

Coordination Committee Meeting

March 2, 2011

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
March 2, 2011 Meeting – 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

Conference Call-in Line for March 2, 2011
Toll Free Number: 9-1-877-917-1554
Participant Passcode: 32403#
(1st Committee member or contractor to arrive, please dial in)

Draft Meeting Agenda

- Introductions and Agenda* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 02/09/11 CC meeting summary*
- Action Item Review (see below)
- Develop a range of options for the adaptive management sessions (formation of an ad hoc workgroup?, formation of a standing workgroup?, etc.) for consideration by the EC at March meeting
- Review draft funding process flowchart (previously posted)
- Review draft 2011 work plans*
- Update on Santo Domingo HR project
- Update on SWM priority project (Using URGWOM to Evaluate Future Water Management Strategies – previously posted)
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC
- Discuss monthly CC meeting dates
 - Two meetings per month?
 - One longer meeting per month?

Next meeting – March 16 @ Reclamation from 1:00 - 4:00 pm

Upcoming meetings

Executive Committee meeting – March 29 @ Reclamation from 9:00 am – 2:00 pm
(PVA models and preliminary outputs will be presented in a.m.)

****denotes read ahead***

February 9, 2011 Action Items:

Yvette McKenna will have Gen Quest incorporate the requested edits to the Future LTP Activities by LTP Category

DRAFT

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
March 2, 2011 Meeting – 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

Actions

- Yvette McKenna will send out another email to invite the Program to participate in adaptive management and join the adaptive management mailing list.
- Yvette McKenna will check in the Program Bylaws to see if the Program Open House is every other calendar year or fiscal year.
- Yvette McKenna will ask Kathy Dickinson if she can give a presentation on the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review Final Report to the CC and EC at their upcoming March meetings.
- Yvette McKenna will post the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review report the Program website by COB March 7.

Decision

- The February 9th meeting summary was approved with the following edits (changes in italics). (1) a correction to the attendance list, (2) a sentence on page 7 was changed to read “*Fish and Wildlife Service* discussed that there might not be a time frame for expiration of the new BiOp if the Program can commit to implement adaptive management in compliance with the BO.”, and (3) a correction to page 8 “The reason that flycatcher habitat should be near existing habitat is because of site fidelity and increasing the probability of *colonizing* adjacent areas.”

Next Meeting: March 16, 2011

- Possible agenda items include: adaptive management, presentation on the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review Final Report (potentially given by Kathy Dickinson), reschedule CC monthly meeting dates

Meeting Summary**Introductions and Agenda Approval**

- Brooke Wyman brought the meeting to order and introductions were made around the table. The agenda was approved with the addition of discussions on SWM Co-chairs and a technical review team for the monitoring report.

- It was shared that the low intensity monitoring report should be coming out around March 15, 2011.

Decision – Approval of 02/09/11 CC meeting summary*

- Attendees reviewed last minutes changes that had been incorporated to the February 9, 2011 CC meeting summary.
- The February 9th meeting summary was approved with the following edits (changes in italics). (1) a correction to the attendance list, (2) a sentence on page 7 was changed to read “*Fish and Wildlife Service* discussed that there might not be a time frame for expiration of the new BiOp if the Program can commit to implement adaptive management in compliance with the BO.”, and (3) a correction to page 8 “The reason that flycatcher habitat should be near existing habitat is because of site fidelity and increasing the probability of *colonizing* adjacent areas.”

Action Item Review

- **Yvette McKenna will have GenQuest incorporate the requested edits to the Future LTP Activities by LTP Category**
 - Complete.
 - Meeting attendees were updated that GenQuest is making changes to the Future LTP Activities by LTP Category. GenQuest has been asked for a disc with the past activities so that they can be uploaded to the Program website for the Coordination Committee (CC) to review.
 - GenQuest and Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) are also exploring implementation of a macro-enabled document so that it is easier to make and track changes in the future. It was explained that currently GenQuest is completing the Annual Report and Long Term Plan (LTP) work through the same Technical Support task order. However there will be added costs associated with the development of a macro-enabled document; these added costs are not currently provided for in the task order. Reclamation will need to provide very specific descriptions of the requested work in order for GenQuest to be able to price out a cost estimate for approval. Likewise, any additional meetings (i.e., adaptive management) that are not currently included in the note taking task order will require a task order modification or issuance of a new task order for GenQuest to support. Some members expressed frustration over the recent challenges that this contract has experienced.
 - Attendees were updated that the government is operating under continuing resolution for at least two more weeks. If continuing resolution continues for the remainder of the budget year Reclamation has a projection for FY11 funding that is FY10 funding levels minus 10%.

- It was stated that it's not likely that the Program will receive non-Program Reclamation supplemental water funding this year.

Develop a range of options for the adaptive management sessions (formation of an ad hoc workgroup?, formation of a standing workgroup?, etc.) for consideration by the EC at March meeting

- Attendees were updated that at the last Executive Committee (EC) meeting there was discussion on whether there should be a workgroup for adaptive management and the CC was delegated to develop a range of options for EC consideration.
 - Attendees were reminded that at the last EC retreat, the EC had decided to postpone any reorganization of the Program until its known if an adaptive management work group will be needed and until the LTP, Biological Assessments (BAs), and Biological Opinion (BO) have become more final.
- Meeting attendees discussed several options for the adaptive management sessions: (1) a work group is not formed and the project continues as it is currently managed with the COTR ensuring that notes and documents are distributed after every planning session; (2) creation of an ad-hoc workgroup; and (3) creation of a standing workgroup.
 - It was discussed that having meeting notes to document the process and meeting attendees is one reason to form a work group.
 - It was shared that ESSA (the adaptive management contractor) has been documenting the process and attendees but without administrative support for the Program the contractor's notes have not yet been posted to the website. It was shared that the new administrative support to the Program will become available on March 13.
 - It was voiced that there were some concerns from an EC member that the ESSA notes have not yet been reviewed and that it's somewhat important that the notes be consistent with the way notes are currently captured.
 - A concern with formation of an ad-hoc or standing work group is that resources and staff time are currently stretched pretty thin.
 - Collapsing some of the current work groups to help facilitate creation of an adaptive management work group is one suggestion to deal with the staff and resource limitations.
 - It was stated that a pro to having a work group is increased Program involvement, but it was pointed out that this can also be a con as in the past projects have been delayed in Program review.

- A representative from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service) shared that since the Service has a regulatory role they would need to be reasonably involved in the implementation of adaptive management.
 - So far the only direct participation that the Service has had with the adaptive management contractors was during the agency interviews.
 - It was commented that Service involvement should also be discussed by the EC.
- It was commented that there have also been concerns from the PVA workgroup that need to be addressed: the PVA workgroup is concerned that the models will not be incorporated into the adaptive management process.
- There was discussion that there may be a need to send out another email to see if people who cannot attend adaptive management meetings would like to receive the related emails; this would help to ensure that concerned parties stay informed. It was explained that initially the mailing list for adaptive management was started by sending out an email inviting people to join the mailing list; meeting attendees are also added to the mailing list. Yvette McKenna will send out another email to invite the Program to participate in adaptive management and join the adaptive management mailing list.
- Consistent with the decision the EC had made, a recommendation from a CC member was for formation of a standing workgroup but after the LTP, BAs, and BO are more complete.
 - There was agreement from several CC members that it's too early to determine if a work group is needed and if in the future a standing workgroup is needed then the collapse of other workgroups can be discussed.
- At the next meeting the CC will further discuss the possible options and whether or not the CC will make a recommendation to the EC.
 - It was said that there should also be further discussion from the Service on what they see their regulatory position being with an adaptive management work group.

Review draft funding process flowchart

- Attendees were reminded that the CC had been tasked by the EC to develop a process to increase transparency in end of year funding. This was brought up as a concern in the EC when last minute funding was given to adaptive management and increased the cost share.
- Currently as the flowchart stands it only applies to Reclamation, Yvette and Jericho would like the flowchart to be more applicable to the Program before the CC reviews it.

- It was commented that the flowchart should be a public friendly document that projects that this is the best plan in the absence of time to work out how to use last minute funds.
- It was suggested that there be “side boards”; recommendations could be made for priorities so that cost share is not increased.
- The funding flowchart will be revisited by the CC in April or May once Yvette McKenna and Jericho Lewis have revised it to be more applicable to the Program.

Review draft 2011 work plans

- Meeting attendees reviewed the 2011 work group work plans.
 - Attendees were updated that the adaptive management meetings had been added to all the work group work plans.
 - The February adaptive management meeting will be removed from the SWM work plan as it was remembered that only PVA, ScW, and HRW had been invited to attend the February meeting.
- Attendees discussed a Program open house and technical workshop.
 - The Program bylaws indicate that every other year there should be a Program open house. In order to address this need and requests for a work group technical workshop it is currently proposed that there be a 2 day event with the first day being a technical meeting and the second day being an open house.
 - It was commented that the San Acacia Reach workshop would be a good model to follow as there was more public involvement than past Program symposiums have had.
 - There was concern that with the LTP, BAs, and BO it might not be possible to have a technical symposium.
 - It was suggested that a smaller public discussion session might be more practical than a technical symposium. The first day of the event could be a discussion session with technical attendees present and the next day could be a more family friendly open house.
 - The CC will further discuss an open house/symposium at another CC meeting.
- It was shared that there was an email exchange about the celebration for the 1000th acre of restored habitat cautioning how the acres should be characterized so that they are not being misrepresented.
- Attendees discussed upcoming Program/agency events that will be going on in March and April to determine if they should be included in the work plans.
 - March 29th PVA meeting

- Since initial model outputs will be viewed the PVA meeting should be opened up to all work groups and put on their work plans.
- It was suggested that “Coordinate with the appropriate Program work group Co-Chairs to develop SOWS for EC approved activities” should be added to the appropriate work plans. The idea was for this to be a joint meeting between the work groups to develop SOWs.
 - A meeting between the PVA and the other technical work groups to work on hypothesis planning was also suggested for sometime in June or July.
- San Acacia Fish Passage peer review report.
 - The final peer review report became available last week and will be posted to the Program website. Yvette McKenna will post the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review report the Program website by COB March 7.
 - It was said that the CC and Kathy Dickinson (project COTR) will need to determine the next steps to be taken. The most immediate path is to undertake more studies for the minnow; there is a placeholder for minnow studies in this year’s budget.
 - It was suggested that the CC determine which work groups should review the report.
 - It was discussed that the EC get a short summary presentation of the report in their March meeting.
 - Kathy might be the most appropriate person to give a summary of the report.
 - Yvette McKenna will ask Kathy Dickinson if she can give a presentation on the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review Final Report to the CC and EC at their upcoming March meetings.
- The low intensity monitoring report will be available by March 15th.
 - It was suggested that the 7 technical work group (ScW, HRW, SWM, PVA, PHVA, and SAR) Co-Chairs be notified that volunteers are needed for review.
 - Permitted volunteers will also be needed for this year’s monitoring. When it’s known what the water year will be like, a block schedule for the monitoring will be drafted.
- The adaptive management meetings in April will be open to the 7 technical work groups. A meeting notice will be sent to the adaptive management mailing list and the Co-Chairs for the 7 technical work groups.
- The LTP

- Attendees were notified that the LTP schedule has been changed to coincide with Reclamation's draft BA submittal to the Service. Reclamation's BA will be submitted for Program review on August 1st and delivered to the Service on October 1st. Reclamation's BA will be submitted separately from the LTP.
- The Corps' BA will be submitted in April. Since the LTP is not ready it will not be included in the Corps' draft BA; however activities that are in the LTP that the Corps plans to fund will be included in their draft BA.
- It was discussed that the initial PVA results in March will not be included in either the Reclamation or Corps initial draft BAs. The PVA models will come into the Reclamation BA once they are ready however they will not be included in the Corp's BA as they have certain management flows that they are required to use.
- It was suggested that the CC have working meetings in May or June to focus on the LTP.

SWM Co-Chairs

- Meeting attendees were updated that the SWM work group is without a non-federal Co-Chair and after discussion at several SWM meetings it was determined that none of the non-federal participants are able to fill that role at this time. The SWM Charter indicates that to the extent possible the work group should have one federal and one non-federal Co-Chair and the work group would like to know if they can have two federal Co-Chairs since a non-federal participant is unable to fill that role. The CC concurred that there could be 2 federal Co-Chairs if a non federal participant is unable to take on that role.

Update on Santo Domingo HR project

- Attendees were updated that there was a slight change to the Santo Domingo Habitat Restoration project. Due to changes in river conditions embayments will now be built as opposed to what was originally proposed. The change will not affect funding and has been concurred upon by the HRW via email. Attendees agreed that though there are no issues with this change in the future there needs to be a process for the CC to approve changes to projects even if funding is not affected.

Update on SWM priority project (Using URGWOM to Evaluate Future Water Management Strategies)

- Previously the SWM project "Using URGWOM to Evaluate Future Water Management Strategies" was thought to be a duplicate of the URGWOM development project but further research has indicated that this project is not a duplicate and should have been included with the work group proposed activities in the budget planning spreadsheet.

- It was shared that though the project is not a duplicate, the URGWOM tech team will not be able to work on this project in FY11 as their work plan is very BA centric.
- Meeting attendees agreed that though the project had originally been left off in error, due to lack of funding and the inability of the URGWOM tech team to carry out this project in FY11, the project will not be included in the budget planning spreadsheet for FY11 and the project will be considered for FY12 funding.

Discuss monthly CC meeting dates

- Meeting attendees discussed rescheduling CC meeting dates.
 - It was commented that it would be preferential for CC meetings to be staggered 1 week apart from the EC meeting in order to have time for preparation. If the meetings are reduced to one meeting a month then it is preferential that the meeting be earlier in the month.
 - The CC will further discuss CC meeting dates at their next CC meeting.
- Meeting attendees also discussed the need for clarification on which agencies the 3 contractors in the PVA represent, particularly when the contractors are participating in the adaptive management sessions.
 - It was clarified that when contractors are brought to adaptive management sessions that the contractors are brought as technical representatives on behalf of their associated agencies. It was confirmed that Dr. Goodman represents the MRGCD, and Mike Hatch and Rich Valdez represent ISC.
 - It was stated that the contractors need to get draft documents either from the agency that is contracting them or from Yvette McKenna and that contractor comments should be funneled through their associated agency.
 - Attendees also discussed that the PVA modelers are listed as work group members in the PVA.
 - It was suggested that the modelers not be included as work group members but be listed as technical representatives to their associated agencies.

**Coordination Committee
02 March 2011 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3640	O – PM	ymckenna@usbr.gov
Ann Moore	NMAGO	222-9024	P	amoore@nmag.gov
Grace Haggerty	ISC	965-2053	P	grace.haggerty@state.nm.us
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	P	rbillings@abcwua.org
Julie Alcon	USACE	342-3281	A	julie.a.alcon@usace.army.mil
Jim Wilber	Reclamation	462-3548	P	jwilber@usbr.gov
Terina Perez	Reclamation	462-3614	O	tlperez@usbr.gov
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4706	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Susan Kelly	UNM	277-0514	P	skelly@law.unm.edu
Stacey Kopitsch	USFWS	761-4737	O	Stacey_kopitsch@gws.gov
Susan Bittick	USACE	342-3397	P	Susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD	247-0234	P	brooke@mrgcd.us
Rebecca Onchaga	Reclamation	462-3624	O	ronchaga@usgr.gov
Hilary Brinegar via phone	NMDA	575-646-2642	P	hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 ext. 139	O	Christine.sanchez@ttemi.com