

Coordination Committee Meeting

June 4, 2010

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program

Coordination Committee Working Meeting

June 4, 2010 Meeting – 9:00 am – 2:00 pm

Bureau of Reclamation

PLEASE REMEMBER TO BRING YOUR LUNCH!

Toll free number: 9-1-888-677-1684

Participant passcode: 80971#

(1st Committee member or contractor to arrive, please dial in)**Draft Meeting Agenda**

- Introductions and Agenda Approval
- Announcements
- **Decision** - Approval of 05/26/10 CC meeting summary*
- Action Item Review (see below)
- Revised Long Term Plan Development*
 - Revised draft document – quick review
 - Guiding principles for inclusion of future activities in LTP
 - Appendix K – Future Activities Summaries (ScW and HR – Priority 1s) – J. Dye, T. Perez, R. Billings and M. Mann
- Next Steps
 - Review and provide one set of agency comments
 - Target Dates

Regular CC Business (1-2 pm) – could be tabled until June 9 meeting, 2-4 pm @ Reclamation
(propose conference call)

- Finalize PIO, DBMS, and PVA charters and work plans (previously posted)
- Review/revise/recommend for approval draft HRW charter*
- Peer review focus for fish passage (updates based on discussions with EC members, K. Dickinson)
- Peer review informal presentations (Pop estimation, Pop monitoring, Genetics – scheduling of appropriate tech people)
- Peer review priorities - write up for June EC mtg

Next meeting – June 9, 2-4 pm @ Reclamation (propose conference call)

***denotes read ahead**

May 26, 2010 Actions**Decisions and Recommendations**

The CC requests that Cheryl Rolland **talk with the CO, then** meet with Tetra Tech to lay out a phased approach for additional analyses for the draft River Mile 83 report. The CC should be updated at the June 23, 2010 meeting.

A special CC meeting to review Long Term Plan Future Activity summaries is scheduled for Friday, June 4, 2010 from 9:00am to 2:00pm.

Actions

Yvette McKenna will email the most recent revision of Appendix G to CC members after it **is provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service.**

Yvette McKenna will email the draft meeting notes from the August 2009 Retreat to EC members for finalization. After finalization Yvette will email the finalized August 2009 Retreat meeting notes to CC members.

Susan Kelly will incorporate information from the finalized August 2009 Retreat meeting notes into the bullets on page 5 of the draft LTP and email to the CC for review.

Yvette McKenna and Grace Haggerty will look through Tom Pitts' white papers and presentation for information on making a budget as a separate document for the LTP.

Susan Bittick will see if someone on her staff can assist Yvette and Grace.

CC members will ask their corresponding EC member for clarification on which components of the San Acacia Fish Passage report should undergo peer review.

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Working Meeting
June 4, 2010 Meeting – 9:00 am – 2:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation

Decisions

The next CC meeting will be on June 9, 2010 from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm at Reclamation.

The May 27, 2010 CC meeting summary was approved with a minor naming correction and with verification that all requested changes were implemented.

Actions

CC members assigned to write a short narrative for Program elements will email their narratives to Yvette McKenna by June 16, 2010.

Mark Brennan and Lori Robertson will review all reintroduction biologist LTP Future Activity summaries to see if they can be combined and to see if any are missing identification of activities the Program is involved in.

Brooke Wyman and Grace Haggerty will work with Yvette McKenna to remove redundancy from and clarify the LTP categories (“population management” will be added).

Brooke Wyman, Grace Haggerty, and Yvette McKenna will write up a decision process paper explaining the thought process for assigning peer review priorities.

Jim Wilbur and Kathy Dickinson will see if the DEC review on Fish Passage can be made public.

CC members will ask their corresponding EC member for clarification on which aspects of San Acacia Fish Passage should undergo peer review.

Yvette McKenna will email the most recent revision of Appendix G to CC members after it is provided by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Yvette McKenna will email the draft meeting notes from the August 2009 Retreat to EC members for finalization. After finalization Yvette will email the finalized August 2009 Retreat meeting notes to CC members.

Susan Kelly will incorporate more language from the approved August 2009 Retreat meeting notes into the bullets on page 5 of the draft LTP and email to the CC for review.

Yvette McKenna and Grace Haggerty will look through Tom Pitts’ white papers and presentation for information on making a budget as a separate document for the LTP. Julie and Monika will find a Corps member to assist on this topic.

Meeting Summary

- Brooke Wyman brought the meeting to order and introductions were made around the table. The agenda was approved with no changes.
- There will be an Adaptive Management Planning webinar Monday - Friday of next week (June 7-11). The webinar will be broadcast in the Rio Grande room at Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) from 12:00 pm to 2:00 pm; the webinar can also be watched individually. Notification of a funding

opportunity for Habitat Restoration Construction was emailed to Program members on Wednesday (6/3); proposals are due June 30, 2010.

- The May 26, 2010 meeting summary was approved with the correction of changing Southwestern Flycatcher to Southwestern Willow Flycatcher and final verification that all requested changes were made.
- The Coordination Committee (CC) performed an action item review. All action items are ongoing with exception to “*CC members will ask their corresponding EC member for clarification on which aspects of San Acacia Fish Passage should undergo peer review*”; this action item was not completed. Fish and Wildlife Service has not yet released the most recent version of Appendix G. Yvette McKenna is working on getting the August 2009 EC Retreat minutes finalized. It was thought that there may not be information on writing a budget as a separate document in Tom Pitts’ presentation and white papers. Monika Mann and Julie Alcon have not been able to find someone to help Yvette and Grace look through Tom’s presentation and white papers.
- The CC reviewed the Revised draft Long Term Plan (LTP) Text and made track changes to the document. The following changes and discussions took place during the review.
 - Page 1, 4th paragraph: The first sentence was changed to “Beginning in 2001 the Program has been funded in part through congressional appropriations to implement projects designed to benefit the federally listed endangered minnow and the flycatcher. Non-federal participants have also contributed funding and in-kind services.”
 - It was asked if the Program was a recovery program or a Recovery Implementation Program (RIP).
 - The CC was reminded that the Program would need additional congressional authorization to become a RIP. The Program could be a recovery program under its current congressional authorization.
 - Page 2, Table 2.1: Rows in the table were rearranged for chronological consistency.
 - Row “1999” the Milestone was changed to “ ‘Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Recovery Plan’ issued by the Service.”
 - The document will be checked to make sure that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is abbreviated as the Service.
 - Row “2001” the Milestone was changed to “Collaborative Program began receiving congressional appropriations for implementing projects beneficial for federally listed endangered species.”
 - Row “January 15, 2010” was changed to read “February 2010.”
 - Page 5, Section 3.1: The CC was reminded that Susan Kelly will pull information from the finalized August 2009 EC meeting minutes to include in the Basis For Long Term Plan Major Revision.
 - Page 7, 8th bullet point: The CC was reminded that this statement may not be completely true. The statement will be revisited once Appendix H is complete.
 - Section 4.0: subsections should be reorganized to discuss the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (minnow) before the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (flycatcher).
 - Page 10, Table 4.1: Once information is issued to the Program it will be added to the table.
 - Page 11, Table 4.2: Mention of Coyote Creek and Bluewater Creek was removed from the table.
 - Page 12, section 4.2: The second sentence was changed to read “The first revision of the minnow recovery plan was published in February 2010 (Service, 2010).”
 - It was verified that the Recovery Plan says recovery actions and not recovery elements. It was asked if “Program elements” should be changed to “Program Actions”. It was thought that the

“recovery actions” should be left as recovery plan identifiers and that “Program elements” should remain the same because they can be broader.

- Page 15, Section 6.0: The first sentence was changed to read “In order to establish a close linkage among the flycatcher recovery plan, the minnow recovery plan and Collaborative Program activities to benefit the species, Collaborative Program elements should correspond to major actions in the species recovery plans.”
 - A sentence was added to the end of the paragraph: “For more information on specific recovery actions, see Section 4.0.”
 - Section 6.1: Renamed to “Minnow Recovery Plan Activities”
 - A corresponding change was made to Section 6.2
 - Redundant pieces in Section 6.2 were removed.
 - Page 16, Section 6.3, paragraph 2: The sentence “Sub-elements are identified for the minnow and flycatcher.” was added before the 2nd to the last sentence.
 - Page 17, Section 7.0: The first sentence was changed to “Historic, ongoing and future Collaborative Program activities are components of the elements list in Section 6.3.” and the last sentence was modified to read “Within each appendix, separate tables are provided to correspond to each of the following Collaborative Program elements (numbering [7.1-7.10]).”
 - It was mentioned that the title to Section 7.0 references schedules, but that there are no schedules included in this section. It was mentioned that on the last LTP there was criticism that milestones and objectives were not included. The CC will write short narratives for each of the sub-elements of Section 7.0 that will include overall strategies, objectives, milestones, and time schedules. CC members present at the meeting volunteered to write some of the narratives.
 - Lori Robertson will write a narrative for sub-element 7.4.
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will write a narrative for sub-element 7.1.
 - Brian Gleadle will write a narrative for sub-element 7.7.
 - Jim Wilber will write a narrative for sub-elements 7.2 and 7.8.
- CC members assigned to write a short narrative for Program elements will email their narratives to Yvette McKenna by June 16, 2010 so they can be reviewed at the next CC meeting. It was asked if sub-element 7.3 should only be applied to the flycatcher since it does not really apply to the minnow. It was thought that it should remain general in case it is applicable to the minnow in the future.
- Page 20, paragraph 1: The sentence “The lead agency is not necessarily the funding entity.” Was added to the paragraph.
 - It was announced that the Santa Domingo Pueblo will be officially changing its name to Kewa Pueblo.
 - The spelling of Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority was corrected in Table 7.1.
- This portion of the CC meeting was spent as a working session reviewing priority 1 LTP Future Activity Summaries written by the Science (ScW) workgroup.
 - Activity: “Annually update and revise controlled propagation and augmentation plans for the Rio Grande Silvery minnow”
 - There was confusion about this activity’s placement in the LTP; the Propagation and Genetics workgroup, which is not a Program workgroup, will be completing this activity. One opinion was that though this workgroup is independent of the Program its decisions affect the Program; therefore it should remain in the LTP in order to show the link.
 - This activity may be able to be combined with another activity summary.
 - Reports need to be cited for this summary.

- The last sentence of the project description was changed to “Biannual meeting summaries are prepared documenting decisions.”
- Estimated cost was changed to “Staff time.”
- Activity: “Identify hurdles to successful RGSM reintroduction by reach”
 - It was pointed out that this activity is part of Mark Brennan’s job and since he is funded by a different work plan it may not need to be included in the LTP. It was thought that it should be included in the LTP because Mark would be collaborating with the Program.
 - Estimated cost was changed to “Staff time”
 - The ESA compliance was deleted
 - There are several reintroduction activities that could possibly be combined.
- Activity: “Identify necessary activities to support future 10(j) populations”
 - This activity is also a reintroduction activity.
 - The ESA compliance was deleted and the estimated cost was changed to “Staff time.”
 - Mark Brennan and Lori Robertson will review all reintroduction biologist LTP Future Activity summaries to see if they can be combined and to see if any are missing identification of activities the Program is involved in.
- The rest of the reintroduction summaries will not be reviewed until Mark and Lori have finished reviewing them.
- Activity: “RGSM Spawning Monitoring”
 - No changes were made to this summary.
- All reports cited for the Activity summaries should be cited individually even if they are annual; once completed the Activity summaries will have live links for the citations.
- Activity: “Continue Rio Grande Silvery Minnow captive propagation activities”
 - Estimated cost was changed to “1.2 M annually at current level (with Los Lunas minnow sanctuary)”
 - The activity “Annually update and revise controlled propagation and augmentation plans for the Rio Grande Silvery minnow” will be combined with this activity summary.
 - The last sentence of the project description was changed to “Specific changes to propagation guidance are established by the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Captive Propagation and Genetics Workgroup (a workgroup independent of the Collaborative Program). Workgroup decisions are documented in biannual meeting summaries and updated propagation plans.”
- Activity: “Review reports and develop summaries of current and past activities”
 - This report was changed so that it applied to all workgroups in the Program. The title was changed to “The Collaborative Program Work Groups will Review Reports and Develop Summaries of Current and Past Activities.”
- Activity: “Develop a strategy for maintenance and creation of new habitats”
 - The 5th sentence of the project description was changed to “Examples of maintenance activities include planting, hydrologic manipulation (etc.).”
- Activity: “Develop larval fish key for the middle Rio Grande and for stream segments where reintroductions are likely”
 - A fish key for the middle Rio Grande has already been developed by Reclamation however the fish key has not been published
 - The title was changed to “Publish larval fish key for the middle Rio Grande and develop and publish fish key for stream segments where reintroductions are likely”
- Activity: “Develop a comprehensive plan for the conservation and management of all existing breeding sites, including San Marcial”

- There was confusion as to why San Marcial was in the activity title when it is not within Program boundaries. The CC desires the priority to focus SWFL activities within the LTP within the Program area.
- It was the general opinion that for a comprehensive recovery plan the Program should coordinate its management activities with the management activities of other programs.
- The title was changed to “Develop a comprehensive plan for the conservation and management of all existing flycatcher breeding sites within the middle Rio Grande”
- The first sentence of the project description was changed to “Develop a comprehensive flycatcher management plan for use throughout the Middle Rio Grande to include coordination with adjacent flycatcher management activities as appropriate.”
- Activity: “RGSM Rescue/Salvage”
 - The second sentence of the project description was changed to “The Service will continue implementing improved salvage and transport using the most updated protocol from the previous year’s field and laboratory research to increase survival of salvaged Rio Grande silvery minnow and reduce the risk of transporting Aquatic Nuisance Species throughout the Middle Rio Grande.”
 - The CC thought that LTP Category “Monitoring” was not an appropriate category for this activity. A new category “Population Management” was created; the category will include captive propagation, egg and fish salvage, and rescue and augmentation. “Propagation facility” should then be removed from the “O&M” LTP category to avoid duplication.
- It was thought that some of the LTP Categories were confusing and that there was overlap among categories. Brooke Wyman and Grace Haggerty will work with Yvette McKenna to remove redundancy from and clarify the LTP categories (“population management” will be added). The CC also thought that the LTP category “Management” should be changed to “Water Management” in order to be more descriptive.
- Activity: “Monitor Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Genetics”
 - ESA Compliance Requirement was changed to “2003 Biological Opinion RPA Elements Y, Z, and AA.”
 - The Agency/Party Implementing the Project was changed to “Reclamation and the Service.”
- Activity: “Evaluate and apply modification to habitat management projects as necessary”
 - No changes were made to this summary.
- The CC discussed the request that the Executive Committee (EC) made at their May 20, 2010 meeting that the CC write up a decision process paper explaining the thought process for how peer review was prioritized.
 - The CC recapped how the thought process occurred. The CC recommended Population Estimation for peer review and asked the workgroups to suggest other projects that were near or in draft stage and to write potential peer review questions for these projects. The CC then decided which of these projects should be peer reviewed and prioritized the projects based on timing and need. River Mile 83 (RM 83) was at the appropriate stage for peer review. Population Monitoring and Genetics have been controversial and ongoing for an extended period of time. The CC also recommended that the PVA models be peer reviewed and were added to the prioritization pending approval from the PVA workgroup. The EC decided that Fish Passage should be peer reviewed. The appropriate technical person for each project will be giving an informal presentation on why the project is appropriate for peer review; after the presentation for RM 83 it was ultimately decided that it would not be appropriate for RM 83 to be peer reviewed in FY 10.

- The CC agreed that there was value in documenting how the decisions for peer review were made. Brooke Wyman, Grace Haggerty, and Yvette McKenna will write up a decision process paper explaining the thought process for assigning peer review priorities.
- The CC discussed the peer review of the San Acacia Fish Passage (Fish Passage) project.
 - The CC is still unsure which aspects of Fish Passage should undergo peer review. CC members will ask their corresponding EC member for clarification on which aspects of Fish Passage should undergo peer review.
 - The DEC Review has already evaluated design components of the project and raised sedimentation issues however the DEC review is an internal Reclamation document and is not available to the public. The CC would not like to duplicate review efforts. Jim Wilbur and Kathy Dickinson will see if the DEC review on Fish Passage can be made public.
 - If the DEC review cannot be made public it was thought that there is enough information available from reports on design alternatives and from the presentation of the DEC Review for a meaningful peer review. Reviewers could use the presentation of the DEC Review to look at the issues raised and determine if Program responses to those issues were adequate.
 - It was felt that peer review questions are very important and will affect the make up of the peer review panel and determine what documents are submitted to reviewers. Science, design and alternatives, and monitoring were 3 suggested categories of questions.
 - It was pointed out that it was still unknown how many fish would need to be moved to resolve genetic differences. No studies have been done to determine this; it was thought that this should be a future activity for the Program.
- The next CC meeting will be June 9, 2010 from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm at Reclamation.

**CC Working Meeting Attendees
4 June 2010**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS
Monika Mann	COE	342-3250	Monika.mann@usace.army.mil
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD	247-02334	brooke@mrgcd.us
Jericho Lewis	Reclamation	462-3622	jlewis@usbr.gov
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	rbillings@abcwua.org
Lori Robertson	FWS	761-4710	lori.robertson@fws.gov
Jim Wilber	Reclamation	462-3548	jwilber@usbr.gov
Ann Moore	NMAGO	222-9024	amoore@nmag.gov
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3642	ymckenna@usbr.gov
Grace Haggerty	ISC	383-4042	grace.haggerty@state.nm.us
Terina Perez	COA	848-7174	tlperez@cabq.gov
Susan Kelly via phone	UNM	277-0514	skelly@law.unm.edu
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Amy Louise	ISC	383-4057	amy.louise@state.nm.us
Nathan Schroeder	Pueblo of Santa Ana	771-6719	nathan.schroeder@santaana- nsn.gov
Mark Brennan	FWS	761-4756	mark_brennan@fws.gov
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	761-4737	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Kathy Dickinson	Reclamation	462-3555	kdickinson@usbr.gov
Jeanne Dye	Reclamation	462-3564	jdye@usbr.gov
Julie Alcon	COE	342-3281	Julie.A.Alcon@usace.army.mil
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 ext. 139	christine.sanchez@tetrattech.com