

Coordination Committee Meeting
March 4, 2010

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee LTP Meeting
4 March 2010 Meeting – 10:00 AM - 4:00 PM
Bureau of Reclamation

Meeting agenda – 03/04/10 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM; *attendees please remember to bring your lunch with you.*

- Introductions and Agenda Approval
- Approval of 02/17/10 CC meeting summary*
- Action Item Review (see below)
- Review Next Steps
 - The future activities list will be compiled (all inclusive) by Monday, February 22 COB; *completed*
 - 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; *ongoing*
 - 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; *ongoing*
 - Discussions to determine if future activities are categorized in the right sections; *ongoing*
 - 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 (*ongoing*) 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 (*propose to approve list on March 10*);
 - 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.
- LTP Future Activity Development and Discussions (RGSM and SWFL)* - *Break out Groups*
 - Physical Habitat Restoration & Management (Table 7.1)
 - Water Management (Table 7.2)
 - Predator/Non-Native Control (Table 7.3)
 - Population Augmentation/Propagation (RGSM only) (Table 7.4)
 - Water Quality Management (Table 7.5)
 - Research, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management (Table 7.6)
 - Policies and Laws (Table 7.7)
 - Education and Outreach (Table 7.8)
 - Program Management (Table 7.9)
 - BiOp Activities not in Recovery Plans (Table 7.10)
- Past Activities Discussion
- Summarize – Next Steps
- Next CC Meeting: March 10, 1 pm – 5 pm at Reclamation (confirm)

- Upcoming Meetings
 - **March 18, 9 am – 1 pm, EC Meeting at Reclamation**
 - **March 31, 1-4 pm, CC Meeting at Reclamation (confirm)**
 - **April 14, 10 am – 4 pm, working CC Meeting at Reclamation**

*Denotes Read aheads

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 22 COB.

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.

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.

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

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

Decisions

- The CC agreed to a temporary modification in the read ahead policy (to be provided 1 week in advance) and acknowledged that only hard copies of the Revised LTP Table 7 (Future Activities Table) will be provided at the next meeting; electronic read aheads copies of this document will not be available in advance due to time constraints, but all other read aheads will be provided 1 week in advance as usual.
- The CC agreed that the work groups will be provided the direction to focus on sequencing future activities/projects in terms of what needs to be accomplished first and then determining which of those activities could begin in FY11.
- The CC agreed to include as much specificity as possible into the LTP and LTP Tables.
- The CC agreed to attempt to approve the Draft LTP (narrative sections and Table 7) at the April 14th meeting.
- The CC decided that the highest priority (first sequence) future activity summaries will be developed and submitted by April 7th; the remainder future activity summaries (those of lower priority or later in sequence) will be developed and submitted by April 28th.

LTP Recommendations and Suggestions

- It was recommended that there be enough specificity in the LTP Future Activities Table to make it as useable as possible for the analysis and consultation; where it is possible, be as specific as possible to help identify what is going to happen and how it is beneficial.
- It was suggested that an adaptive management narrative be included in the LTP text that clearly defines what is meant by “adaptive management” as a process and cycle.
- It was recommended that any categories in the Future Activities Table remain in even if there are no suggested future activities identified at this point as this could be an indication of a deficiency that the Program will need to address at some point, even if not addressed for several years out.
- It was recommended the CC raise the issue of the lack of flycatcher experts or resources with the EC to make sure they are aware of the resource problem and the potential for delays that could mean a potential modification of the schedule.

Actions

- Jean Burt will add a dash (---) indication to the work group column to the bold/italicized headings in the Future Activities Table to indicate that work groups are not being assigned to the headings.
- The HR work group will add the “development of a system monitoring program” to their FY11 work plan.
- Rick Billings will take the suggestion to use the 2005 flycatcher solicitations (based on Nancy Baczek’s flycatcher information; ex: projects nearest existing territories should be priority and done first) to the HR work group to investigate potential flycatcher language and future projects.
- Stacey Kopitsch will compare the flycatcher categories in the LTP Future Activities Table to the categories and language in the flycatcher recovery plan for (1) accuracy; (2) to identify any recovery plan categories that still need to be included in the LTP table; and (3) to differentiate what of those categories applies to the MRG and what doesn’t. The results of this review are due no later than March 9th in order for GenQuest to be able to include in their revised table due March 10th.

- Once Stacey Kopitsch has compared the flycatcher recovery plan categories to the LTP flycatcher categories, Gina Dello Russo will attempt to populate the 7.1 sections of the Future Activities Table with potential future flycatcher activities.
- Kathy Dickinson will check with Hector Garcia about contributing suggested future flycatcher activities for Section 7.6.
- Yvette McKenna will review and revise Future Activity Section 7.5 (Water Quality) and provide the changes to Jean Burt by Monday, March 8th.
- Kathy Dickinson and Jeanne Dye will provide an electronic copy of the revised Future Activity Section 7.6 (Research, Monitoring, and Adaptive management) to Jean Burt by COB tomorrow (03/05/10).
- Stacey Kopitsch will provide an electronic copy of Future Activity Sections 7.3 and 7.4 (Predator/Non-native Control and Population Augmentation and Propagation) to Jean Burt by COB tomorrow (03/05/10).

Next Steps

- GenQuest will compile all Table 7 changes from today's CC meeting no later than March 9th.
- The CC will meet on March 10th to review the Revised Table 7 sections and approve for distribution to the work groups to begin sequencing projects. Work groups will be provided the approved Revised LTP Table 7 sections on March 10th or 11th.
- Work groups will have until April 7th to sequence their respective project in terms of what needs to be done first and what could be feasibly started in FY11. Once identified, activity summary descriptions will need to be drafted for each FY11 (or priority projects) identified activity. Activity descriptions on the priority future projects are expected for CC review on April 14th. The remainder of the activity summaries (those in lower priority or sequence) will be developed and submitted by April 28th.
- The Draft LTP target date remains April 30th.

Upcoming Meetings

- 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) review newest hard copy of revised Table 7.0 to approve sections to release to work groups for starting on sequencing, prioritizing, and activity summaries;
 - Work group chairs are not required at this meeting.
- March 18th EC Meeting from 9:00am to 1:00pm at Reclamation
- March 31st CC regular business Meeting from 1:00pm to 4:00pm at Reclamation – plan to review and finalize remainder of Table 7 sections for release to the work groups
- April 14th CC/WG/PMT working meeting from 10:00am to 4:00pm at Reclamation – review activity summaries

March 4th, 2010 CC/WG/PMT Meeting Summary

- **Introductions and Agenda Approval:** Amy Louise brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was briefly reviewed and approved with no changes.
- **Approval of 02/03/10 Meeting Summary:** The February 17th, 2010 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.

• **February 17th Action Item Review:**

- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
- 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. – *in progress; ongoing*;
- ✓ Reclamation will work with the tribes to clarify and discuss options on different cost sharing scenarios. – *complete*;
 - The answer provided was “no, they are basically separate.”
- 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. – *unknown status*;
 - It was suggested that a starting point could be for each non-federal agency to develop a list of their known non-Program entities and associates as a first step.
- Susan Bittick will send past activities to Jericho Lewis and Yvette McKenna. – *not complete*;
- Susan Bittick will provide the DBMS charter and FY10 work plan to the CC for review and consideration. – *not complete*;
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
 - Debrah Hill has limited time. Reclamation is exploring using the Denver tech center as well.
- 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. – *in progress*;
- ✓ The San Acacia Reach (SAR) work group will need to incorporate all FY10 proposed activities on their LTP future activities list. – *complete*;
- ✓ Kathy Dickinson will provide section categories on the SWM, SAR, PIO, and DBMS future activities to Jean Burt. – *complete*;
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;

- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
 - After there is input on the recovery plan elements from today’s meeting discussions, Jean will be able to move the activities under the appropriate bolded italicized headings
 - The table, built using the draft recovery plan, needs to be updated to reflect the actual language, titles, and sequencing used in the final recovery plan. GenQuest will compare the table to the final recovery plan to make sure the bolded categories number, language, and priorities are still consistent or correct them as needed. The next version of LTP Table 7 will be updated to reflect the final recovery plan.
- ✓ Tetra Tech will reformat the CC agenda items to follow the EC agenda format with decisional informational items specifically noted. – *complete*;
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
 - There are still work group proposals that might be included- like peer review and presentations –into the modified, expanding contract. But the River Mile 83 Project is not ready for presentation to the CC until April at the earliest.
- **Review Next Steps:**
 - ✓ The future activities list will be compiled (all inclusive) by Monday, February 22 COB; *completed*;
 - 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; *ongoing*;
 - 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; *ongoing*;
 - Discussions to determine if future activities are categorized in the right sections; *ongoing*;
 - 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 (*ongoing*) 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 (*propose to approve list on March 10*);
 - It was shared that between today’s meeting and March 10th there won’t be enough time to implement suggested changes to the table and have another revised table available as a read ahead. Instead, the revised table could be provided as *hard copy only* at next Wednesday’s meeting. The CC could then be appraised of the revisions made during the meeting.

Decision: The CC agreed to a temporary modification in the read ahead policy (to be provided 1 week in advance) and acknowledged that only hard copies of the Revised LTP Table 7 (Future Activities Table) will be provided at the next meeting; electronic read aheads copies of this document will not be available in advance due to time constraints, but all other read aheads will be provided 1 week in advance as usual.

- Once the Table 7 is finalized by the CC, the work groups will need to consider meeting extra times to meet the review cycles being imposed. They will have to prioritize activities, identify ongoing projects, and begin to develop the activity summaries.
- The CC discussed potential prioritization that could be applied to the future activities including: short vs. longer-term or high, medium, and low need for the species. These would result in 2 different sets of priorities. Suggested ideas included:
 - Time-sequence – based on the strict deadlines and the limited resources, have the work groups move forward with FY11 activities first;
 - Have the work groups identify their #1 priority project needed; especially for the new activities and studies there has to be consideration of what are the steps that has to happen first and what could feasibly occur in FY11.
 - Have the work groups assign a starting fiscal year to projects.
 - Have the work groups set sequencing on what has to happen 1st, 2nd, 3rd, etc. It was cautioned that if this option was agreed upon, the EC would need to be kept informed and up-to-date on the extended 3-4 year commitment period they would be setting in motion.

Decision: The CC agreed that the work groups will be provided the direction to focus on sequencing future activities/projects in terms of what needs to be accomplished first and then determining which of those activities could begin in FY11.

- Attendees discussed the need to identify and incorporate Operations & Maintenance (O&M) activities into the table; O&M is currently included under broad projects such as “General HR O&M” and O&M is in the table by facility as well. Concern was raised that O&M at the specific project level is not identified for future projects (i.e., for all applicable future projects, there should be activities to identify and then carry out all O&M actions) as the purpose is to allow the Service to clearly see all the specific things being done to benefit the species – ongoing O&M is very significant.
 - It is not a given that O&M will be an annual activity for every single HR project. Not all project sponsors request O&M following completion of the project.
 - For tribal that have submitted O&M requests, those will be specifically captured in the table. In some cases, it could be on a yearly request basis and in others situations it could be multi-year requests.
 - Regarding the tribes, much O&M is taking place that is not necessarily being funded through the Program. This is another element involving non-Program funded activities that needs to be included.
 - It was recommended that there be enough specificity in the LTP Future Activities Table to make it as useable as possible for the analysis and consultation; where it is possible, be as specific as possible to help identify what is going to happen and how it is beneficial.

Decision: The CC agreed to include as much specificity as possible into the LTP and LTP Tables.

- 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.
ongoing;
 - Concern was raised that the LTP development is getting wrapped up with the FY11 budgeting process instead of the 5 to 7 year plan – which may not coincide with the FY11 budgeting.
 - Read aheads for the April 14th CC meeting are due on April 7th; there is a scheduling concern because the work groups only meeting once a month. The CC discussed the deadlines for the development of the future activity summaries.
 - The CC will meet on March 10th to review the Revised Table 7 sections and approve for distribution to the work groups to begin sequencing projects. Work groups will be provided the approved Revised LTP Table 7 sections on March 10th or 11th.
 - Work groups will have until April 7th to sequence their respective project in terms of what needs to be done first and what could be feasibly started in FY11. Once identified, activity summary descriptions will need to be drafted for each FY11 (or priority projects) identified activity. Activity descriptions on the priority future projects are expected for CC review on April 14th. The remainder of the activity summaries (those in lower priority or sequence) will be developed and submitted by April 28th.
 - The LTP will be reviewed annually and will be updated based on funding, on-the-ground progress, and the results of studies and monitoring. Based on their focus and expertise, the work groups need to identify what they think needs to happen under the activity categories for the next 5 to 7 years. We are asking them for a “best guess.”
 - However, all proposed activities for those 5 to 7 years are supposed to have activity summaries developed. Realistically, there needs to be direction on which the work groups are to work on first because it is not feasible to have all of them done right now.
 - The CC discussed using the final recovery plans as the tool/template for developing the LTP and making sure benchmarks in the plans are captured and considered while determining future projects.

Decision: The CC decided that the highest priority (first sequence) future activity summaries will be developed and submitted by April 7th; the remainder future activity summaries (those of lower priority or later in sequence) will be developed and submitted by April 28th.

- **LTP Future Activity Development and Discussions – Break Out Groups**

- In the next portion of the meeting, attendees were asked to break out into 5 separate small working groups to review the future activity table to (1) identify duplicate projects; (2) verify projects are listed under the correct category and move as necessary; (3) assign the appropriate recovery plan number; (4) identify and/or correct lead work group assignment; (5) where possible identify lead implementing entity; (6) identify recovery plan element or sub-element; (7) when possible, propose or suggest possible future activities for the bold italicized headings that do not currently have any projects listed underneath; and (8) where possible, fill in any other piece of project specific information. Attendees were reminded that the current table *does not reflect the final minnow recovery plan categories*.

Action: Jean Burt will add a dash (---) indication to the work group column to the bold/italicized headings in the Future Activities Table to indicate that work groups are not being assigned to the headings.

- The CC then discussed the question of where adaptive management should be included in the LTP and whether or not individual adaptive management activities needed to be specifically identified and listed under multiple sections or if combining all adaptive management into one section was more appropriate.
 - Benefits to having individual adaptive management activities listed is (1) it makes the link to the specific project clearer; (2) there is adaptive management scale considerations (i.e., specific project versus system wide); and (3) there are different time frames, different actions, etc. for different pieces of adaptive management. But as long as the content is captured and described, actual placement in the table becomes a judgment call.
 - Attendees also discussed the concern that adaptive management is really a process and cycle of if/then/else responses and not really *fundable activities* except from the perspective of plan development and evaluation.
 - It was suggested that an adaptive management narrative be included in the LTP text that clearly defines what is meant by “adaptive management” as a process and cycle; it was also recommended that the specifics be included in the table as well. The specific adaptive management activities could include (1) line items of evaluation of effectiveness of actions and (2) staff time for data assessment and project review and evaluation.
- **Summary and Report Out from Break Out Groups:**
 - Participants in the break out sessions reconvened as a large group to report back on the progress made. Below are summaries of the report outs. The actual break out group changes were recorded on hard copies of the table and provided to GenQuest.
 - **Table 7.1 Physical Habitat Restoration and Management Break Out Group:**
participants: Susan Bittick, Rick Billings, and Tom Pitts to start.
 - Projects were reviewed and reassigned as necessary. Where possible, the group filled in as much information in the table. Only 7.1.A was reviewed (not 7.1.B or 7.1.C). This was in part due to time constraints as well as not having flycatcher expertise to be comfortable suggesting or making changes.
 - **Table 7.2 & Table 7.5 Water Management and Water Quality Management Break Out session:** *Participants: Amy Louise, Susan Kelly, and Tom Pitts toward the end.*
 - Elements were assigned and crossed-checked within the table. Only 7.2 was reviewed, not 7.5.
 - Participants felt that many, if not most, of water activities are applicable to both multiple species. However, to move projects to the “multispecies” category would leave no indication of activities listed in the individual species categories. It was suggested that a reference to “see activity” be listed for cross projects (i.e., include the actual project in the multispecies category but put references under the minnow and flycatcher categories to direct readers to where the project details could be found). In conjunction, include references to both recovery plans elements in the RPE column (Column I).

- **Table 7.3 & Table 7.4 Predator/Non-native Control and Population Augmentation and Propagation:** *Participants: Stacey Kopitsch, Jen Bachus, Brian Gleadle*
 - Both Tables 7.3 and 7.4 were completely reviewed. Categories and heading were corrected and reorganized as needed, projects were reorganized as appropriate, . There were several questions the break out group had for the larger group including (1) clarification on the federal and non-federal “technical support activity; (2)
 - It was explained that the technical support activity is to capture cost share and man-hours involved in writing scopes and summaries, reviewing deliverables, etc. The original intent was to have these activities listed under all LTP categories but the CC agreed that instead of having technical support listed under every single project, a new subsection under Table 7.9 (Program Management) be created. Table 7.9.3 will include “Program participation” with indented activities for technical, administrative, and managerial tasks.
 - The CC approved the changing of the title of Table 7.4 to “Population Propagation/Augmentation/Reintroduction.”
 - There were certain activities identified (ex. Table 7.4, line 48) where the lead work group is not a Program work group. The Captive Propagation group does have Program participants but is not a Program group. To address this, it was suggested that dashes or NA be listed under the lead work group and the implementing entity should be assigned to FWS.
 - Since there is a new subsection under Table 7.9 to capture Program participation, it was suggested that the reintroduction biologist be included there instead of having a separate reintroduction category.
 - The CC discussed the lack of flycatcher expertise and the need for experts to be involved in the development of the table and future activities. Reclamation’s flycatcher expert from Denver can’t assist in recommending activities but might be of assistance later in the scope development process. The Service’s flycatcher expert can’t get involved in the Program at this time due to existing work load. However, the input is that a more evenly distributed flycatcher population in the MRG is the number one priority; any activities that would contribute to establishing flycatchers in other places should be priority.
 - It was recommended the CC raise the issue of the lack of flycatcher experts or resources with the EC to make sure they are aware of the resource problem and the potential for delays (in completing the flycatcher portions of the LTP) that could mean a potential modification of the schedule.
 - It was recommended that any categories in the Future Activities Table remain in even if there are no suggested future activities identified at this point as this could be an indication of a deficiency that the Program will need to address at some point, even if not addressed for several years out. Categories can also be omitted later if/when the Service concurs that it doesn’t apply to the MRG and can thus be taken out.

Action: Rick Billings will take the suggestion to use the 2005 flycatcher solicitations (based on Nancy Baczek’s flycatcher information; ex: projects nearest existing territories should be priority and done first) to the HR work group to investigate potential flycatcher language and future projects.

Action: Stacey Kopitsch will compare the flycatcher categories in the LTP Future Activities Table to the categories and language in the flycatcher recovery plan for (1) accuracy; (2) to identify any recovery plan categories that still need to be included in the LTP table; and (3) to differentiate what of those categories applies to the MRG and what doesn't. The results of this review are due no later than March 9th in order for GenQuest to be able to include in their revised table due March 10th.

Action: Once Stacey Kopitsch has compared the flycatcher recovery plan categories to the LTP flycatcher categories, Gina Dello Russo will attempt to populate the 7.1 sections of the Future Activities Table with potential future flycatcher activities.

Action: Kathy Dickinson will check with Hector Garcia about contributing suggested future flycatcher activities for Section 7.6.

- **Table 7.6 Research, Monitoring, and Adaptive Management:** *Participants: Kathy Dickinson, Gina Dello Russo, Jeanne Dye, Nathan Schroeder, and Jean Burt.*
 - The minnow portion of Table 7.6 was completely reviewed but only the first few items of C were discussed because there wasn't a flycatcher expert in attendance to compare the flycatcher projects with the recovery plan. The group did attempt to consolidate and assign recovery plan elements where possible.
 - The group continued the adaptive management discussion and reorganized a lot of activities to other, more appropriate categories. There will continue to be reorganization of the activities once the activity summaries are available.
 - The peer review projects and potential candidates and database projects were moved under Program Assessment (Table 7.9.2 and 7.9.1, respectively).
- **Table 7.7, 7.8, 7.9 Policy & Laws; Education & Outreach; and Program Management:** *Participants: Yvette McKenna, Julie Maas, and Ann Moore.*
 - The group reviewed their sections and filled in categories as much as possible, corrected or updated language,
 - It was identified that in several places, only one or the other (the flycatcher or minnow) recovery plan elements have been identified but the policies are applicable to both species so the recovery plan elements need to be updated to include both.
 - It was suggested that the land ownership issues and restrictions be addressed or reviewed in the LTP narrative. For example, the Corps or Reclamation may be a lead implementing agency there are land ownership considerations that impact the project.
 - In Table 7.7, project "Establish policies that limit floodplain development and educate the public on the need to limit such development" it was suggested the language be changed from "establish" to "advocate" or "promote" to better capture agency roles and responsibilities.
 - The group also discussed the role of the Public Information and Outreach (PIO) work group – while PIO may be the most appropriate lead work group in many of the education and outreach tasks, there is also the need to have the other specific project lead work groups supply necessary information in order for PIO to be successful. The Program needs to make a conscious effort at all levels to make sure PIO stays informed and up-to-date on activities.

- At the conclusion of the break out group recaps, the CC discussed the next steps and scheduling of the current LTP development activities.
- The hard copy tracked table revisions from each break out group were given to Jean either at the conclusion of the meeting or were to be electronically submitted no later than Monday; please provide a contact name and number on the submitted copies for GenQuest in case clarification is needed. GenQuest is obligated to incorporate the revisions and provide the updated table by March 9th.

Action: Yvette McKenna will review and revise Future Activity Section 7.5 (Water Quality) and provide the changes to Jean Burt by Monday, March 8th.

Action: Kathy Dickinson and Jeanne Dye will provide an electronic copy of the revised Future Activity Section 7.6 (Research, Monitoring, and Adaptive management) to Jean Burt by COB tomorrow (03/05/10).

Action: Stacey Kopitsch will provide an electronic copy of Future Activity Sections 7.3 and 7.4 (Predator/Non-native Control and Population Augmentation and Propagation) to Jean Burt by COB tomorrow (03/05/10).

- **Past Activities Discussion**

- GenQuest is currently working developing the past activity summaries. They will be subcontracting with Tetra Tech to provide additional support and review before the summaries are submitted to Reclamation.
- The only work the Program should need to do with the past activity summaries is to review for accuracy.

- **Upcoming Meetings**

- 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) review newest hard copy of revised Table 7.0 to approve sections to release to work groups for starting on sequencing, prioritizing, and activity summaries;
 - Work group chairs are not required at this meeting.
- March 18th EC Meeting from 9:00am to 1:00pm at Reclamation
- March 31st CC regular business Meeting from 1:00pm to 4:00pm at Reclamation – plan to review and finalize remainder of Table 7 sections for release to the work groups
- April 14th CC/WG/PMT working meeting from 10:00am to 4:00pm at Reclamation – review activity summaries

**CC/WG/PMT LTP Meeting Attendees
4 March 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
Kathy Dickinson	Reclamation	462-3555	O	kdickinson@usbr.gov
Lori Robertson	FWS	761-4710	P	lori_robertson@fws.gov
Jennifer Bachus	FWS	761-4714	O	Jennifer_bachus@fws.gov
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
Ann Moore	NMAGO	222-9024	P	amoore@nmag.gov
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
Gina Dello Russo	FWS – BDP	575-835-1828	O	gina_dellorusso@fws.gov
Jean Burt	GenQuest	247-1000	O	jean.burt@genquestinc.com
Julie Maas	ISC	383-4095	O	julie.maas@state.nm.us
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	761-4737	O	stacey_kopitsch@FWS.gov
Jenae Maestas	GenQuest	462-3600	O	jmaestas@ucbr.gov
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	O	marta.wood@tetrattech.com