

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Science Work Group Meeting

16 March 2010 Meeting – 9:00 AM-11:30 AM

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Albuquerque, NM

Decision

- The revised version of the February 16th meeting notes were approved with no changes.

Actions

- Douglas Tave will check with Linda about scheduling a standing conference room at ISC for the 3rd Tuesday of every month, from 9:00am to 4:00pm to accommodate the Science (ScW), Monitoring Plan Team (MPT), and Habitat Restoration (HR) work groups (maximum size estimated to be about 20 participants for any given meeting).
- By the first of next week, Douglas Tave will inform Jeanne Dye and science members if a regular meeting room is available at ISC to accommodate the ScW, HR, and MPT work groups.
- If a meeting room at ISC is not available for the monthly ScW, HR, and MPT work groups, then Jeanne Dye will look into scheduling a conference room at Reclamation. If neither is available, the regular monthly meetings will revert back to the Corps.
- Stacy Kopitsch will send the FWS peer review website links to Tetra Tech for inclusion in the notes.
- Jeanne Dye will confirm the April 6th 8:00am to 10:30am Community Sampling/Gear Evaluation presentation with the contractor(s).
- ScW members are to review the remaining science activities in the future activities table; changes are to be tracked in an electronic copy using highlighting to capture those changes and send to Stacey Kopitsch by next week for compilation.
- Terina Perez will send out an email about changing the times of the Propagation meeting scheduled for March 30th at 1:00pm at Jason Remshardt's office.

Meeting Summary

- Terina Perez brought the meeting to order. The agenda was approved with the additions of (1) review of the draft scientific code of conduct and (2) the election of a new non-federal co-chair scheduled for April.
- The work group then discussed changing the regularly scheduled meeting locations. The intent is to have ScW and HR meet on the same day in the same building to allow for joint interactions as necessary and the MPT meets between those work groups to accommodate members who are active in more than one group. A change in meeting location would require approval from both HR and MPT. ISC has several new conference rooms at their new building on San Antonio. Members agreed to change the meeting location permanently to ISC if the conference space can accommodate the schedule.
- The revised version of the February 16th meeting notes were approved with no changes.
- All the February 16th action items were completed.
- In the Program Update, Yvette McKenna shared that the EC will be meeting this Thursday, March 18th. The EC agenda includes (1) approving available updated work group charters, work plans, and accomplishment documents; any of the work group documents not yet ready will be reviewed and approved at a future meetings; (2) status on the peer review report with the decision to treat the peer review as an auxiliary document to the final A&R that will be posted on a

password protected page on the website; (3) updates on fish passage; (4) updates on the recovery plan including an update on status of the species; (5) update on the non-federal congressional trip to Washington, D.C. scheduled for March 22nd through the 24th; and (6) updates on adaptive management (the CC will be reviewing the draft scope and provide comments by March 24th).

- The work group scheduled a special meeting on Tuesday April 6th from 8:00am to 10:30am at the Corps for a Community Sampling/Gear Evaluation presentation.
- Attendees discussed the co-chair positions. The terms have been staggered by 6 months so that the federal co-chair changes in the fall while the non-federal co-chair is scheduled for renewal or replacement in the spring. Terina Perez volunteered to continue in the co-chair position for another year unless another volunteer can be found at next month's meeting.
- The scientific code of conduct for the Program was adapted from the ethics chapter of the FWS code of conduct and is intended as a guideline for Program document review. The draft scientific code of conduct was presented at the last CC and has been distributed to work group members for review and comments. Comments are due to Stacey Kopitsch by March 24th.
- In an update on the revised LTP Table 7, Yvette McKenna, Interim Program Manager, explained the newest revisions to the table that was distributed to all work group members as an attachment in an email sent yesterday afternoon. Changes include: (1) lead work groups were assigned to each project; (2) bolded italicized categories in the original table were based on the *draft* recovery plan but are still being compared to the final recovery plan for accuracy and consistency - some additional changes or corrections are still being found; (3) some of those category changes made by the PMT have been shaded in gray in the revised table; (4) for bolded italicized projects (from recovery plan) that did not have specific activities identified underneath, the PMT reviewed to determine if the category was itself specific enough to be considered an activity; if appropriate, the category was assigned a lead work group but the project will remain bolded and italicized font to signify it is a category heading from the recovery plan but a project too; and (5) flycatcher information provided by Reclamation's Denver flycatcher expert has been incorporated into the table.
 - Representatives from the Service have volunteered to tackle the flycatcher sections including assigning priorities. Suggested participants include Deborah Hill (FWS), Daryl (BOR), Peter Walker (NMDGF), Jen Bachus (FWS), Stacey Kopitsch (FWS), and Ondrea Hummel (COE). However everyone interested is invited to assist in the effort.
 - In order to brief the CC at their March 31st meeting, the list of work group priorities is due by March 24th. At that time, an extension can be requested if the work groups are unable to meet the deadline of having activity summaries available by April 7th as a read ahead for the April 14th CC/Work Group/PMT working meeting. Even with extension, the intent is to have the draft activity summaries available for review by the April 14th meeting.
- In a working session the science work group reviewed the LTP Table 7 activities assigned to ScW starting with those assigned a Recovery Plan (RP) Priority 1. The first RP Priority 1 for ScW is found in Table 7.4 Population Propagation/Augmentation/Reintroduction. Participants only worked through activities in Table 7.4. Changes were tracked directly on an electronic copy of the table.
 - Since only one section of the table was reviewed for prioritization, the work group assigned a home work review for members to go through ScW projects and assign a recommended priority (please also complete Column L & M and correct anything else identified). Members are asked use highlighting to track changes on an electronic copy of the table and send to Stacey Kopitsch by March 24th to compile and develop the list of

ranked projects. Stacey will distribute the priority list to members by March 26th for the members to begin working on the activity summaries. Remember that FWS will lead the completion and prioritization of the flycatcher pieces.

Next ScW Meeting April 20th, 2010 from 9:00 am to 11:30 am Location Tentatively ISC

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Science Work Group Meeting

16 March 2010 Meeting – 9:00 AM-11:30 AM

U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, Albuquerque, NM

Introductions and Agenda Approval

- Terina Perez called the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was approved with the additions of (1) a review of the draft scientific code of conduct and (2) the April (spring) election of non-federal co-chair.
- The work group then discussed changing the regularly scheduled meeting locations. The intent is to have ScW and HR meet on the same day in the same building to allow for joint interactions as necessary and the MPT meets between those work groups to accommodate members who are active in more than one group. A change in meeting location would require approval from both HR and MTP. ISC has several new conference rooms at their new building on San Antonio. Members agreed to change the meeting location permanently to ISC if the conference space can accommodate the schedule.

Action: Douglas Tave will check with Linda about scheduling a standing conference room at ISC for the 3rd Tuesday of every month, from 9:00am to 4:00pm to accommodate the Science (ScW), Monitoring Plan Team (MPT), and Habitat Restoration (HR) work groups (maximum size estimated to be about 20 participants for any given meeting).

Announcements

- Terina Perez announced that she will be changing her name back to Niskanen.
- The Propagation Meeting has been scheduled for March 30th at 1:00pm at Jason Remshardt's office (Singer and Commerce).

Approval 02/16/10 meeting notes

- The revised version of the February 16th meeting notes were approved with no changes.

February 16th Action Item Review (see below)

- Terina Perez will contact Jason Remshardt regarding work group suggestions for his analysis of VIE/PIT tag data. – *complete*;
 - This topic was discussed at the last meeting; Jason was going check if there was potential for another study but there is still not enough fish of the correct size to maximize survival.
- Terina Perez will contact Jeanne Dye to schedule a room at Reclamation for the next ScW meeting. – *complete*;
 - Please see the above work group discussion about relocating meetings to ISC, if the space is available. Douglas Tave will follow up with ISC and inform the ScW group know if the space is available; if not, he will let Jeanne Dye know to check into scheduling a conference room for all day at Reclamation. Attendees agreed that if neither is available, the meeting location will remain at COE.

Action: By the first of next week, Douglas Tave will inform Jeanne Dye and science members if a regular meeting room is available at ISC to accommodate the ScW, HR, and MPT work groups.

Action: If a meeting room at ISC is not available for the monthly ScW, HR, and MPT work groups, then Jeanne Dye will look into scheduling a conference room at Reclamation. If neither is available, the regular monthly meetings will revert back to the Corps.

Program update

- *EC Update* – The Executive Committee (EC) will be meeting this Thursday. They will be discussing a lot of “regular business” including the approval of work group charters, accomplishments, and 2010 work plans. The EC will be briefed on (1) the recovery plan including an update on status of the species; (2) on the non-federal trip to Washington, D.C.; (3) adaptive management – a scope has been drafted for the CC to review and provide comments by March 24th; (4) revised LTP development – the process is still moving forward but there remains a lot of work still to be done for the table of future activities and the past activity summaries are taking a while; and (5) Kathy Dickinson will be giving an update on the SA fish passage. They will also be discussing the status on the peer review report with the decision to treat the peer review as an auxiliary document to the final A&R under a password protected page on the website. The next peer review will be conducted during a draft stage in order to include recommendations into the final reports.
 - All work groups will be able to propose potential projects for peer review. The peer review process is funded through an ID/IQ so it can be relatively efficient. There are different report templates available for different types of peer review.
 - Most ScW projects did have peer review time accounted for in their initial contracts. The FWS link to the peer review process as discussed at the meeting is:
http://www.fws.gov/informationquality/peer_review/
 - Under the "checklist" link on the website is where the different types of peer reviews are listed: Panel; Individual letters; National Academy of Sciences review; or Other procedure approved by OMB.
- *CC Update* – The Coordination Committee (CC) has been very focused on the revised LTP. They will be greatly involved in the adaptive management process as well. The next working LTP meeting is scheduled for April 14th from 10:00am to 4:00pm – it is hoped that there will be maximum participation. Beginning in May, the CC and EC meeting schedules become more staggered. There is a regular CC business meeting on March 31st.

Special Meeting for Community Sampling/Gear Evaluation presentation (tentative Tuesday April 6)

- The draft design is scheduled to be presented on April 6th; this is an extra ScW meeting regarding this project.
- It was suggested the presentation start at 8:00am in order to accommodate member's schedules. Mick Porter scheduled a meeting room at the Corps for this presentation meeting from 8:00am to 10:30am in the main conference room (119).

Action: Jeanne Dye will confirm the April 6th 8:00am to 10:30am presentation with the contractor(s).

Non-Federal Co-chair

- It was explained that ScW co-chair terms have been staggered so that one chair is due for elections (or reelection) in the spring while the other position is offset by 6 months (due for election or reelection in the fall) to allow for overlap and smoother transitions.
- Work group expressed thanks for the work Terina Perez has done as the co-chair. Terina Perez volunteered to continue in the co-chair position for another year unless another volunteer can be found at next month's meeting.

Review of Scientific Code of Conduct

- The CC has been discussing the need for a Program scientific code of conduct to help guide product and deliverable review. Stacey Kopitsch drafted a scientific code of conduct document that was

adapted from the FWS ethics chapter with guidelines on documents review. Comments on the code of conduct draft are due to Stacey no later than March 24th in order to be presented to the CC for recommendation for EC approval.

Review of Revised Draft LTP future Activities List

- Yvette McKenna, Interim Program Manager, shared that the CC and PMT have been meeting frequently to continue development of the Revised Long-Term Plan (LTP). She then explained the newest revisions to the Future Activities Table (Table 7.0) that was distributed to all work group members as an attachment in an email sent yesterday afternoon.
 - The PMT has been working to fill in as many of the columns in the table as possible. They focused on assigning lead work groups to each project to assist work groups in being able to sort through the table based on their own activities.
 - The work groups were advised to “sort” or “organize” future projects into short, medium, and long-term projects and then further prioritize those in order to begin drafting the activity summaries with a focus on the top priorities first.
 - The Coordination Committee (CC) agreed that a Priority Ranking 1 would be projects to be completed in FY11, FY12, and FY13; a Priority 2 is for targeted project completion in FY14, FY15, and FY16; and a Priority 3 is for longer-term projects from FY17 to FY20 and beyond.
 - While this task is very overwhelming considering the expected timeframes for LTP completion, as duplicates and proper sequencing are found/determined there is the chance that some of the projects may drop out leaving only a few that need to be addressed in the LTP right away.
 - The numerical priorities were attached to an email sent last Friday as well as yesterday’s email with the attached revised Table 7.
 - The bolded italicized categories in the original table were based on the *draft* recovery plan. GenQuest has compared the table categories to the final recovery plan for accuracy and consistency but some additional changes or corrections are still being found. Some of those category changes made by the PMT have been shaded in gray in the revised table.
 - For bolded italicized projects (from recovery plan) that did not have specific activities identified underneath, the PMT reviewed to determine if the category was itself specific enough to be considered an activity. If appropriate, the category was assigned a lead work group but the project will remain bolded and italicized font to signify it is a category heading from the recovery plan but a project too.
 - The PMT now trying to populate the rest of the columns as best as possible.
 - It was suggested that the work groups could use Columns L & M to help identify if a project is near term (higher priority) or farther off.
 - It was suggested that work groups could begin the prioritizing process by filling in Column E first and then assign a 1, 2, or 3 ranking and sorting to see what falls out as priority.
 - The work groups will have a month to complete the full task of prioritizing and drafting activity summaries; however, the project rankings are due to PMT members no later than March 24th.
 - It was suggested that unfinished ranking can be assigned as “home work” for work group members (if needed). All rankings can be forwarded to the PMT member for compilation and determination of Priority 1 activities that will need activity summaries developed first.

- In order to brief the CC at their March 31st meeting, the list of work group priorities is due by March 24th. At that time, an extension can be requested if the work groups are unable to meet the deadline of having activity summaries available by April 7th as a read ahead for the April 14th CC/Work Group/PMT working meeting. Even with extension, the intent is to have the draft activity summaries available for review by the April 14th meeting. Other changes to the revised table include incorporation of flycatcher information provided by Reclamation's Denver flycatcher experts. Representatives from the Service have volunteered to tackle the flycatcher sections including assigning priorities. However everyone interested is invited to assist in the effort. The following persons were identified:
 - The work group was encouraged to please continue to cross-checking the activities described in the LTP table with the final recovery plan activities. (Note that the Recovery Plan number is referred to as the Recovery Plan Element in the table).
 - Representatives from the Service have volunteered to tackle the flycatcher sections including assigning priorities. Suggested participants include Debra Hill (FWS), Daryl (BOR), Peter Walker (NMDGF), Jen Bachus (FWS), Stacey Kopitsch (FWS), and Ondrea Hummel (COE). However everyone interested is invited to assist in the effort.
 - The remainder of the meeting was focused on prioritizing and ranking only the identified ScW lead projects. The work group discussed how to approach the project prioritization and some of the missing components in the table (such as recovery plan elements not filled in, titles in different areas with different recovery plan priorities, etc.). Please note that the actual changes to the table were tracked on an electronic copy of the table; these text notes capture some but not all of the discussion surrounding those changes.
 - Work group decided to “sort” projects by the recovery plan priority 1 in the recovery plan priority column. There is a separate category – multispecies - for activities that benefit both species. For manageability, could go through by table tab (ex. 7.1) to assign numerical score first. The first Recovery Plan Priority 1 for the minnow is found on table 7.4 Population Propagation/Augmentation/Reintroduction.
 - All monitoring projects need to be considered a priority “1.” Attendees discussed how there will be differing opinions on some of the on-going activities and how to differentiated legal obligations versus projects essential for moving forward.
 - Original Line 15, pg 1, identify relationships between quality, habitat conditions, spatial (carrying capacity/density): the work group discussed concerns raised regarding habitat “units” and how to garner habitat units from the URGWOM outputs (cfs are not habitat units; habitat units are in terms of area or depth and velocity). Part of the intent is to establish how different flow levels create different habitat using the PVA. There needs to be an understanding of how the PVA is interfacing with habitat.
 - It is hoped that this concern can be better addressed by the end of summer. It was suggested this concern (that the units aren't correct) could be noted and raised to the PVA or CC (since they look at projects).
 - It was suggested that the activity summary could be used to identify work that needs to be done.
- Review of 7.4.A.1 and 7.4.A.2
 - Original Line 7, pg 17: the work group discussed needing to add a project for genetic monitoring (under Line 7 on pg 17). Genetic monitoring is a Priority 1; the genetic

studies other than monitoring are a Priority 2. There was discussion of needing to compare to the recovery plan for context.

- Original Line 11, peer review of any genetics reports:
 - The work group discussed whether or not to include Line 11 (peer review) as part of Line 8 to make sure it is properly included. It was suggested that it be assigned a Priority 1 and then have the project specifics listed out in the activity summary.
- Original Line 14, develop larval fish key: was assigned a Priority 1 since this work has already been started.
- Original Line 15, efficacy of marking methods: attendees discussed needing more information regarding this topic. Jason Remshardt has briefly mentioned a possible additional project on potential tracking for cross-generations.
- Original Line 16, determine the role of environmental parameters in sex determination: attendees discussed needing qualifiers for “environmental parameters.” It was suggested that the phrase be replaced with “endocrine disruptors” instead.
 - The work group added 2 line items for specific projects under Original Line 16 to specify the specific projects that are related, but different, to those listed on page 19 Line 14. The work group discussed project titles and while lab studies are nice (reference to second part of Kevin Buhl’s recent project) they do not necessarily impact the fish in the river to the same degree. A pilot project is needed to determine if it is something to worry about and what the sensitivities might be. The 2 new projects were assigned to the ScW work group and given a Priority 1 and 2, respectively.
- Original Line 17 (new Line 19), rate of development and hatching: the work group discussed how this project would help the Program to move toward recovery. In terms of hatching success rate, no one gets enough eggs to get useful estimates.
 - It was suggested the activity summary expand the description with language similar to: “...based on other eggs studies there is concern with collecting representative samples. Until other studies reach that point to get a good cross section of identifiable units for study, this study can’t be done with confidence in applying the results.”
 - Some of the work will have to be lab supported or collected in a controlled environment. Hatching success under *what* conditions?
 - **Question:** What aspect of life history is this project looking at and why?
 - **Response:** Several questions could be addressed; such as (1) how long flows need to be maintained subsequent to spawning? and (2) how long does it take for the fish to go from spawning to hatch to swimmer under different temperatures?
 - The recruitment flows are currently based on Steve Platania and Chris’s basic lab study and empirical data since 2004 on.
 - The work group discussed how the PVA group has been discussing the issue of how much a 4 or 5 age class fish might contribute to population based on hatching success. In hatcheries, they don’t do as well as 1 or 2 age class fish. Even by age 3, they anecdotally don’t

perform as well. However, these are hormone injected fish which is a confounding factor.

- It was shared that the newest issue of Fisheries has an interesting article on fecundity in fish: why it's important, how it's measured, what to do with it, etc. The article review can be found online at the American Fisheries Society under Publications. There is an icon showing Journal Fisheries by issue: March 2010, page 148.
 - Possible specifics to include in the activity summary are: (1) the need to have individual females to get to the fecundity; (2) do a histological study and group studies to determine of amount of produced eggs that are hatching; and (3) the need to do field replicates in outdoor cages in the river.
 - A new project was added titled "Research hatching success and related fecundity for all age class fish." It was assigned jointly to the ScW and PVA work groups and given a Priority 1.
- Original Line 18 (new Line 21), improve understanding of stocking conditions: this project is trying to get to sustainable populations and reduce the dependence on hatchery fish. It could feasibly be done concurrent with reintroduction.
 - In terms of how this relates to what is being done now, with recapture rates low – it is relatively hard to assess stocking conditions or release sites. It will continue to be a challenge until there are higher recapture rates.
 - The work group hesitated to continue with priority assignment without Jason Remshardt's input; the project was assigned a tentative Priority 2.
 - Original Line 20, Line 30, Line 45 (new Line 23), use excising data to develop summary of past and ongoing projects: the Program does not have a consolidated "repository" for information or a summary of what has been accomplished or learned to date. The intent is to move to adaptive management by building off what we know or can learn from past work. We need to integrate the information and data.
 - A note was added that this is an adaptive management project; the main project is identified in Table 7.6.
 - Original Line 42, Line 43, and Line 44 (new Line 45), addressing 10J population: this project was assigned a Priority 1 and made a joint work group lead with HRW and SCW.
- Since only one section of the table was reviewed for prioritization, the work group assigned a home work review for members to go through ScW projects and assign a recommended priority (please also complete Column L & M and correct anything else identified). Members are asked use highlighting to track changes on an electronic copy of the table and send to Stacey Kopitsch by March 24th to compile and develop the list of ranked projects. Stacey will distribute the priority list to members by March 26th for the members to begin working on the activity summaries. Remember that FWS will lead the completion and prioritization of the flycatcher pieces.

Action: ScW members are to review the remaining science activities in the future activities table; changes are to be tracked in an electronic copy using highlighting to capture those changes and send to Stacey Kopitsch by next week for compilation.

Next ScW Meeting April 20th, 2010 from 9:00 am to 11:30 am tentatively at ISC, 5550 San Antonio

**Science Work Group
16 March 2010 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Jeanne Dye	Reclamation	462-3564	jdye@usbr.gov
Michael Porter	USACE	342-3264	michael.d.porter@usace.army.mil
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	rbillings@abcwua.org
Jennifer Bachus	FWS	761-4714	jennifer_bachus@fws.gov
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	761-4737	stacey_kopitsch@FWS.gov
Peter Wilkinson	NMISC	827-5801	peter.wilkinson@state.nm.us
Douglas Tave	NMISC	841-5202	douglas.tave@state.nm.us
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3642	yrmckenna@usbr.gov
Terina Perez	COA	848-7174	tlperez@cabq.gov
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech, EMI	269-6098	marta.wood@tetrattech.com