

Coordination Committee Meeting

August 4, 2010

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program

Coordination Committee Working Meeting

August 4, 2010 Meeting – 8:30 am – 4:00 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
- Welcome Susan Bittick as CC vice-chair
- Revised Long Term Plan Development
 - Review Revised 10J/Reintroduction Future Activity Summaries *(to be posted on 7/30)**
 - Appendix K – Review Future Activities Summaries (HRW priorities 1, 2 and 3)* *(previously posted)*
- Next Steps
- Regular CC Business (if time allows)
 - **Decision** - Approval of 07/14/10 CC meeting summary* *(previously posted)*
 - Action Item Review (see below)
 - Review Program Element Narratives
 - Review draft guiding principles for inclusion of future activities in LTP* *(previously posted)*

Next meeting – August 11, 1:00 – 4: pm @ Reclamation

***denotes read ahead**

July 14, 2010 Actions

- Jim Wilber will revise the 7.4 Program Element Narrative for review at the July 28, 2010 CC meeting. ✓
- Yvette McKenna will send the draft guiding principles for inclusion of future activities in LTP with Service comments in track changes to the CC for review at the July 28, 2010 CC meeting. ✓
- Tetra Tech will compile a list of the Future Activity Summaries that the CC has reviewed. ✓(for ScW)
- Lori Robertson will create an activity summary for the Service's staff (Stacey Kopitch, Jennifer Bachus, and Mark Brennan) future work activities for inclusion in the LTP. *(After further discussion, it was determined that the PMT will be preparing all the staff support activity summaries and Stacey Kopitsch will be responsible for the Service submittals; continuation of a June 9th action; should be available by July 28)* ✓
- 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. *(ongoing - June 9th action not previously completed)*

- Susan Kelly will incorporate more language August 2009 Retreat meeting notes into the bullets on page 5 of the draft LTP and email to the CC for review. (*June 9th action not previously completed since the 2009 EC retreat notes have not been distributed*)

July 28, 2010 Actions

- Mark Brennan will email the 10(j) Future Activity summaries to Yvette McKenna and Jenae Maestas to distribute to the CC; Lori Robertson will notify Mark of this action item.
- Yvette McKenna will revise the “*Continue to collect and evaluate existing data on water quality and sediment quality and identify future investigations that are needed.*” Future Activity summary so that it is in alignment with the “*Evaluate water quality in the MRG in relation to the RGSM*” Future Activity summary and distribute to the CC for review.
- Jim Wilbur will email the revised 7.4 Program Element Narrative to Yvette McKenna to distribute to the CC.
- Yvette McKenna will highlight discussion on the peer reviews of the PVA models from the June PVA work group meeting notes and distribute to the CC.

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Working Meeting
August 4, 2010 Meeting – 8:30 am – 4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation

Action Items:

- Yvette McKenna will direct the formation of a Big Bend Reintroduction or Reintroduction Documents webpage to include the Big Bend EA and other recovery related documents for a reference page to assist with future reintroduction efforts.
- FWS will provide a copy of the 2004 FWS/NMDGF Cochiti Reach habitat survey to Brian Gleadle, Yvette McKenna, and Mark Brennan. ~~Brian Gleadle will forward the final version of the 2004 FWS/NMDGF Cochiti Reach habitat survey to Mark Brennan and Yvette McKenna.~~
- Yvette McKenna will have Jenae Maestas post the recently received Water Quality study annual reports (K. Buhl) to the website.
- Susan Bittick and/or Monika Mann will let the DBMS contractors know to include all the locations of the proposed A&R projects in the geographical layout. The known SWFL nest locations including details on the vegetation/habitat characteristics (i.e., in tamarisk, etc.) also needs to be included in the geographical layout. Ideally there will be layers showing floodplain inundation, vegetation mapping, etc. as well.
- Rick Billings and Stacey Kopitsch will add combining the ScW *increase understanding of RGSM life history and habitat needs* and HR *floodplain habitat* future activity summaries and to make sure all pertinent information is carried over (i.e., keep as Priority 1) to the next ScW meeting agenda.
- Stacey Koptisch will add discussing the linkage of the following HR future activities to ScW to the next ScW meeting agenda: (1) *Study Benefits of In-channel Refugia*, Pg. 12; (2) *Conduct floodplain habitat studies to determine important aspects for HR projects*, Pg. 18; (3) *Floodplain Habitat*, Pg. 34; (4) *Determine how to link HR effectiveness monitoring results to science results*, Pg. 45; and (5) *Isleta Reach Floodplain and Refugial Habitat*, Pg. 46.
- Ondrea Hummel will add language to Isleta Reach Floodplain and Refugial Habitat project description on Pg 46 to clarify “habitat characteristics, water quality monitoring, etc.” since this project is better categorized as monitoring instead of construction.
- Anders Lundahl will combine and edit all the HR Priority 1 Monitoring future activity summaries no later than August 11th; Projects to be rolled in are:
 - (1) *Based on the peer review recommendations, adjust the second year of monitoring as needed & Evaluate EMP Pilot Project to Develop 10-year Plan*, Pg. 3;
 - (2) *Implement 10-year Effectiveness Monitoring Plan (EMP)*, Pg 4;
 - (3) *2-year EMP Pilot Project*, Pg. 16;
 - (4) *Develop and implement a 10-year Program-wide Habitat Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring Plan*, Pg. 26;
 - (5) *Oversee the first year of low and high intensity effectiveness monitoring at 20 sites in two reaches of the Rio Grande*, Pg. 27;
 - (6) *Conduct EMP monitoring program of HR sites*, Pg. 32; and

- (7) *Evaluate the results of the first year of monitoring through an external peer review process*, Pg. 42.
- Gina Dello Russo will combine and edit all the HR Priority 1 Planning and Implementation future activity summaries no later than August 11th;
 - Planning Projects to be rolled in are:
 - (1) *Determine which Habitat Restoration Assessment & Recommendation Report proposed projects should be implemented*, Pg. 5;
 - (2) *Albuquerque Reach Habitat Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 6;
 - (3) *Cochiti Reach HR Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 7;
 - (4) *Identify flycatcher habitat in need of improvement*, Pg. 10;
 - (5) *Prioritize HR projects by reach*, Pg. 11;
 - (6) *Research Reach specific habitat*, Pg. 14;
 - (7) *Cochiti Reach Residential Habitat*, Pg. 15;
 - (8) *Isleta Reach Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 22;
 - (9) *Use riparian groundwater modeling tools to identify locations best suited to refugial habitat and riparian habitat restoration actions*, Pg. 24;
 - (10) *In suitable but unoccupied and potentially suitable habitats where exotic species are to be removed through chemical or mechanical means, use a temporally staged (phased) approach to clear areas so some mature habitat remains throughout the restoration period for potential use by flycatchers*, Pg. 29;
 - (11) *Evaluate Cost/Benefit*, Pg. 31;
 - (12) *Use FLO-2D and HEC-RAS modeling tools to estimate frequency and extent of overbank inundation and in-channel habitat, respectively*, Pg. 33;
 - (13) *Floodplain Habitat*, Pg. 34;
 - (14) *Avoid removing non-native vegetation within 1/4 mile of occupied nest sites*, Pg. 36;
 - (15) *Reach Planning Projects*, Pg. 40;
 - (16) *San Acacia Reach Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 47;
 - (17) *San Marcial Floodplain*, Pg. 48;
 - (18) *San Marcial Reach Habitat Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 49;
 - (19) *Portions of Hold regular workshops focused on reach-specific/adaptive management possibly*, Pg. 55; and
 - (20) *Prioritize HR projects by reach*, Pg. 59.
 - Implementation Projects to be rolled in are:
 - (1) *Implement Priority Habitat Restoration Projects (*note no priority assigned to individual reaches; reaches not listed in any particular order)*, Pg. 38;
 - (2) *Implement Priority Habitat Restoration Projects*, Pg. 44;
 - (3) *San Marcial Floodplain*, Pg. 48; and
 - (4) *Habitat Improvement/Restoration in the San Acacia Reach*, Pg. 57.
- Once completed, Rick Billings will provide a QA/QC review of the combined HR Priority 1 Future Activity Summaries.
- Ondrea Hummel will add language describing the background information and issues on the tamarisk beetle and SWFL nesting to the *Map Areas Where SWFL Nest Sites are Located in Tamarisk* summary.

- Stacey Kopitsch will email Gina Dello Russo with the ScW future project summaries that overlap with HR future summaries.
- Yvette McKenna will distribute (or post) the changes made to the HR and 10(j)/Reintroduction future activity summaries in order for work groups to have access to the most current version reflecting changes made at the 08/04/10 working CC meeting.
- Mark Brennan will follow up on the existing fish recovery teams to determine potential involvement in the reintroduction planning team and any possible historic information or data that could be provided through these groups.
- Mark Brennan will develop a new future activity summary to describe obtaining any missing information identified as a data gap through future contracted projects. This summary is to be a Priority 1 place holder in the LTP and will be geographically dependant on where the need is identified.
- Mark Brennan will draft language describing the reintroduction planning team concepts including (1) how the team is envisioned to work; (2) who is expected to be involved; and (3) team function and roles, etc. This language can be incorporated into one of the first 10(j)/reintroduction activity summaries.
- Mark Brennan will enhance the project description of *Reintroduce new RGSM 10(j) Population* activity summary to include details on the technical steps of moving stock fish from hatcheries to designated sites. Details should include the description of the potential for release to more than one location at the site, clarification of rule making, etc.
- Mark Brennan will reconcile all the duration completion dates for all 10(j)/reintroduction future activity summaries for consistency (2026 or 2035, etc.).
- Mark Brennan will enhance the project description of the *Optimize survivorship of RGSM during transportation and stocking for post-release retention of reintroduction and augmentation sites* future activity summary to include background language on why this project is needed and the history with the transportation issue.
- Yvette McKenna will email the CC with a reminder of the next regular business meeting scheduled for Wednesday, August 11th. The email will include notice that (1) the agenda will not be available until COB Friday, August 6th at the earliest, but most agenda items and read aheads are carried over from other meetings; (2) there is a tentative working CC meeting scheduled for September 8th from 10:00am to 4:00pm; and (3) Program element narratives are to be attached with an August 11th deadline for submission.

Recommendations

- One recommendation put forward at the CC meeting was for the CC to discuss potential reintroduction activities (especially those outside the Program boundaries and authorities) and present recommendations to the EC on whether or not to include them in the Program's LTP and why/why not.

Brief Meeting Recap

- The CC met in an all-day working meeting and discussed and reviewed future activity summaries for the 10(j)/reintroduction and Habitat Restoration (HR) future activities.
- A quorum was not present so decision items were postponed until the next meeting.

- The CC reviewed 10(j) reintroduction summaries while changes were tracked in the actual documents and tracked in the meeting notes as well. Part way through, the CC switched to reviewing the HR summaries in order to accommodate HR work group member schedules. It was determined that several HR summaries could be combined and HR members were assigned the revision tasks. Both the HR and 10(j) reintroduction summaries will be revised based on CC input and re-reviewed at a future CC meeting.

Next/Upcoming Meetings

- **CC August 11th, 1:00pm– 4:00pm @ Reclamation;**
 - tentative agenda to include: (1) regular business items; (2) maybe a few activity summaries (ex. re-review of 10(j) future activity summaries); (3) approve past meeting summaries; (4) review draft guiding principles for inclusion of future activities in LTP; (5) DBMS data model presentation; and (6) RGSM 5 yr status review submittals
- **CC August 20th, 8:30 am – 4:00 pm Strengths Finder workshop**
- **CC August 25th, 1:00pm – 4:00pm @ Reclamation;**
 - tentative agenda to include: (1) white paper on peer review project decision process; (2) history of 10(j) reintroduction position; and (3) 3rd quarter financial reports
- **EC August 30th, 9:00am – 1:00pm at Reclamation;**
 - tentative agenda to include (1) regular business; (2) 10(j) activities and geographic authority discussion; (3) timeline of consultation; (4) PVA issues; (5) possibly look at categorizing existing IAs in terms of activities being supported; and (6) 3rd quarter financial reports from FY10
- **CC September 8th, 9:30am - 4:00pm at Reclamation;**
 - tentative agenda to include LTP discussions in the morning followed by a ½ hr. lunch break and then regular business in the afternoon. LTP items could include (1) review the HR and ScW reconsolidated Priority 1 future summaries; (2) HR and ScW Priority 2 & 3 future activity summaries; and (3) Program Management activity future summaries. Regular business items could include (1) FY11 budget.
- **EC September 16th, 9:00am - 4:00pm at Reclamation;**
 - All day EC meeting with tentative agenda items to include: (1) revisit the 2009 retreat topics; and (2) tamarisk beetle presentations
- **CC September 22nd 1:00 pm – 4:00 pm**

Meeting Summary

- **Introductions and Agenda Approval:** Yvette McKenna opened the meeting and welcomed and thanked Habitat Restoration (HR) members for attending. A quorum was not present. After introductions, the agenda was approved with no changes. Susan Bittick was welcomed as the new CC Vice Chair.
- **Revised Long Term Plan Development:** The work groups have been tasked with developing future activities summaries and prioritizing future activities as near- or long-term. Science and HR happen to be the work groups producing the most activities. The CC is reviewing the draft activity summaries to provide input and editing.
 - *Review Revised 10(j) Reintroduction Future Activity Summaries:*

- *Continue 10(j) Population Monitoring at Big Bend Reintroduction Site:*
 - ✓ The EC is currently having discussions about the roles, responsibilities, options, and level of involvement of the Program regarding use of funds outside the Program area including Big Bend. It was shared that the Army Corps of Engineers (COE) Civil Works Department has authority down to Amistad Reservoir that might be used to establish an activity allowing the Program to support additional activities through Interagency Agreements (IAs).
 - ✓ The CC discussed metrics for determining a successful reintroduction. Big Bend has its own set of established metrics for success and a second reintroduction site will probably have its own metrics based on what the Service believes will be needed for recovery. One recommendation was put forward to the CC that the CC discuss possible reintroduction activities outside the Program boundaries and make an initial recommendation if those activities should or should not be included in the LTP and why. Reintroduction efforts that will benefit the species can be supported in various ways without funding but there are several agencies that have already taken a stand not to be involved in projects/activities outside of the Program boundaries or outside the state.
 - The CC briefly discussed the fish health monitoring as it relates to predation issues and fish communities. As far as is known, no studies have focused on predator issues in Big Bend although the USGS study includes everything. Big Bend [as a reintroduction site] could have been selected because of the existing partnerships there; it could be that other potential reintroduction sites could be much more challenging.
 - Changes made to the *Continue 10(j) Population Monitoring at Big Bend Reintroduction Site* future activity summary included:
 - BOR was deleted from the funding source
- *Continue Big Bend 10(j) population reintroductions:*
 - It was clarified that the \$20,000 requested for this project covered the transportation and staff time to transport minnow from the propagation facility to Big Bend and is exclusive of monitoring and other overhead. The cost of fish production at the facilities is included in the facility O&M.
 - Changes to the *Continue Big Bend 10(j) population reintroductions* future activity summary included:
 - Addition of a clarifying sentence in the project description: *This requirement is for transportation and staff time to transfer RGSM from propagation facilities to Big Bend.*
 - NEP was spelled out: non-essential experimental population
 - BOR was removed from the funding source
 - In the table on the bottom, 3.3.3 *monitor reintro RGSM pop* should be replaced with the LTP table section (7.4.A.7) and project name and the project duration should be 2009 to 2022
 - Under ESA compliance require: Biological Opinion is listed twice, omit duplication.

- *Identify and assess habitat needs, management activities, and any major hurdles to RGSM reintroductions into upper and lower Rio Grande and Pecos River reaches:*
 - The CC discussed the original project duration projections (start in 2011 with no end date) but agreed that since the implementation project is dependant on this and scheduled to begin in 2013, this suggests it is a 2 year project.
 - The CC also discussed the logical sequencing (or progression) of the 10(j) reintroduction projects. The decision tool has to exist prior to the collection of data in order to know what data to collect [and to avoid collecting unnecessary data]. But there is additional work to the decision tool that will come out of the information collected. There is some level of concurrent activity to these projects.
 - It was clarified that the percentage of staff time to identify and assess habitat needs for this year is about 50%.
 - Concern was expressed with the last sentence in the original project description – additional efforts will capture data for future reintroduction sites. The concern is that with Big Bend and the Middle Rio Grande (MRG), only one more potential site is needed for the 3rd self-sustaining population. It was briefly discussed that neither Big Bend nor the MRG is a self-sustaining population yet. The summaries need to be focused on how the Program will be productive in the reintroduction efforts. It was agreed to change the language to “additional efforts will be ongoing to capture data as needed.”
 - The CC omitted the phrase “missing information can be obtained through future contracted projects” and requested that a generic data collection future activity summary be created as place holder in the LTP for Priority 1 2010 funding.
 - Concern was expressed that the original title was too long and negative. It was explained that the title was derived from the language of 3 original summaries that were lumped (in order to indicate which summaries went into the creation of this single summary).
 - Changes to the *Identify and assess habitat needs, management activities, and any major hurdles to RGSM reintroductions into upper and lower Rio Grande and Pecos River reaches* future activity summary included:
 - N/A was added under the ESA compliance requirement category
 - Add “2011-2012 (ongoing as needed)” to the project duration
 - Add to project description: “The first phase is a 2 year effort that will lead to a site-specific reintroduction plan. Additional ongoing efforts will capture data for future reintroduction sites.”
 - Add “Decision tool project” to the table of projects needing completion prior with a completion date of 2011; implement New 10(j) Pop is tentatively 2013
 - Under Estimate Cost add: ½ FTE USFWS reintroduction biologist
 - A disclaimer should be added to the LTP text that some of the costs identified might be overlapping or paid through the same agreement; a reference to funding source should be included in the Estimated Costs section of the activity summaries – for example: *these staff costs are included in the reintroduction summary title here as a reference.* For *Identify and Assess Habitat Needs* project, the Estimate Costs section

was changed to: *0.5 FTE USFWS reintroduction biologist activities identified in interagency agreement and LTP section 7.9.B.2.*

- “Additional efforts will capture data for future reintroduction sites” was changed to “additional efforts will be ongoing to capture data as needed.”
- The phrase “missing information can be obtained through future contracted projects” was omitted from the project description.
- “Sufficient” was changed to “existing” in the first words of the first sentence under project description.

[Please note that at this point in the discussion, the CC switched to discussing HR future activity summaries in order to accommodate HR member’s availability to attend. For the purposes of tracking changes and the notes however, all the 10(j) reintroduction summary discussions have been kept together.]

- *Develop a decision tool to test the feasibility of reestablishing RGSM populations at current, historic, and proposed reintroduction locations:*
 - The purpose of this proposed activity is to gather all information to help guide the decision process for future reintroductions with the ultimate outcome of utilization for non-biased assessment of potential reintroduction sites and to help determine missing information or data gaps to guide data collection efforts.
 - The CC discussed the proposed “planning team” and questioned who would be involved/included, how it was to be structured, etc. The CC requested clarifying information on the planning team be included in the project description.
 - It was explained that the first phase of the planning team was expected to be FWS experts to review the information acquired over the years, to reorganize what is known, and make a first pass at determining what data is missing. The second phase would include the input of stakeholders (universities, signatories, pueblos, etc.).
 - The CC requested clarification on how this planning team would fit and logistically work with the other recovery teams. The Rio Grande silvery minnow recovery team and the Rio Grande Fishes recovery team were both briefly mentioned. Mark Brennan will follow up on the existing fish recovery teams to determine potential involvement in the reintroduction planning team and any possible historic information or data that could be provided through these groups.
 - Attendees discussed the phrase “other staff in consulting roles” and the possible confusion surrounding that language. It was agreed to omit the wording altogether.
 - Changes to the *Develop a decision tool to test the feasibility of reestablishing RGSM populations at current, historic, and proposed reintroduction locations* future activity summary included:
 - Title change: omit “current, historic” and change “proposed” to “potential” and add “...and utilized...” New title: *Develop and utilize a decision tool to test the feasibility of reestablishing RGSM populations at potential reintroduction locations.*

- Add 3.3(M) to the other 10(j) summaries for consistency since it shows the overall goal and the steps to that goal
 - Correct the Estimated Cost section to reflect previous summary changes and keep the language consistent in all: *FWS reintroduction biologist staff time included in Interagency Agreement in LTP section 7.9.b.2*
 - Funding source changed to MRGESCP
 - Omit “other staff in consulting roles”
 - Add to Projects Dependant table: *Identify and Assess habitat needs* with completion dates of 2011-2012 and *Implement 10(j) population reintroductions* with completion date of 2013 (tentatively)
- *Necessary activities to support future 10(j) population reintroductions:*
- The CC requested consistent language be included in the summary about how the Program can support reintroduction efforts to recover the species without providing funding.
 - The reintroduction biologist IA was reviewed for specific responsibilities involving public outreach and compliance. The official language in the IA includes work on public involvement and NEPA compliance, including scoping (see Section 3C).
 - Changes to the *Necessary activities to support future 10(j) population reintroductions* future activity summary included:
 - ESA Compliance was changed from 2003 RPA BB to N/A
 - Change project duration to *2011-2013 (tentative)* since language in the project description indicates the project will begin “after identification.”
 - Funding source changed to MRGESCP
 - Corrected Estimate Cost to reflect the staff time language agreed for other 10(j) summaries
 - Changed language from “create a planning team” to “work with a planning team” in the Project Description
 - Add “concurrently” to *ID Habitat needs, Hurdles, mgmt needs* in the Projects Completed First table
 - Title changed to “conduct necessary activities to support future 10(j) population”
 - The Funding Source was changed to MRGESCP and Others instead of just the MRGESCP
- *Implement new 10(j) population reintroduction:*
- Concern was expressed that the habitat relationship language (habitat relationships, geomorphology, channel relationships, etc.) is not currently captured in the summaries. Post-release, these relationships are being explored in Big Bend.

- The CC discussed the original tentative target date of 2013 when the NEPA process can easily take 18 months or more. It was suggested the date be changed to 2014 in order to be more realistic. Concern was also raised regarding the estimated cost of \$25,000; however it was explained that the estimate was based off the Big Bend reintroduction (which costs ~\$20,000). This project is the actual transport and release of the fish and is the simplest part of the reintroduction process.
- Mark Brennan will enhance the project description of *Reintroduce new RGSM 10(j) Population* activity summary to include details on the technical steps of moving stock fish from hatcheries to designated sites. Details should include the description of the potential for release to more than one location at the site, clarification of rule making, etc.
- Changes to the *Implement new 10(j) population reintroduction* future activity summary included:
 - Title changed to: “reintroduce new RGSM10(j) population”
 - Project description changed to “Reintroduce RGSM into a newly designated non-essential experimental population (NEP) reach of the Rio Grande...”
 - Changed “Implementation will occur...” to “Reintroduction will occur...” The new reintroduction phrase (replacing implementation) will now follow the “...thorough evaluation of habitat...”
 - Add to project description: *This is a short-term, intensive activity that will take place over a few weeks per year. The effort will be based on the reintroduction plan and will include the transport of RGSM from propagation facilities to the indentified 10(j) site(s), releasing the RGSM, and initially monitoring their retention status.*
 - Funding source changed to unknown
 - ESA Compliance changed to N/A
 - Change/clarify the Project Duration to “Initial effort: 5 years with continued augmentation as needed up to 16 years; augmentation may be needed based on monitoring results.”
 - Add to description: *The initial effort is planned to take approximately 5 years with additional years for augmentation as required based on monitoring results.*
 - In the Projects to be completed first table, change the completion date on *ID Habitat Needs* to 2012. In the same table, add *Develop and Utilize Decision Tool* with completion date of 2011. Change the completion date of *Necessary Activities* to 2013 (tentatively).
 - In the projects dependant on table, change completion date of *Implement 10(j)* to 2013-2035.
- *Implement 10(j) population monitoring at a future site*
 - The CC discussed the estimated cost for this project. It was explained that the estimate was based on the current monitoring of Big Bend which at 4 times per

year is insufficient. The monitoring needs to be increased (ex. 8 times a year) or maybe by adding additional sites. The cost reflects a more intensive monitoring effort.

- Mark Brennan will reconcile all the duration completion dates for all 10(j) reintroduction future activity summaries for consistency (2026 or 2035, etc.).
- Changes to the *Implement 10(j) population monitoring at a future site* future activity summary included:
 - Title changed “Conduct RGSM monitoring at 10j reintroduction site(s)
 - Change the project description to read: Implement monitoring efforts at the second reintroduction site exclusive of Big Bend following reintroduction efforts. Big Bend RGSM monitoring is covered under a separate activity summary. Population monitoring needs and protocol, including duration following releases, and other activities (genetics, fish health, water quality, etc.) will be described in the site specific reintroduction plan(s).
 - ESA compliance changed to N/A
 - Under Anticipated Benefits add: “...and the need for further augmentation” to the first sentence.
 - Add to project description: “This monitoring effort is expected to be more intensive than the actual Big Bend experience and the need to increase the monitoring by more than quarterly analysis or an increase in site locations.”
 - To the Projects to be Completed Prior table, add: *Reintroduce the minnow*.
 - Change end date of *Implement 10(j) Pop reintro* to 2013 (tentatively).
- *Improve our understanding of the Effects of transportation and various stocking conditions and release site on RGSM survival and retention at reintroduction sites:*
 - It was suggested that this project could begin as early as the next release to Big Bend instead of postponing implementation to until 2013 which then couldn't inform the other reintroduction effort.
 - The CC requested that the project description be enhanced with background information on why the project is needed and the history of the transportation issues. (Some new information might be available in Kevin Buhl's most recent reports.) It was shared that a 3rd type of transportation method is being used to move fish from Dexter to South Dakota for an additional data set for comparison.
 - Changes to the *Improve our understanding of the Effects of transportation and various stocking conditions and release site on RGSM survival and retention at reintroduction sites* future activity summary included:
 - Title changed to: Optimize survivorship of RGSM during transportation and stocking for post-release retention of reintroduction and augmentation sites.
 - Funding Source changed to unknown

- Changed Estimated Cost to a total of \$175,000
- *Review Habitat Restoration Priority 1, 2, and 3 Future Activities Summaries*
 - HR work group members shared that all of their future activities can probably be lumped into a few categories: system monitoring, effectiveness monitoring, planning and compliance, and construction.
 - *Implement System monitoring plan:*
 - ✓ Concern was expressed that the description for the development of system monitoring seems to focus on habitat restoration projects instead of the system as a whole. The title was changed from “system” to “Program-wide” or “within Program boundaries.”
 - ✓ This project was intended to serve the purpose of validation and determine what is happening in system due to natural processes (versus the impacts of human actions) and to track longer-term trends at the larger scale. This is a separate project from the 2-year EMP project and is still a Priority 1 that needs to happen concurrently with the EMP project.
 - The EMP is very site specific to determine if the restoration being implemented is suitable and being utilized by species but it does not give indications to the system. Systems monitoring is needed for adaptive management, to determine the effectiveness of Program activities, and to assist with planning efforts.
 - The CC discussed the intended purpose of validation monitoring to determine the difference in system response due to management actions versus natural progression and how HR projects have an impact on long-term geomorphical long-term trends. There is a need to understand the system as a whole in order to understand if HR projects are successful and beneficial. Unless the Program has a good pulse on long-term process and trends of the system, then we may be headed down a different path from the system; this is thus a precursor to adjusting our actions and adaptive management.
 - Changes to the *Implement System monitoring plan* future activity summary included:
 - Incorporate the Development of System Monitoring Plan into the Implement System Monitoring summary to create a single summary covering both.
 - In Anticipated Benefits to species, added: “...analyzed in the context of the larger river system or project area to allow for tracking long-term trends that may be important or linked to species management and recovery.
 - In Project Description, added: ‘...so as to provide context for Program activities as part adaptive management.’
 - In Project Description, added: ‘Preliminary efforts will be based on the database management system (DBMS) and other sources including the collection, consolidation and trend analysis of existing/extra data to document the quantity and quality of suitable species habitat available.’

- In Project Description, moved the "...understanding the system..." sentence to the Anticipated Benefits to the Species section.
 - In Project Description, changed the last sentence to "An external Peer Review *may* be done on the draft system monitoring plan."
 - Changed Implementing Party to MRGESCP
 - Changed title to: Develop and implement Program-wide System monitoring and Trend analysis for adaptive management
 - Changed LTP section to: 7.6.C.3
 - Changed LTP category to: Adaptive Management, Monitoring
 - Omit the peer review cost estimate of \$30,000
 - Add to References: pending Program Adaptive Management plan
 - In the Projects to be Completed prior table: add Draft Adaptive Management Plan with completion date of 2011; add 2-year EMP (simultaneously) with completion date of 2012; and add DBMS (simultaneously) with completion date of 2012.
 - In the Projects Dependent table, add: Program adaptive management
 - In the Benefits to Species, add: "Whether system wide or specific to area, accomplished by the Program or external interests, it is important to species recovery and other Program goals to have continually current assessment of the Program area. This effort will assume the Program decision makers have the current information to guide future activities. Both species' recovery will be more attainable with this improved information at all scales."
- *Implement 2-year EMP*
- It was suggested that the *Based on peer review recommendations, adjust the Second year of monitoring as needed and Evaluate EMP pilot project to develop 10-year plan* to be rolled into a single summary with the other 2-year projects relating to the 2-year EMP. It was suggested the 10-year EMP projects could also be lumped with the 2-year EMP projects since they are so closely linked.
 - The following summaries will be lumped into a single activity summary to remain a Priority 1: (1) *Based on the peer review recommendations, adjust the second year of monitoring as needed & Evaluate EMP Pilot Project to Develop 10-year Plan*, Pg. 3; (2) *Implement 10-year Effectiveness Monitoring Plan (EMP)*, Pg 4; (3) *2-year EMP Pilot Project*, Pg. 16; (4) *Develop and implement a 10-year Program-wide Habitat Restoration Effectiveness Monitoring Plan*, Pg. 26; (5) *Oversee the first year of low and high intensity effectiveness monitoring at 20 sites in two reaches of the Rio Grande*, Pg. 27; (6) *Conduct EMP monitoring program of HR sites*, Pg. 32; and (7) *Evaluate the results of the first year of monitoring through an external peer review process*, Pg. 42.
 - A suggested new title for the combined EMP summary included: Developing, implementing, and evaluating the 2-year and 10-year EMP pilot project.

- Concern was expressed about lumping all the activities considering limited funding and priorities. This issue could be addressed in the project duration columns of the LTP Table 7 (ex. project start date of 2011 with end date of 2020).
- *Planning and Compliance*
 - The CC and HR members discussed whether to lump these activities into a single summary with references to each reach or to keep a separate activity summary for each reach. The habitat planning and compliance is larger than just utilizing the A&Rs – but a more collective and system-based view.
 - The planning summaries to be lumped into the new HR Projects Determination include: (1) *Determine which Habitat Restoration Assessment & Recommendation Report proposed projects should be implemented*, Pg. 5; (2) *Albuquerque Reach Habitat Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 6; (3) *Cochiti Reach HR Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 7; (4) *Identify flycatcher habitat in need of improvement*, Pg. 10; (5) *Prioritize HR projects by reach*, Pg. 11; (6) *Research Reach specific habitat*, Pg. 14; (7) *Cochiti Reach Residential Habitat*, Pg. 15; (8) *Isleta Reach Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 22; (9) *Use riparian groundwater modeling tools to identify locations best suited to refugial habitat and riparian habitat restoration actions*, Pg. 24; (10) *In suitable but unoccupied and potentially suitable habitats where exotic species are to be removed through chemical or mechanical means, use a temporally staged (phased) approach to clear areas so some mature habitat remains throughout the restoration period for potential use by flycatchers*, Pg. 29; (11) *Evaluate Cost/Benefit*, Pg. 31; (12) *Use FLO-2D and HEC-RAS modeling tools to estimate frequency and extent of overbank inundation and in-channel habitat, respectively*, Pg. 33; (13) *Floodplain Habitat*, Pg. 34; (14) *Avoid removing non-native vegetation within 1/4 mile of occupied nest sites*, Pg. 36; (15) *Reach Planning Projects*, Pg. 40; (16) *San Acacia Reach Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 47; (17) *San Marcial Floodplain*, Pg. 48; (18) *San Marcial Reach Habitat Planning and Compliance*, Pg. 49; (19) *Portions of Hold regular workshops focused on reach-specific/adaptive management possibly*, Pg. 55; and (20) *Prioritize HR projects by reach*, Pg. 59.
 - It was cautioned that the planning and research projects need to be kept separate. For example, the floodplain habitat project (originally on pg 34) is a research project not a planning project. It is also duplicative of work that ScW proposed. The CC discussed the potential overlap between the ScW and HR future projects regarding habitat. The topic of project overlap will be raised at the next ScW meeting.
 - An additional change included adding the recovery plan element of 1.2.3(M) with a priority 2(M).
 - Implementation Projects to be lumped include: (1) *Implement Priority Habitat Restoration Projects (*note no priority assigned to individual reaches; reaches not listed in any particular order)*, Pg. 38; (2) *Implement Priority Habitat Restoration Projects*, Pg. 44; (3) *San Marcial Floodplain*, Pg. 48; and (4) *Habitat Improvement/Restoration in the San Acacia Reach*, Pg. 57.

- For those projects that will now be lumped into a single summary, the project durations in the LTP Table 7 will be extended to 2015 or 2020 to indicate carry over years.
- Add “for HR projects” to the *Annually identify operation and maintenance needs on existing and future projects (e.g., O&M for funding/capital improvement, general types of maintenance)* originally on page 8; this will be kept as a separate summary.
- **Next Steps**
 - The remaining work group future summaries to review include: Program management and adaptive management.
- **Regular CC Business**
 - **Decision** - Approval of 07/14/10 CC meeting summary – postponed until next meeting as there was no quorum at the August 4th meeting.
 - Action Item Review:
 - **July 14th, 2010 Actions**
 - ✓ Jim Wilber will revise the 7.4 Program Element Narrative for review at the July 28, 2010 CC meeting.
 - ✓ Yvette McKenna will send the draft guiding principles for inclusion of future activities in LTP with Service comments in track changes to the CC for review at the July 28, 2010 CC meeting.
 - ✓ Tetra Tech will compile a list of the Future Activity Summaries that the CC has reviewed.
 - ✓ Lori Robertson will create an activity summary for the Service’s staff (Stacey Kopitch, Jennifer Bachus, and Mark Brennan) future work activities for inclusion in the LTP. *(After further discussion, it was determined that the PMT will be preparing all the staff support activity summaries and Stacey Kopitsch will be responsible for the Service submittals; continuation of a June 9th action; should be available by July 28)*
 - 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. – *Ongoing; the comment period on the 2009 EC retreat summary closes tomorrow. All received comments will be combined and the summary finalized prior to distribution to the CC.*
 - Susan Kelly will incorporate more language August 2009 Retreat meeting notes into the bullets on page 5 of the draft LTP and email to the CC for review. – *June 9th action not previously completed since the 2009 EC retreat notes have not been distributed; not received as of 08/04/10*
 - **July 28, 2010 Actions**
 - ✓ Mark Brennan will email the 10(j) Future Activity summaries to Yvette McKenna and Jenae Maestas to distribute to the CC; Lori Robertson will notify Mark of this action item. – complete and will be revised with today’s discussion

- Yvette McKenna will revise the “*Continue to collect and evaluate existing data on water quality and sediment quality and identify future investigations that are needed.*” Future Activity summary so that it is in alignment with the “*Evaluate water quality in the MRG in relation to the RGSM*” Future Activity summary and distribute to the CC for review. – *not complete*
- ✓ Jim Wilbur will email the revised 7.4 Program Element Narrative to Yvette McKenna to distribute to the CC.
- Yvette McKenna will highlight discussion on the peer reviews of the PVA models from the June PVA work group meeting notes and distribute to the CC. – *not completed*
- Review Program Element Narratives - *postponed*
- Review draft guiding principles for inclusion of future activities in LTP - *postponed until next meeting as there was no quorum at the August 4th meeting.*

**Coordination Committee
4 August 2009 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD	247-0234	P – Chair	brooke@mrgcd.us
Grace Haggerty	ISC	965-2053	P	grace.haggerty@state.nm.us
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3555	O	kdickinson@usbr.gov
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	P	rbillings@abcwua.org
Kathy Dickinson	Reclamation	462-3555	O	kdickinson@usbr.gov
Anders Lundahl	ISC	383-4047	O	anders.lundahl@state.nm.us
Jill Wick	NMDGF	476-8091	O	hill.wick@state.nm.us
Sarah Beck	COE	342-3333	O	sarah.e.beck@usace.army.mil
Ondrea Hummel	COE	342-3375	O	ondrea.c.hummel@usace.army.mil
Monika Mann	COE	342-3250	O	monika.mann@usace.army.mil
Susan Bittick	USACE	342-3397	P – Vice-Chair	susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
Brian Gleadle	NM DGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Mark Brennan	FWS	761-4752	O	mark_brennan@fws.gov
Jen Bachus	FWS	761-4714	A	jennifer_bachus@fws.gov
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	761-4737	O	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov

Jim Wilber	Reclamation	462-3548	P	jwilber@usbr.gov
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	O	marta.wood@ttemi.com