

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

18 May 2010 Meeting – 9:00 AM-11:30 AM

Interstate Stream Commission

Recommendations and Decisions

- ScW recommends that the Population Estimation and Population Monitoring reports be reviewed independently; once independent reviews have been completed the two reports should be reviewed comparatively.

Actions

- Jeanne Dye will resend the draft peer review questions and grant agreement for Genetics out to the workgroup for review. Comments and suggestions should be returned by June 4, 2010.
- Jeanne Dye will email the DBMS spreadsheet to workgroup members.
- Jeanne Dye will send the list of standard peer review questions to workgroup members for review.

Meeting Summary

- The meeting was called to order and the April 20, 2010 meeting minutes were approved with no changes.
- All action items were completed. The CC does not need more information on the “Through the Lens of Past Monitoring Data” presentation; there will not be an additional Science workgroup (ScW) meeting to discuss the presentation. The CC will be reviewing the draft questions for the Population Estimation, Population Monitoring, and Genetics peer review.
- The workgroup discussed the Population Estimation and Population Monitoring peer reviews. Concern was expressed that if there was overlap in the time frame of the peer reviews the two reports may be compared to one another. It was thought that there would be value in having the reports reviewed independently of one another and also reviewed comparatively. ScW recommends that the Population Estimation and Population Monitoring reports be reviewed independently; once independent reviews have been completed the two reports should be reviewed comparatively.
- At the latest CC meeting it was expressed that there may not be a need for additional peer review of Genetics because components of the Genetics reports have already been peer reviewed. It was the general opinion of the workgroup that peer review on all the components as a whole would give beneficial feedback and direction for moving forward. It was thought that peer review questions should be framed carefully and the peer review should only occur in the context of the Request for Proposal (RFP). Jeanne Dye will resend the draft peer review questions and grant agreement for Genetics out to the workgroup for review. Comments and suggestions should be returned by June 4, 2010.
- The ScW was given a Long Term Plan (LTP) Future Activities update. All priority 1 Future Activity summaries have been completed. Priority 2 and 3 Future Activity

Summaries are due to Stacey Kopitsch by May 19, 2010. If summaries will be submitted after May 19 they should be sent to Jenae Maestas or Yvette McKenna.

- A request was made to Program workgroups to submit data to the Database Management System (DBMS) workgroup for inclusion in the Program database. DBMS has created a spreadsheet that lists known available data and notes which data have not been submitted to DBMS. Workgroup members should review the spreadsheet and submit available data. DBMS would also like workgroup members to submit any data that is not listed on the spreadsheet but should be included in the Program database. Jeanne Dye will email the DBMS spreadsheet to workgroup members.
- The workgroup discussed the Fish Community/Gear Evaluation. An objective of the project was to investigate means of assessing catchability. The DIDSON camera was one proposed method. The workgroup thought that the DIDSON camera may not be appropriate for use in this project. The DIDSON may be considered for use in future projects.
- There was a brief discussion on adaptive management. The RFP for adaptive management is close to completion. Adaptive management will be a key component to getting through the Biological Assessment (BA)/Biological Opinion (BO) process.
- Jeanne Dye will send the list of standard peer review questions to workgroup members for review.

Next ScW Meeting June 15, 2010 from 9:00 am to 11:30 am at Interstate Stream Commission

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program
Science Work Group Meeting
18 May 2010 Meeting – 9:00 AM-11:30 AM
Interstate Stream Commission

Meeting Minutes

Introductions and Agenda Approval

- The meeting was brought to order and the agenda was approved with no changes.

Approve 04/20/10 ScW Meeting Minutes

- The April 20, 2010 meeting minutes were approved with no changes.

Action Item Review (see below)

- The Science Workgroup (ScW) performed an action item review.
- Stacey Kopitsch will clarify with the CC if they are requesting ScW to review the “Through the Lens of Past Monitoring Data” presentation, or the Recovery Plan itself.
 - **Complete.** The action item was an old action item and has been taken care of. The Coordination Committee (CC) does not need any more information. There will not be a ScW meeting to discuss the presentation.
- Stacey Kopitsch will send comments on task three of the community Sampling/Gear Evaluation to Jeanne Dye and Terina Perez. After the comments have been consolidated, Jeanne will forward them to the contractor.
 - **Complete.** Further discussion of this is scheduled on today’s agenda.
- Stacey Kopitsch will email the workgroup a template for writing activity summaries. Activity summaries are due back to Stacey by April 28th, 2010. Jeanne Dye will confirm with those activity summaries were assigned to but that were not present at the meeting
 - **Complete.**
- Jeanne Dye will email the list of questions developed during the meeting for peer review to the workgroup. Workgroup members will review the questions and provide further comment/suggestions to Jeanne by close of business on Wednesday, April 21, 2010.
 - **Complete.** The peer review questions were sent out to the workgroup, however no input was received. Some modifications were made to the questions based on CC feedback. If there are any additional edits, suggestions, or questions to add to the draft list please email them to Jeanne Dye (jdye@usbr.gov).

Peer Review of Population Estimation and Population Monitoring

- A discussion on the peer reviews of Population Estimation and Population Monitoring reports stemmed from Jeanne Dye’s above action item.
 - Concern was expressed that if there was overlap in the timeframe of the peer reviews of the Population Estimation and Population Monitoring reports and the same peer review company was reviewing both, the reports may be compared to one another. It was proposed that the Population Monitoring peer review be pushed back until after the Population Estimation peer review is complete.

- It was recognized that some Program members have expressed that the two reports should be reviewed together.
- There are pros and cons to having the reports peer reviewed separately and having them reviewed together.
- The original reason for doing the Population Estimation was concern that Population Monitoring was not sufficient to track changes in population. It was one opinion that for historical context they should be looked at together; but that it is arguable that the reports could be reviewed separately.
- The advantage of a comparative review is that it provides the Program with a better context. The questions may need to be modified for that context. It was suggested to have the reviewers looking at both but also have different reviewers only looking at one.
- There was agreement that each report should be evaluated on its own merits, and then a comparative peer review would take place.

Recommendation: ScW recommends that the Population Estimation and Population Monitoring reports be reviewed independently; once independent reviews have been completed the two reports should be reviewed comparatively.

Genetics Peer Review

- The ScW discussed concerns that arose at the latest CC meeting regarding the Genetics peer review; some of the components of Genetics studies have been peer reviewed so it was asked why there should be additional peer review.
- It was the general opinion that a peer review on all the components as a whole would yield beneficial feedback; suggestions from peer review on the techniques being used, appropriate next steps, and an evaluation of how well the contractor has met their obligations would make Genetics stronger.
- There was a suggestion that there be 2 sets of questions; one set to see how well the contractor fulfilled their obligations, and the other set to evaluate the science used and how to move the project forward.
- It was thought that peer review questions should be framed carefully and the peer review should only occur in the context of the Request for Proposal (RFP).

Action: Jeanne Dye will resend the draft peer review questions and grant agreement for Genetics out to the workgroup for review. Comments and suggestions should be returned by June 4, 2010.

Future Activity Summaries Update - Priority 2/3s

- All priority 1 Long Term Plan (LTP) Future Activity summaries have been completed; everyone who contributed was thanked.
- Priority 2 and 3 Future Activity summaries were assigned last week. The CC has requested that they be finished by May 21, 2010. The summaries should be sent to Stacey Kopitsch by May 19; if they will be submitted after May 19, they should be emailed to Jenae Maestas or Yvette McKenna. More than half of the priority 2 and 3 summaries have been completed.
- ScW was briefed that some of the summaries under the Predator/Non-Native Control section were condensed into one project.

- The workgroup thought that some of the Future Activities were not an issue; for these activities ScW will make a note in the LTP Future Activities table and cite supporting reports.
- It was also thought that many of the Future Activities could be completed by analyzing data that has already been collected.

DBMS Request for Needed Information

- A request was made to Program workgroups to submit data to the Database Management System (DBMS) workgroup.
- There was confusion as to how this database differed from the database made by RESPEC.
 - The RESPEC database was only for geospatial data. The DBMS database will include everything that has been generated from the Program.
- The workgroup briefly reviewed the DBMS spreadsheet that lists known available data and notes which data have not been submitted to DBMS.
- Workgroup members should review the spreadsheet and submit available data. DBMS would also like workgroup members to submit any data that is not listed on the spreadsheet but should be included in the Program database.

Action: Jeanne Dye will email the DBMS spreadsheet to workgroup members.

- It was also mentioned that the DBMS may be looking for database testers by the end of the summer.

Discussion on Fish Community/Gear Evaluation Comments

- The workgroup first discussed the historical context for the project. An objective of the project was to investigate means of assessing catchability.
- The DIDSON camera was one proposed method for assessing catchability. One concern in the gear evaluation was that the DIDSON would significantly increase personnel and equipment costs.
- Part of the RFP was to look at different capture methods and see which are most beneficial. Seining is considered to be the most efficient way of catching fish.
- The workgroup thought that the DIDSON camera may not be appropriate for use in this project, but it may be considered for use in future projects.

EC update

- There was a brief discussion on adaptive management. The ScW was briefed that the RFP for adaptive management is close to being completed.
- It was mentioned that once there is a contractor for adaptive management that the ScW may be asked to develop a science plan for adaptive management.
- Adaptive management will be a key component to getting through the Biological Assessments (BAs)/Biological Opinions (BOs) process.

CC update

- The ScW was updated that the CC has been focusing on peer reviews and the LTP.

Establish Standard Peer Review Questions

- The ScW has a tentative list of standard peer review questions.

Action: Jeanne Dye will send the list of standard peer review questions to workgroup members for review.

View Program Video

- The ScW was updated that a Program video has been made. It's a 15-20 minute overview about the Program.

Next ScW Meeting June 15, 2010 from 9:00 am to 11:30 am at Interstate Stream Commission

**Science Work Group
18 May 2010 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Jeanne Dye	Reclamation	462-3564	jdye@usbr.gov
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	rbillings@abcwua.org
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	761-4737	stacey_kopitsch@FWS.gov
Terina Perez	COA	848-7174	tlperez@cabq.gov
Alison Hutson	NMISC	841-5201	alison.hutson@sate.nm.us
Andrew Monie	NMDGF	476-8105	andrew.monie@state.nm.us
David Propst	NMDGF	476-8103	david.propst@state.nm.us
Michael Porter	USACE	342-3264	michael.d.porter@usace.army.mil
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 x. 139	christine.sanchez@tetrattech.com