

**Kickoff Meeting for
San Acacia Fish Passage External Peer Review
September 9, 2010 12:30 pm to 4:30 pm
Bureau of Reclamation – Rio Grande Room**

Actions

- Yvette Paroz will contact Manuel Uliberri at Dexter Fish Hatcher to request the monitoring data be sent to Kathy Dickinson.
- Kathy Dickinson will post any provided information/data/studies to the Program's website and notify Paul Callahan when it is available.
- Jason Remshardt will provide Kathy Dickinson with the fish movement data and PIT tag study(ies).
- Jericho Lewis will coordinate with Kathy Dickinson to ensure all data/information is available on the Program's website.
- The Review Panelists will review the Recovery Plan and other provided information to determine if more data is needed on non-native fish especially considering that in other locations, dams are being built to isolate species from non-natives.
- Mickey Porter will provide the Corps's HEC-RAS model inundation and channel form results to Kathy Dickinson.
- Jeanne Dye will determine when the genetics data will be available and will provide to Kathy Dickinson for posting to the website.
- Yvette Paroz will provide Reclamation's electrofishing data to Kathy Dickinson for posting to the Program's website.
- Jericho Lewis to check if the previous peer review report on the sturgeon in Yellow Stone is available and if so, will have it posted to the Program's website as a reference on the report template.

Meeting Summary

- Paul Callahan, a PBS & J consultant, introduced himself as the facilitator to the panelists for the San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage External Peer Review (Peer Review) Phase I. Paul will be pulling together materials for the panelists as well as compiling their reviews for the report.
- The Peer Review panelists (panelists) who were able to attend the Kickoff Meeting were introduced to meeting attendees: Jim Garvey (Southern Illinois University Carbondale) is the fisheries biologist, George Cairo (George Cairo Engineering, Inc.) is the engineering/ irrigation systems consultant, and Robb Leary (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks) is the fish conservation geneticist. All panelists have experience working on fish passage projects.
- A quick recap of the field tour was given for afternoon session attendees who were unable to participate in the morning site visit.
- There were two objectives for the Kickoff Meeting: 1) to verify what question(s) will be addressed during the review and 2) to give panelists an opportunity to make data requests and ask for clarification on data that has been provided or on the objectives of the peer review. The panelists expressed concern with the wording of the Peer Review Scope of Work (SOW) objective because it is somewhat ambiguous and offered to provide a recommended revision to the objective question if warranted (revising the wording, not the intent).

- It was clarified that the review of key documents and other relevant information is intended to determine if the requirement to implement fish passage at San Acacia is based on sound science; it is a review of the science and not necessarily a document review. Peer reviews conducted under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) IDIQ are intended to ensure quality and credibility of information.
- Panelists and meeting attendees discussed and clarified additional data needs and requests.
 - The following data was requested: (1) the raw genotype data from the UNM Genetics Study; (2) a cumulative dataset of everything UNM has done for the Program; (3) monitoring data from Dexter Fish Hatchery; (4) any fish movement data available; (5) PIT tag studies; (6) any/all recruitment data; (7) female egg counts and information on floating eggs; (8) egg drift rates; (9) sediment plug information including dates, geographic extent, etc.; and (10) electrofishing data.
- Attendees discussed the indication that the silvery minnow live an average of 1 year in the wild, but based on information shared during the site tour this morning that may not necessarily be true. This is a critical piece of information. The age and growth study results will not be available until December.
- Attendees briefly discussed the similar issues with fish passage that are occurring elsewhere in the country and the need for evaluation/review since the prospective projects are expensive.
- Attendees discussed that future/continued communications need to be directed through the contracting officer in order to keep the peer review as independent as possible. As long as the contracting officer, Jericho Lewis, is advised in advance, the review panelists can contact other Program members, contractors, and other researchers for clarifications on the work/studies performed.
- Attendees discussed that the information from this peer review will be used to inform the next/new Biological Assessments and Biological Opinion.
- Jennifer Bachus will be the Service's point of contact for any Section 7 or Recovery Plan documents, links, or questions.
- In a brief schedule review, it was shared that the draft report with consensus findings and any dissenting findings will be provided to Reclamation in mid January. The full panel will come back to the Program to present the draft report/findings; comments will be incorporated or addressed as appropriate and the final report is expected in February.
- In response to a question regarding how the draft report will be finalized, including how questions/comments will be addressed, it was shared that the final report is the product of the independent peer review panel and they will address comments and concerns as deemed appropriate. However, the panel is very thorough and tough, and the results of the peer review can be expected to be well thought out and substantiated as well as possible given possible data gaps.
- Whether or not to address fish passage for the entire Middle Rio Grande range of the silvery minnow or just below the SADD will be left to the panelists to determine. The review panel will consider this issue and a multi-tiered report may result.

**Kickoff Meeting for
San Acacia Fish Passage External Peer Review
September 9, 2010 12:30 pm to 4:30 pm
Bureau of Reclamation – Rio Grande Room**

Meeting Minutes

- Paul Callahan, a PBS & J consultant, introduced himself as the facilitator to the panelists for the San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage External Peer Review (Peer Review) Phase I. Paul will be pulling together materials for the panelists as well as compiling their reviews for the report.
- The Peer Review panelists (panelists) who were able to attend the Kickoff Meeting were introduced to meeting attendees: Jim Garvey (Southern Illinois University Carbondale) is the fisheries biologist, George Cairo (George Cairo Engineering, Inc.) is the engineering/ irrigation systems consultant, and Robb Leary (Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks) is the fish conservation geneticist. This is a high level panel with all panelists having experience in working on fish passage projects.
- For afternoon session attendees who were unable to participate in the morning site visit, a quick recap of the field tour was given.
 - Panelists and morning session attendees were given a site tour; panelists were able to get feel for the site as well as a feel for the political context.
- There were two objectives for the Kickoff Meeting: 1) to verify what question(s) will be addressed during the review and 2) to give panelists an opportunity to make data requests and ask for clarification on data that has been provided or on the objectives of the peer review. Meeting attendees were also advised to keep in mind that the peer reviewers were brought in for an independent opinion and that they do not have as much historical knowledge as Program participants.
- There was discussion on the question posed as part of the Peer Review Scope of Work (SOW) objective.
 - The panelists expressed concern with the wording of the Peer Review Scope of Work (SOW) objective because it is somewhat ambiguous and offered to provide a recommended revision to the objective question if warranted (revising the wording, not the intent).
 - It was said that the Program would like to stick as close as possible to the question in order to keep its intent. They would like to avoid any delays by having to run the question by the Executive Committee (EC) for approval.
 - When the panel begins to dig into the data they will meet and determine if rewording would be recommended.
- It was verified that this is the only question that will be posed for the Peer Review.
 - It was commented that the process seems more like an advisory committee than a peer review.
 - The panelists will be expected to review key documents and other relevant information for fish passage. They have been tasked with

going through literature and unpublished data to see whether the question is merited or not. The Peer Review is a review of the science and not necessarily a document review.

- This peer review is being conducted under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) IDIQ. The IDIQ is intended to ensure quality and credibility of information.
- It was said that an advisory panel review had been done 5 years ago, since then more science has been done. Kathy Dickinson will send the draft report from the review to Paul Callahan; it won't be posted to the Program website as the document remains in draft form.
- Panelists and meeting attendees discussed and clarified additional data needs and requests.
 - The raw genotypes data from the UNM Genetics Study
 - This data has been requested and should be on hand in October 2010.

Action: Jeanne Dye will determine when the genetics data will be available and will provide to Kathy Dickinson for posting to the website.

- A cumulative dataset for everything that UNM has done for the Program has also been requested.
- The monitoring data from Dexter Fish Hatchery is also available.

Action: Yvette Paroz will contact Manuel Uliberri at Dexter Fish Hatchery to request the monitoring data be sent to Kathy Dickinson.

- Any movement data and PIT tag studies that are available.

Action: Jason Remshardt will provide Kathy Dickinson with the fish movement data and PIT tag study(ies).

- It was said that for the PIT tag study only fish over 60 mm standard length were able to be tagged; this is only a subset of the entire population.
- Discharge data
 - There are links from USGS for several different studies.
- Panelists said that if they could get a hold of wild fish from each of the 3 reaches that a fatty acid analysis would be helpful; the analysis would be completed by the panelist at no charge.
 - Due to permitting issues this might be something that can't be done; fish cannot be given to someone without a permit.
- It was asked how long the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow lives.
 - Attendees discussed the indication that the silvery minnow live an average of 1 year in the wild, but based on information shared during the site tour this morning that may not necessarily be true.

- For some of the assessments that panelists will be doing this will be a critical piece of information.
- A study using museum specimens showed 5-6 years historically.
- The Age and Growth study is currently being conducted but results will not be available until December.
- Recruitment data, information on female egg counts, and information on floating eggs
 - This type of information is available from the hatcheries.
 - It was said that there is a study that Steve Platania and Robert Dudley did on reproductive biology in 2002. It is not known if the raw data from that study is available or just the report.
- Drift rates of eggs and larvae before they swim
 - This information is available on the Program website.
- Information on non-natives and potential predators
 - In Platania and Dudley's monitoring data every fish is sorted and identified.
 - Some of this information can also be found in the augmentation and salvage data.
 - There is also the electrofishing and seining data from Reclamation. It was said that this monitoring effort has found Channel Catfish and a few other predators.

Action: Yvette Paroz will provide Reclamation's electrofishing data to Kathy Dickinson for posting to the Program's website.

- It was said that common carp are probably the biggest non-native threat for habitat and space.

Action: The Review Panelists will review the Recovery Plan and other provided information to determine if more data is needed on non-native fish especially considering that in other locations, dams are being built to isolate species from non-natives.

- Information on sediment plugs
 - Reclamation Technical Services Division may have some of this information.
 - The Corps should have HEC-RAS model inundation and channel form results by the end of September 2010.

Action: Mickey Porter will provide the Corps's HEC-RAS model inundation and channel form results to Kathy Dickinson.

- Attendees briefly discussed the similar issues with fish passage that are occurring elsewhere in the country and the need for evaluation/review since the prospective projects are expensive.

- There was discussion on the process through which communication should be handled.
 - The Program is striving for a very independent peer review. Future communications should be directed through the contracting officer, Jericho Lewis.
 - As long as Jericho Lewis is advised in advance, the review panelists can contact other Program members, contractors, and other researchers for clarifications on the work/studies performed.

Action: Jericho Lewis will coordinate with Kathy Dickinson to ensure all data/information is available on the Program's website.

- It was briefly discussed what the Program/Reclamation plans to do with the information provided in the Peer Review.
 - Fish Passage is an RPA element in the 2003 biological opinion and will have to be implemented. The information from the peer review will be used to inform the next/new Biological Assessments and Biological Opinion.
- Jennifer Bachus will be the Service's point of contact for any Section 7 or Recovery Plan documents, links, or questions.
- In a brief schedule review, it was shared that the draft report with consensus findings and any dissenting findings will be provided to Reclamation in mid January 2011. The full panel will come back to the Program to present the draft report/findings; comments will be incorporated or addressed as appropriate and the final report is expected in February 2011.
 - Jericho Lewis will check if the previous peer review report on the sturgeon in Yellow Stone is available and if so, will have it posted to the Program's website as a reference on the report template.
- The floor was opened for questions to the panelists and questions about the Peer Review.
 - It was asked if what the panel provides back to the Program will be a final product or if it will be draft
 - The Program will be provided with the draft report in early to mid January and the Program will review it and provide comments. The Peer Reviewers will review the comments and the final report will address comments and concerns as appropriate.
 - It was asked if the panel will be determining which comments are incorporated.
 - Yes, this is why the peer review is independent.
 - The panel is very thorough and tough, and the results of the peer review can be expected to be well thought out and substantiated as well as possible given possible data gaps.
 - Panelists asked if fish passage should be addressed for the entire Middle Rio Grande range of the silvery minnow or just below the SADD.

- This will be left for the panelists to determine.
- The review panel will consider this issue and a multi-tiered report may result.
- Panelists were asked if information on surrogate species would be used.
 - This issue will probably be left up to the individual panelist.
 - There are sufficient differences among different species at the larval stage that might make it difficult to extrapolate information from another species, but there are steps that the reviewers try to follow.
 - It was thought that there are studies dealing with other small minnows that would be valuable.

**SADD External Review Kickoff Meeting
09 September 2010 Meeting Attendees**

Name	Affiliation	Phone Number	Email Address
Kathy Dickinson	Reclamation	462-3555	kdickinson@usbr.gov
Mark Brennan	U.S. FWS	761-4756	mark_brennan@fws.gov
Wally Murphy	U.S. FWS	761-4781	wally_murphy@fws.gov
Steven Chambers	U.S. FWS	248-6658	steve_chambers@fws.gov
Steve Harris	RG Restoration	575-751-1269	steve.harris39@gmail.com
Alison Hutson	NM ISC	841-5201	alison.hutson@state.nm.us
Anders Lundahl	NM ISC	383-4047	anders.lundahl@state.nm.us
Jason Remshardt	U.S. FWS	342-9900	jason_remshardt@fws.gov
Jim Garvey	SIUC – Fisheries	618-536-7761	jgarvey@siu.edu
Paul Callahan	PBS & J	406-240-7799	pcallahan@pbsj.com
George Cairo	George Cairo Engineering	480-921-4080	gcairo@gcairoinc.com
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD	247-0234	brook@mrgcd.com
Robb Leary	MFWP	406-243-6725	Robb.leary@gso.umt.edu

Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3640	yrmckenna@usbr.gov
Jericho Lewis	Reclamation	462-3622	jlewis@usbr.gov
Jim Brooks	U.S. FWS	342-9900 ext. 102	jim_brooks@fws.gov
Jen Bachus	U.S. FWS	761-4714	jennifer_bachus@fws.gov
Terina Perez	Reclamation	462-3614	tlperez@usbr.gov
Stacey Kopitsch	U.S. FWS	761-4737	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Yvette Paroz	Reclamation	462-3581	yparoz@usbr.gov
Jeanne Dye	Reclamation	462-3564	jdye@usbr.gov
Lisa Croft	Reclamation	462-3541	lcroft@usbr.gov
Michael Porter	USACE	342-3264	michael.d.porter@usace.army.mil
Susan Bittick	USACE	342-3397	susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
Jenae Maestas	GenQuest	462-3600	jmaestas@usbr.gov
George Dennis	U.S. FWS	761-4754	george_dennis@fws.gov
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 ext. 139	christine.sanchez@tetrattech.com