

Coordination Committee Meeting  
*March 16, 2011*

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program  
Coordination Committee Meeting  
March 16, 2011 – 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm  
Bureau of Reclamation  
555 Broadway Blvd. NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

Conference Call-in Line for March 16, 2011  
Toll Free Number: 9-1-888-989-3415  
Participant Passcode: 69302#  
(1<sup>st</sup> Committee member or contractor to arrive, please dial in)

**Draft Meeting Agenda**

- Introductions and Agenda\* Approval
- Introduce new Program Administrative Assistant
- **Decision** – Approval of 03/02/11 CC meeting summary\*
- Action Item Review (see below)
- **Decision** – Recurring Monthly CC meetings
  - Two meetings per month?
  - One longer meeting per month?
- Discuss Fish Passage Peer Review Final Report (posted)
- Discuss range of options for the adaptive management (AM) sessions for consideration by the EC at March meeting
- Discuss AM documents (to be posted)
- Review draft 2011 work plans (to be posted)
- Update on contracted note takers
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC

**Next meeting** – propose April 13 @ Reclamation from ? to ?

**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.)

Adaptive Management Planning Follow-up Meetings – April 5 and 6 (technical sessions); and April 7 (open session)

Executive Committee meeting – April 21 @ Reclamation from 9:00 am – 1:00 pm

***\*denotes read ahead***

---

### March 2, 2011 Actions

- Yvette McKenna will send out another email to invite the Program to participate in adaptive management and join the adaptive management mailing list. **Will do after the documents are posted**
- Yvette McKenna will check in the Program Bylaws to see if the Program Open House is every other calendar year or fiscal year. **✓ This is not specified in the by-laws, however, in the 2003 BiOp, Conservation recommendations #5) states: Provide for citizen education and outreach regarding prevention of pollution to water resources and the effects that pollution has on river ecosystems.**
- Yvette McKenna will ask Kathy 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. **✓ Kathy was not available; the fish passage peer review contractor and panel members will be available via conference call for EC questions on March 29.**
- Yvette McKenna will post the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review report the Program website by COB March 7. **✓ Email notice sent March 3.**

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program  
Coordination Committee Meeting  
March 16, 2011 – 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm  
Bureau of Reclamation  
555 Broadway Blvd. NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

**Actions**

- CC members will review the LTP past and future activity summaries in preparation for the May 4<sup>th</sup> CC meeting.
- Yvette McKenna will send Kathy's summary of the San Acacia Reach fish passage peer review recommendations to the workgroup Co-Chairs for workgroup feedback on which recommendations should be the top priorities.
- Susan Bittick and Stacey Kopitsch will follow up with Jericho Lewis to determine if the SOW is needed before an ID/IQ can be issued for the high intensity effectiveness monitoring.
- CC members will review the final Fish Passage peer review report and brief their EC members before the next EC meeting. Any questions for the panel should be sent to Yvette McKenna in advance of the next EC meeting (due date TBD).

**Decisions**

- The March 2, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with the following edits (changes in italics). (1) The first bullet at the top of page 3 will be changed to read "It was stated that it's not likely the Program will receive *non-Program Reclamation supplemental water funding* this year." (2) The second bullet on page 4 will be changed to read "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."
- CC meetings will now be regularly scheduled for the first Wednesday of every month from 12:30 PM to 4:00 PM with additional CC/LTP meetings scheduled as needed. It was agreed that the next CC meeting will be on April 13<sup>th</sup> from 12:30 PM to 4:00 PM and the May 4<sup>th</sup> CC meeting will be from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM with a working lunch.

**CC March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Meeting Summary****Introductions and Agenda Approval**

- Susan Bittick brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was approved with the addition of an update on the recently distributed final draft low intensity efficiency monitoring report.

**Introduce new Program Administrative Assistant**

- Ali Saenz was introduced as the new Program administrative assistant. Ali is from Albuquerque and has experience with the City of Albuquerque and the military.

**Decision – Approval of 03/02/11 CC meeting summary**

- Meeting attendees briefly discussed the changes that were made at the last CC meeting to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service) edits for the February 9<sup>th</sup> CC meeting summary. A representative from the Service verified that the Service was fine with the changes.
- The March 2, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with the following edits for clarification (changes in italics).
  - The first bullet at the top of page 3 will be changed to read “It was stated that it’s not likely the Program will receive *non-Program Reclamation supplemental water funding* this year.”
  - (2) The second bullet on page 4 will be changed to read “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.”

### Action Item Review

- ✓ **Yvette McKenna will send out another email to invite the Program to participate in adaptive management and join the adaptive management mailing list. Will do after the documents are posted – complete.**
  - Attendees were updated that all adaptive management (AM) documents have been posted the Program website. The posted documents include: 2 sets of meeting minutes for the October kick-off meeting, one by GenQuest and one by ESSA; the draft working adaptive management plan; the presentation that ESSA gave on February 3<sup>rd</sup>; and the uncertainties that were generated during the technical session on February 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup>. A list of all participants and those interested in receiving emails and information about Program AM is also posted to the Program website.
  - It was briefly discussed that none of the AM documents are password protected as the process should be open to all Program participants.
- ✓ **Yvette McKenna will check in the Program Bylaws to see if the Program Open House is every other calendar year or fiscal year. ✓ This is not specified in the by-laws, however, in the 2003 BiOp, Conservation recommendations #5) states: Provide for citizen education and outreach regarding prevention of pollution to water resources and the effects that pollution has on river ecosystems.**
  - The Program by-laws do not specify when the Program should have an Open House but the 2003 Biological Opinion (BiOp) indicates that public education and outreach should be provided (see *above in red*). It was shared that past Program Management Team (PMT) documentation has indicated that in the past it was a goal of the PMT to have an open house annually.
  - It was discussed that Program participants have expressed a need for a technical workshop to discuss new scientific initiatives and report information. It is currently proposed that a technical workshop occur as part of a two day event in conjunction with a Program Open House in the fall, with the first day of the event the technical workshop and a family friendly open house the second day. The Public Information and Outreach (PIO) workgroup and PMT

will be discussing the workshop/Open House further to see if it can occur this year.

- ✓ **Yvette McKenna will ask Kathy 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. ✓ Kathy was not available; the fish passage peer review contractor and panel members will be available via conference call for EC questions on March 29. – complete;**
  - Attendees were updated that since Kathy is unavailable for the March 29<sup>th</sup> EC meeting the current plan is to have the peer review contractor and panel members available for the EC meeting via conference call.
  - Attendees were updated that the final report for the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review has been posted to the Program website. The peer reviewers' recommendations did not change much from the draft report but information was clarified and the language was toned down.
    - It was discussed that the report points the Program to more targeted fish studies as opposed to continuing with fish passage Phase II. The report recognizes that many sound studies have been completed but it also acknowledges that the information from the studies needs to be analyzed to determine what it means for upstream fish passage.
    - It was also briefly discussed that not all of the comments and suggestions from the Program were incorporated into the report. Comments and suggestions are incorporated at the panelists' discretion. It was said that there might be questions from the EC as to why not all of the comments were addressed or why they were addressed in the manner that they were.
  - Since a presentation of the final report has already been given and the final report has been posted to the Program website there are no plans for the EC to see a presentation before the conference call. The EC should focus on the recommendations of the report and have questions ready for the panelists. It was commented that it will be really important for the CC to read the report and synthesize the information for the EC.
  - It was discussed that the peer review panelists will only be available for 30 minutes so to ensure that the discussion is productive and time is used efficiently, questions for the panel should be compiled prior to the meeting and if possible provided to the panelists beforehand. It was said that there should be a deadline for questions a few days before the meeting. There may not be many questions for the panelists but mostly discussion for the EC. If no questions are received there may not be a need to have the panelists call in.
- ✓ **Yvette McKenna will post the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review report the Program website by COB March 7. ✓ Email notice sent March 3. – complete;**

**Decision** – Recurring Monthly CC meetings

- Attendees discussed whether regularly occurring CC meetings should be rescheduled to one longer recurring monthly meeting as it has been difficult for the Program Manager, PMT, and CC members who attend meetings every week to manage the current schedule. It was proposed that if there are 2 meetings every month that they be scheduled so there is at least a week between CC and EC meetings. It was also proposed that there be one monthly CC meeting occurring on the first Wednesday of the month. The outcome of EC meetings and the need to wrap up the LTP at future CC meetings may necessitate additional meetings. Attendees agreed that there would be a recurring CC meeting once a month with additional or longer meetings being scheduled as needed. It was agreed that the CC meetings will be from 12:30 to 4:00 in order to have a more realistic time frame to complete the agenda.
- It's proposed that the April CC meeting occur on April 13<sup>th</sup> in order to fit around AM meetings.
- Attendees discussed scheduling meetings to work on the LTP. Attendees were updated that all of the past activities have been posted to the Program website. It was suggested that the CC review the past activities before meeting in order to make the most efficient use of time.
  - Attendees discussed that having a working meeting for the LTP in May would be good as there may be a better idea of how the LTP will fit into implementation of the BiOP and AM. Attendees agreed that the May 4<sup>th</sup> CC meeting will be from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM with a working lunch - the majority of the meeting will be focused on the LTP.

#### **Discuss Fish Passage Peer Review Final Report**

- Attendees discussed the San Acacia Diversion Dam Fish Passage peer review final report and that the peer review points towards more focused studies for the minnow. If these recommendations are acted on, the CC will need to prioritize additional studies. All comments to the draft report are posted on the password protected page on the Program website.
- Identified data/knowledge gaps were included in the report conclusions. It was noted that Kathy Dickinson supplied the data and knowledge gaps from the fish passage peer review report to the most recent AM working session.
  - It was suggested that the AM working group provide an example by performing the exercise of randomly choosing a hypothesis and working through what it might take to formulate an appropriate study.
- Attendees discussed that there is a placeholder to fund fish passage-related studies for FY2011 but the list of possible studies needs to get prioritized in order to implement in 2011.
- Kathy has written a summary of the panelists' recommendations. This could be provided to the CC for their next meeting for discussion and recommendations.
  - Funding has been set aside for both the SADD Peer Review Phase II and for additional studies if/as identified in the Phase I peer review. Theoretically, the original money set aside for the Phase II could now be used toward additional studies as well. It was recommended that the CC select their top priority projects from the summary so that the scopes of work (SOW) can be developed.
    - Attendees discussed how the technical workgroups should give their recommendations before the CC makes any decisions. It was proposed that the workgroups read Kathy's summary, once available, and the SADD fish passage peer review report and recommend a study to the CC

- for consideration at the April 13<sup>th</sup> CC meeting. This can be accomplished either via email or at their next workgroup meeting.
- In order to be funded in FY11, the deadline to submit a new SOW is June 1<sup>st</sup>.
    - A synthesis of data and research already conducted is one of the recommendations from the peer reviewers. This might be one of the projects to initiate first as it could benefit all subsequent projects and studies. Plus, it would be fairly easy to write a scope for the data synthesis.
    - Depending on which activity is the approved priority, the appropriate workgroup could be assigned to write the SOW.
    - The synthesis recommendation will be incorporated into Kathy's summary as one of the possible fish passage-related studies that could be funded in 2011. The workgroup can use this summary and the peer review report to provide initial feedback (from their technical perspective) on what the recommended top priorities for CC consideration should be.
      - The question of recommended top priorities for a targeted study based on the uncertainties and their recommendations could also be posed to the peer review panel.

### **Effectiveness monitoring report**

- The low intensity effectiveness monitoring draft report was received a few days ago and the CC would like a semi-independent review as several personnel from Program signatories participated in the data collection and report writing. It was suggested that Program participants who have relevant expertise and who were not involved with the monitoring should review the report. The report was distributed to the technical workgroups; comments should be vetted through your agency and then emailed to Ondrea Hummel, Stacey Kopitsch, and Anders Lundahl by March 30<sup>th</sup>.
- It was shared that the report is good but that it might not make strong enough connections about why vegetation is mapped and counted. This should be more obvious in the report. It was suggested that the authors give a definition for effectiveness as based on the information in the report.
  - It was commented that the report might not include deeper discussions until after the 2nd year; it would be more appropriate to try to describe what effectiveness means at that point.
  - It was discussed that though Santa Ana Pueblo is unable to participate in the Program's effectiveness monitoring they are doing similar monitoring on their own and have offered to share their data collection methods and review the report.
  - It was commented that it is very important to have the draft monitoring report reviewed before decisions are made for the monitoring this year (i.e., to inform the direction on monitoring this year).
  - A presentation on the monitoring should be given to the EC after the 2<sup>nd</sup> year of monitoring.
- The ability to get an RFP out for the 10-year monitoring and the obligations of funds was discussed. It is not known if Jericho (for the Program) will be able to get an RFP out. The Corps has provided some funding through an Interagency Agreement (IA). It would be good to have some of the funds obligated towards a contract because unobligated funds can be pulled back.



- Meeting attendees were updated that comments to the draft SOW for food availability monitoring were pretty substantial so the MPT will be meeting with ScW to discuss the comments before any changes are implemented.
- It would be best to have the funds obligated by the end of the fiscal year.
- Attendees were reminded that initially the Corps would provide funding for the high intensity effectiveness monitoring but that was changed at a previous CC meeting and now the Corps would fund all the monitoring.
- An ID/IQ could be issued to show activity on the IA to obligate some of the funds.
- The CC had already decided that an ID/IQ should go out. It was thought that the SOW might be needed in order for Jericho to issue an RFP. Susan Bittick and Stacey Kopitsch will follow up with Jericho Lewis to determine if the SOW is needed before an ID/IQ can be issued for the high intensity effectiveness monitoring.

**Discuss range of options for the adaptive management (AM) sessions for consideration by the EC at March meeting**

- Meeting attendees were reminded that they began discussion on the range of options for the AM sessions and had agreed to discuss the options further. It was discussed that the CC should propose to the EC that a new AM workgroup should not be created until the AM plan and the Long-term Plan (LTP) have both been completely developed. This is not expected until September 2011. Development of a new AM workgroup can be discussed in more detail in September.
  - It was clarified that the need for an official AM workgroup has nothing to do with participation or interest in the work but rather with the documentation concerns. If the CC is comfortable with the current record keeping (notes, participant list, etc.), document posting and availability, etc. then there is no immediate need at this time.

**Discuss AM documents**

- Meeting attendees were updated that the adaptive management documents have been posted to the Program website ([www.middlerigrande.com](http://www.middlerigrande.com) > Library > Adaptive Management).
- Attendees were also reminded that since there is no official adaptive management workgroup at this time, no one is “approving” the summaries, notes, or presentations.

**Review draft 2011 work plans**

- Attendees reviewed the ScW, MPT, and PVA draft 2011 workgroup work plans. Attendees were reminded that joint work group meetings and review of the draft AM plan had been added to all the work plans. The PVA modelers have also been called out as technical representatives to the PVA and a distinction is made when a contractor is a workgroup member.
- Attendees discussed that the technical symposium to occur with the Program Open House in the fall should be referred to as a “technical workshop” as it is believed that a true “symposium” would be too labor intensive for this year. It will be a Program-wide technical day of meetings and presentations that would highlight newer science developments and report findings and study information. There was agreement from attendees to call it “2011 Open House/Technical Workshop” on the work plans.
- Attendees reviewed the work plans for any tasks that were not completed before March and for any due dates that subsequently needed to be changed.

- Attendees briefly discussed the 1,000 Acres of Habitat event. There was general agreement that ScW, HR, and MPT should all assist PIO with the event. It was shared that PIO will be having a small planning session(s) for the event with HR and MPT. They will discuss how to celebrate without giving any “false impressions” of the restoration work.
- It was discussed that June 2011 should be the workgroup deadline for SOW development. Setting the schedule would enable workgroups to plan ahead in order to have enough time for the SOW development.
- The PMT will review the FY2011 work plans for any minor edits before they are sent to the EC for approval.
- It was discussed that part of the AM is about “closing the loop” and looking at projects and work that has been done. It is assumed that all the workgroups evaluate their project work (i.e., what has been done) but it has never been specifically mentioned as a task although it is an important part of what they do. It was suggested that in the future the work plans should be proactive in identifying the adaptive management steps.
- It was suggested that it might be helpful for the workgroups to determine the number of reports that they will be reviewing for the year and estimate the “man hours” expected. It was also suggested that the HR workgroup look at the restored sites to see if they have accomplished the goals. There should be an evaluation component in the future work plans to identify what portions/pieces of each project should be incorporated into AM. This could also be useful in showing the public how deliverables are used and integrated into the “big picture” AM.

#### **Update on contracted note takers**

- Attendees were updated that GenQuest notified the Program that there will be a change in meeting note takers effective March 1st. Christine Sanchez will be the primary note taker for Tetra Tech and will continue to support the EC, CC, SWM, PVA, PHVA, and DBMS workgroup meetings. Marta Wood will only serve as a back-up note taker at this time. Rebecca Christy will be GenQuest’s primary note taker and will support ScW, HR, PIO, SAR, and MPT workgroup meetings. It was briefly discussed that the major change is that Marta will be less involved; as she has an extensive background in note taking for the Program this will probably be discussed further when the EC is informed of this change.
  - Some members asked if there was a back up note taker for GenQuest; none was identified in the notification that GenQuest sent.

#### **Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC**

- An update can be provided to the EC that several construction “fixes” are being made to the Silvery Minnow Sanctuary – including the sediment intake structure, removing a failed sediment pump, and installation of a rack in the culvert. It is still non-operational at this time. This will be part of the PM/CC update.

#### **Next meeting: April 13 @ Reclamation from 12:30 to 4:00 PM**

- Tentative Read Ahead: Kathy’s summary of the SADD panelist recommendations;

**Coordination Committee  
16 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	<a href="mailto:amoore@nmag.gov">amoore@nmag.gov</a>
Grace Haggerty	ISC	965-2053	P	grace.haggerty@state.nm.us
Ali Saenz	Reclamation	462-3600	O	asaenz@usbr.gov
Jen Bachus	USFWS	761-4714	A	Jennifer_bachus@fws.gov
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
Ann Watson	Santo Domingo Tribe	465-0055	P	Awatson@sdutilities.com
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	<a href="mailto:brooke@mrgcd.us">brooke@mrgcd.us</a>
Nathan Schroeder	Pueblo of Santa Ana	771-6719	P	Nathan.schroeder@sanatana-nsn.gov
Kathy Dickinson	Reclamation	462-3555	O	kdickinson@usbr.gov
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188- ext. 139	O	Christine.sanchez@ttemi.com