQuest to assist with the administrative and editorial portions of the LTP development freeing up Tom to transition into a consultant role.
- **Concerns with EC Read Ahead Materials:** Concerns were expressed that the EC read aheads materials are not appropriate for the executives (ex. bad formatting, in draft form, not appropriate, not necessarily needed, etc.). Part of the concern is that the executives often don't know what needs to be done with the materials provided. There needs to be time between the CC meeting decisions/discussions before being elevated to the EC. In response, it was shared that due to the directives from the EC regarding the LTP schedule and their desire to be involved, the CC and EC meet during the same week and often only 1 day apart making it extremely difficult to provide any materials in advance unless there is a 1 month lag time. Also, the PMT received criticism when material or information not provided Program wide.
 - Suggestions to improve the read aheads included: (1) have follow up emails with bold or colored read heads to indicate those which are decisional or are recommended for printing; (2) to have informational/action/decision included in the title of the read aheads posted to the webpage; or (3) to have 2 separate read ahead sections on the webpage: one for decisions and one for information only.
 - It was suggested that there be further discussion on this topic including how to improve the read ahead formatting.

Decision: With quorum present, the CC decided to have their agendas reformatted to follow the EC agendas with designated decision versus informational items. It was also agreed that the read aheads posted to the website be organized by agenda item and to have two separate read ahead modules: one for decisional items and one for informational items.

Action: Tetra Tech will reformat the CC agenda items to follow the EC agenda format with decisional informational items specifically noted.

- **Approval of San Acacia Reach (SAR) and PHVA Work Group Charters:** There are significant changes to the PHVA charter, most stemming from the fact that the original BA/BO deadlines have been extended.
 - The charter revisions include: (1) recognizing a new BA development schedule with no known ending date and recommendations for the group to continue until the completion; (2) work group member changes; and (3) "BO" was changed to "BOs" since there are separate assessments resulting in 1 programmatic coverage.
 - The PHVA 2010 work plan was modified to: (1) change the group's completion date to March 2011 as a current best understanding of the new BA schedule; (2) Kathy Dickinson is listed at the PMT liaison, replacing Amy Louise; (3) a new work group product was added to document URGWOM used in PVA models as requested; and (4) a new line was added to record the EC approval date.

Decision: With quorum present, the CC recommended the approval of the PHVA/Hydrology ad hoc work group charter and 2010 work plan with the correction of Paul Tashjian's name.

- **SWM's Climate Change Input to URGWOM SOW Update:** MRGCD provided suggestions and comments and ISC addressed those comments. The work group reviewed the revisions and is in agreement to recommend the project for approval. Both SWM and MRGCD are okay with the changes.

Decision: With quorum present, the CC recommended the Climate Change Input to URGWOM SOW move forward in the RFP process for funding this year.

- **Work Group 2009 Accomplishments and 2010 Work Plans:** This topic was tabled since not all work groups have been able to submit their documents. It was noted that the groups that were not able to meet the original deadline were those that did not have PMT liaison support.
- **Status of Deobligated Funds:** The EC will see the financial reports tomorrow; the reports are being used to determine which agencies still have money on the books (for 2007 and earlier). Agencies will be asked to obligate the funds or provide a spending plan by the end of the month.
- **Schedule Regular Upcoming CC Meetings:** Due to the tight schedule for completing the LTP and the fact that regular CC business is expected to take more than 1 hour a month, additional CC meetings to conduct normal business are suggested.
 - The proposed meeting dates are: March 17th, March 31st, April 28th, May 12th, and May 26th.
 - Attendees were reminded that the draft LTP – including narrative and tables – is due by April 14th.

Decision: With quorum present, the CC agreed to meet again on March 10th from 1:00pm to 5:00pm to conduct regular business. The following suggested meetings date for regular CC business meetings will be further agreed upon at the March 10th meeting: March 31, April 28, May 12 and May 26.

▪ **Work Group Updates:**

- **HR:** There are no pressing action items at this time. The group is continuing with evaluating the A&R reports and setting up a TPEC (technical evaluation committee) for the Effectiveness Monitoring Plan (EMP). The RFP may be out as soon as the end of the week.
- **ScW:** The only update from the science meeting yesterday is that they updated and started prioritizing the LTP future activities.
- **SWM:** SWM is working on identifying their future activities and they resolved/updated the Climate Change Input to URGWOM SOW. It was shared that Dr. Bill Lindermin (NMSU) agreed to assist the group with site selection for the soil moisture project. Since a lot of SWM's original tasks have been delegated to the ad hoc work groups, it was suggested that the SWM co-chairs to met with other group chairs (PHVA, SAR, etc.) to try to come up with water management goals and research for the LTP.

Action: Amy Louise will request a co-chair joint meeting lead by SWM to discuss or identify other water management goals and research for the LTP future activities.

- **HR:** Jill Wick has stepped down as HR co-chair. Please encourage your agency's representative to consider filling the co-chair position. HR is proposing the RM 83 project for the FY2010 peer review. The timing is fortunate as there needs to be a contract modification for time and the peer review tasks could be included in the modification.

Action: Yvette McKenna will ask Jericho Lewis if the CC has time enough to discuss peer review contract modifications to the River Mile 83 project at the March 4th or 10th meeting.

- **PVA/PHVA Update:** Jim Wilber updated the group that the PHVA work group has the URGWOM model pretty much calibrated with new policy information included; they are thus ready to begin "kicking out" runs for first use in the consultation process in development of the BA/BO. The PVA process has 2 models that are still in developmental stage. After the last PVA work group meeting, the development

trajectory of the PVA models doesn't match with the ESA BA development consultation schedule. It is being proposed that instead of trying to force the PVA schedules to be developed for analysis in the BA/BA process, we instead let the PVA model go on their development trajectory which is meaningful for the long term, and let the PHVA focus on providing the hydrologic information needed for the ESA consultation. This means disconnect the models for the time being until the PVA gets to the place to allow for meaningful runs on scenarios. Remember that the URGWOM model runs will be available for the PVA models to use at any time they are ready.

- URGWOM has drying information calibrated to a useful level for the BA and the predictions will be useful for the BA/BO analysis.
 - It was shared that Jim Wilber will be stepping down as the lead chair of the PVA group.
 - The next PVA meeting is scheduled for March 3rd and 4th.
- **Next Meeting: March 4th, 2010 from 10:00 am to 4:00 pm at Reclamation; please back a brown bag lunch**

**CC/WG/PMT LTP Meeting Attendees
17 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
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
Susan Kelly	UNM	277-0514	P	skelly@law.unm.edu
Terina Perez	COA	848-7174	A	tlperez@cabq.gov
Ann Moore	NMAGO	222-9024	P	amoore@nmag.gov
Reese Fullerton	SPO	690-3190	O	reese.fullerton@state.nm.us
Ann Watson	Santo Domingo	465-0055	O	awatson@sdutilities.com
Nathan Schroeder	Pueblo of Santa Ana	771-6719	P	nathan.schroeder@santaana-nsn.gov
Tom Pitts	Water Consult	570-667-8692	O	h2orus@waterconsult.com
Matt Schmader	COA/Open Space	452-5200	A	mschmader@cabq.gov
Barbra Portzline	GenQuest	247-1000	O	portzline@genquestinc.com
Jean Burt	GenQuest	247-1000	O	jean.burt@genquestinc.com
Julie Alcon	COE	342-3281	A	julie.a.alcon@usace.army.mil
Julie Maas	ISC	383-4095	O	julie.maas@state.nm.us
Mick Porter	COE	342-3264	O	michael.d.porter@usace.army.mil

Jim Wilber	Reclamation	462-3548	O	jwilber@usbr.gov
Chris Shaw	ISC	383-4054	O	chris.shaw@state.nm.us
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	---	O	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	O	marta.wood@tetrattech.com