

# Coordination Committee Meeting

## *May 4, 2011*

### Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program  
Coordination Committee Meeting  
May 4, 2011 – 10:00 pm to 4:00 pm  
Bureau of Reclamation  
555 Broadway Blvd. NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

Conference Call-in Line for May 4, 2011  
Toll Free Number: 9-1-888-843-7186  
Participant Passcode: **61470#**  
(1<sup>st</sup> Committee member or contractor to arrive, please dial in)

### **Draft Meeting Agenda**

- Introductions and Agenda\* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 04/13/11 CC meeting summary\*
- Action Item and EC Directive Review (see below)
- Discuss draft CC process to document the justifications for which peer review recommendations they suggest pursuing and explain why other peer review recommendations were not preferred (build on Program FY10 Peer Review Process Summary\*)
- Revised Long Term Plan - posted on website under “Library>>Revised LTP Development” (must be logged on to access)
  - LTP Past Activities March 2011
  - LTP Future Activities as of December 2010 (Review Priority 2s and 3s by workgroup)
  - Narratives\*
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC

**Next meeting** – June 1 meeting @ Reclamation from 12:30 – 4:00 pm

### **Upcoming meetings**

Adaptive Management Workshop, May 18 (8:30 am – 4:30 pm) and May 19 (8:30 am – 12:00 pm); w/Executive Committee on May 19 @ Reclamation

***\*denotes read ahead***

---

**April 13, 2011 Actions:**

- The PMT will correct the SWM and SAR work group 2011 work plans; the revised versions will be electronically distributed to CC members via email by close of business tomorrow (04/14/11) for CC review and approval recommendation. ✓
- Stacey Kopitsch will add the San Acacia Diversion Dam Fish Passage Peer Review recommendations to the next PVA and ScW meeting agendas. ✓
- Yvette McKenna will seek Jericho Lewis' input/advice on how to obligate the budgeted \$50,000 for fish passage research.
- Stacey Kopitsch will add the development of a scope of work for the *Impacts of Augmentation to Silvery Minnow Genetics* project to the next ScW agenda. ✓
- Yvette McKenna will seek permission to release all comments and information from the 4 agencies that provided feedback on the 5 year minnow status review. ✓ *Per Ann Moore: Regarding the discussion at CC meeting about comments submitted in connection with FWS's Five Year Review, the comments can be made publicly available at any time, so there should be no problem with using them in the data synthesis.*
- Once permission has been given, Lori Robertson will supply the CC with the comments, feedback, and other information that was provided for the minnow status review. ✓
- ~~Yvette McKenna will inform Jericho Lewis of the contracting situation for Dr. Miller.~~ *Jericho has been in direct communication with the Service on this matter.*
- Yvette McKenna will inform the PVA and PHVA co-chairs of the CC directive to postpone the April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011 meeting; the PVA co-chairs will also be instructed to complete the assigned action (12/08/10) of providing a written letter to the PHVA with specific PVA needs. ✓
- Tetra Tech will find and copy the language regarding the PVA written data needs request letter. This language will also be provided to Yvette McKenna for use in her follow up with the PVA and PHVA co-chairs. ✓
- Yvette McKenna will update the April EC agenda based on the CC feedback. ✓

**March 16, 2011 Actions:**

- CC members will review the LTP past and future activity summaries in preparation for the May 4<sup>th</sup> CC meeting.

**Directive from April 21 EC meeting:**

- The EC requested that the CC develop a process to document the justifications for which peer review recommendations they suggest pursuing and explain why other peer review recommendations were not preferred.

**Directive from March 29 EC meeting:**

- The EC directed the CC to continue the "synthesis of all existing data" discussions and brainstorm how to accomplish the actual synthesis work. It was recommended that these discussions take place simultaneously with the LTP development as the synthesis work may inform LTP priorities and activities. *On-going*

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**  
**Coordination Committee Meeting**  
**May 4, 2011 – 10:00 am to 4:00 pm**  
**Bureau of Reclamation**  
**555 Broadway Blvd. NE**  
**Albuquerque, NM 87102**

**Actions**

- Yvette McKenna will find out when the Program began contributing funding to Dexter and include the information in the 2008 and 2009 Annual Reports.
- Yvette McKenna will follow up with Grace Haggerty on a document that ISC generated to describe what can be used as cost share.
- Susan Bittick will discuss the suggestion of a Program-wide technical presentation of the LIDAR data and digital photography with John Peterson.
- Susan Bittick will communicate with Robert Padilla regarding the *Geomorphic/hydrodynamic data collection* USACE future activity to see if he would like to look over the SOW and meet with Stephen Scissons.
- Susan Bittick and Terina Perez will initiate communications between Grant Kolb and Ed Kandl to see how the USACE's *Groundwater-Surface water interactions in the riparian zone* project can correspond with the SWM *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction* project.
- Susan Bittick will give the cost for the *Hydraulics of Los Lunas Habitat Restoration Site* activity so it can be included in the project's activity sheet.
- Ali Saenz will verify with the PIO work group that the two PIO LTP future activities are still relevant. She will also find out if they will be making any changes to the activities.
- Yvette McKenna will confirm with Carol if the Adaptive Management workshop meeting is open.

**Decisions**

- With no objections, the April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.

**Announcements**

- Santa Ana invited the Program to their Environmental Fair on June 4. The Program will have a booth at the fair. There is interest in making the origami minnows but instructions are needed. *This has since been postponed until September 3.*
- The City of Albuquerque will present on their Storm Water Program next Tuesday (May 17<sup>th</sup>) from 11:30am to 12:30pm (between the ScW and HR meetings). The city will be assigning Roland Penttila as their representative on the ScW and SWM technical work groups.

**Next meeting – June 1 meeting @ Reclamation from 12:30 – 4:00 pm**

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Discussion – habitat restoration by reach per Grace's email

## Meeting Summary

**Introductions and Agenda Approval:** Brooke Wyman brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was approved with the addition of a recap on the recent drying event and an update on the LIDAR and digital photography.

**Approval of the 04/13/11 CC meeting summary:** With no objections, the April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2011 Coordination Committee (CC) meeting summary was approved with no changes.

### Action Item and EC Directive Review:

- *April 13, 2011 Action items:*
  - The PMT will correct the SWM and SAR work group 2011 work plans; the revised versions will be electronically distributed to CC members via email by close of business tomorrow (04/14/11) for CC review and approval recommendation. – *Complete.*
  - Stacey Kopitsch will add the San Acacia Diversion Dam Fish Passage Peer Review recommendations to the next PVA and ScW meeting agendas. – *Complete.*
  - Yvette McKenna will seek Jericho Lewis' input/advice on how to obligate the budgeted \$50,000 for fish passage research.
    - It was clarified that the amount indicated in the above action item is incorrect and should actually be \$120,000 that was budgeted for fish passage research. It was explained that the line item that had already been approved was \$120,000 for the Phase 2 of the San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage to review the structural portion. It can be conveyed to the Executive Committee (EC) that the CC recommends applying this funding towards an RGSM specific or synthesis study. The CC is now seeking advice on how to obligate the \$120,000.
    - Some members suggested synthesis activities might be an option now that more funding is available.
    - At the previous CC meeting it had been agreed that some aspect of data synthesis and genetics should move forward but recent information from Jason Remshardt indicates that pre and post augmentation genetics data have already been evaluated. It is unclear whether Jason was referring to a specific study.
    - It was suggested that a logical approach to the data synthesis could be to parcel out the copious amounts of information in phases by LTP category and still begin a targeted fish passage (in order to show progress on the fish passage Biological Opinion (BiOp) requirement).
    - The CC was reminded that the Program is on a time constraint and has to make a decision, develop a SOW, and then compete the RFP. Getting an award in place will take time and there is less than 4 months. It was Jericho's opinion that the CC should make a decision on the comparison from pre- and post-augmentation genetics as soon as possible.
      - It was explained that the ScW has met to work on the SOW but there are significant questions on what information can be provided from the past data. The work group needs to know if the questions that they want to answer are capable of being answered by the past data. They are not clear on what they have and what was done. The ScW has requested Reclamation look into the existing genetics data that is available, and whether the objectives of this SOW can be answered.

- Once the ScW gets enough information to determine if the past data can answer their questions then CC can decide whether or not the project can advance. The raw genetics data has been requested. The ScW may meet the May 15<sup>th</sup> deadline but that is dependent on getting a response of whether or not the data can be used to answer their questions.
  - Attendees agreed to use email communications to decide whether or not to advance the project that ScW was tasked with writing.
  - Attendees were reminded that all new contracts now have a standard provision for receiving all raw data (down to the field notes).
- Stacey Kopitsch will add the development of a scope of work for the *Impacts of Augmentation to Silvery Minnow Genetics* project to the next ScW agenda. – *Complete*
- Yvette McKenna will seek permission to release all comments and information from the 4 agencies that provided feedback on the 5 year minnow status review. – *Complete; Per Ann Moore: Regarding the discussion at CC meeting about comments submitted in connection with FWS's Five Year Review, the comments can be made publicly available at any time, so there should be no problem with using them in the data synthesis.*
- Once permission has been given, Lori Robertson will supply the CC with the comments, feedback, and other information that was provided for the minnow status review. – *Complete.*
- Yvette McKenna will inform the PVA and PHVA co-chairs of the CC directive to postpone the April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011 meeting; the PVA co-chairs will also be instructed to complete the assigned action (12/08/10) of providing a written letter to the PHVA with specific PVA needs. – *Complete.*
- Tetra Tech will find and copy the language regarding the PVA written data needs request letter. This language will also be provided to Yvette McKenna for use in her follow up with the PVA and PHVA co-chairs. – *Complete.*
- Yvette McKenna will update the April EC agenda based on the CC feedback. – *Complete.*
- *March 16, 2011 Action Items:*
  - CC members will review the LTP past and future activity summaries in preparation for the May 4<sup>th</sup> CC meeting. – *Complete.*
- *Directive From April 21, 2011 EC Meeting:*
  - The EC requested that the CC develop a process to document the justifications for which peer review recommendations they suggest pursuing and explain why other peer review recommendations were not preferred.
    - A document built off of the Program FY10 Peer Review Process Summary to show how the Program is implementing peer review and working with the results of peer review was viewed. Yvette took language from an OMB letter on the Department of the Interior (DOI) peer review website on how to implement recommendations and findings from peer reviews. What is basically drawn from DOI text is that though a peer review is an additional source of information it is the agencies' discretion on how the recommendations fit with their view point. Reviewers' recommendations are an important factor but are rarely the sole consideration.
    - There was general agreement that this is what the CC/Program has been doing and that to try to apply a uniform process to the results of peer review is not

going to work. A “cookie cutter” process may not be practical for incorporating recommendations.

- Currently the CC has decided to take the SADD peer review recommendation to the work groups and see if they could fit any of them in as a beneficial activity into the LTP. It was commented that this is the only way to utilize the information and make it specific to the Program. The work group may have thought of some of these recommendations already. Yvette can take out the language regarding publication and literature that is not applicable to the Program.
- Feedback from CC members was that they liked the paragraphs but that they should be cleaned up to be more relevant to the Program. There should also be a few more sentences on the technical recommendations being disseminated to the appropriate workgroup for them to look at and see if it has been considered and if they meet needs in the LTP.
- The CC notes that captured the guidance from the last CC can be used to show how the process is formulating itself.
- The CC can make a decision on this process at the June 1<sup>st</sup> CC meeting and the process can get to the EC in June.
- Jericho gave an update on the status of the peer reviews.
  - The SADD peer review has been completed.
  - The Population Estimation peer review is in process but at a previous meeting the CC approved for the Population Monitoring and the Population estimation to be reviewed at the same time as the Population Estimation report refers to the Population Monitoring. The two reports will be reviewed by the same panel. The timeline will be extended and Jericho will need the final price estimate from the panel. This may also result in cost savings.
  - The Genetics peer review has not been moved forward with yet. Funding may be available for this in FY11. If the funding is available Jericho will notify the CC.
  - Discussions have occurred that the PVA process and not the models themselves should be reviewed.
- *Directive from the March 29, 2011 EC Meeting:*
  - The EC directed the CC to continue the “synthesis of all existing data” discussions and brainstorm how to accomplish the actual synthesis work. It was recommended that these discussions take place simultaneously with the LTP development as the synthesis work may inform LTP priorities and activities. *On-going*

**Recap of the Recent River Drying Event:** Stacey Kopitsch reported: The Rio Grande dried on April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011 with there being 9 miles of drying in the Bosque Del Apache Wildlife Refuge. The drying occurred prior to June 15<sup>th</sup> - which is in violation of the flow requirements in the 2003 BiOp. On April 23<sup>rd</sup> 1,126 adult silvery minnow were salvaged and 527 dead silvery minnow were collected, most of which were sexually mature. The river reconnected on the afternoon of April 25<sup>th</sup>. Lori Robertson from the Service will be sending a report to Yvette McKenna that can be posted to the Program website detailing the event. Jericho Lewis is moving forward on the main RiverEyes contract to get it awarded as soon as possible. In the meantime, ISC, Reclamation, and other agencies have used staff or contractors to get regular “river eyes” observations until the official contract is complete.

**Update on the LIDAR and digital photography:** Issues with the LIDAR data and digital photography that was supposed to become available in August or September of 2010 have been resolved. Program signatories were notified that the data are available on external drives at the Corps. John Peterson will be available to give a presentation/overview of the data and the reconciled issues to the CC or a technical work group. It was suggested that there be a technical session or presentation that anyone from the Program can attend and agencies can pick up the external drives with data if they have not already done so. It was briefly explained that some of the difficulties stemmed from having 2 different contractors.

**Revised Long Term Plan:**

- *LTP Past Activities:* The past activities have been used in the draft 2008 and 2009 Annual Reports. This is the most complete compilation of past activities that the Program has. The past activities are grouped by LTP section and have been provided as a basis for moving forward with the future activities that will be in the LTP. The past activities go back to 2001, which was when Collaborative Program funding was first received. The past activities will be an appendix in its own separate volume to the LTP and have already been provided for inclusion in the Database Management System. The original timeframe for the revised LTP was 2011 to 2022 but it will now be FY2012 to FY 2023. Attendees reviewed the *Toxicity of adverse water quality conditions* activity sheet as an example. Some of the activity sheets have links to associated reports.
  - The projects should be linked to any deliverables or executive summaries of results. Some of the summaries indicate expected results or information but there is no follow up on whether that information was actually provided by the study or if the results of the study were ever used for anything.
  - It was asked if there is a link between the past projects and any related future projects and if there has been any follow up to the past summaries.
    - There are some cases where it was determined that there was no benefit to the species or that the study was inconclusive.
    - It was suggested that researchers should have to familiarize themselves with work that has been done and indicate if a new project is building on past work.
  - The past activities are the documentation source for where the data synthesis could start.
  - The Program's database (under development) could be used to help link up future activities to any associated past activities.
  - It was commented that one of the water quality studies started out as a toxicity study that focused on waste water treatment outfalls but then Phase 2 of the study became a study to look at estrogenic biomarkers and its not known where/how the study transitioned from something broad to being more focused. The ScW's number one priority is still to do a synthesis of water quality studies from Program information and public information. The LTP 7.1 Water Quality past activities could be a logical breakout to pass to a contractor to start data/information synthesis. It is a relatively manageable section of past activities as opposed to the habitat restoration activities (although the habitat restoration activities might be more manageable if they were organized by reach).
  - It was again commented that this is a starting point for the data synthesis and that the past activities and the database could also help to define where on the path to recovery the Program currently is.
  - It is the responsibility of anyone writing a SOW to review the past activities and look at any results and recommendations.
  - The CC was cautioned on trying to connect project results to a specific benefit to the minnow because there is the potential for low population numbers to be "blamed" on the project(s).
  - Information is often found by searching the references cited in projects and resources.



- *Narratives:*
  - Attendees reviewed the draft 2008 and 2009 Annual Report activity category descriptions to view what has been compiled so far. The Annual Reports contain additional information to build on for the LTP narratives; however, the focus will need to be changed for the revised LTP. The annual reports used old narratives for each of the LTP categories. The narratives were edited to make them more applicable to the current Program goals and focus.
  - *Physical Habitat Restoration and Management* – Tried to move away from saying that the Program will achieve restoration because that is not achievable in our lifetime.
  - *Water Management* – For the context of the Annual Reports it was thought that these narratives looked good and could be used as the basis for the LTP narratives.
  - *Population Augmentation/Propagation (silvery minnow only)* – Yvette explained that she removed “stabilizing and enhancing populations” as there is not a definition for a stable population and enhancing is not measureable. Attendees were ok with this. It was commented that (1) augmentation does not provide populations, it provides numbers of individuals for use in reestablishing and augmenting the minnow populations; (2) the Dexter Facility is not listed but should be included as the Program funds the O&M; (3) the Program did not fund the construction of the Minnow Sanctuary. The augmentation description will be revised to: *the Program has partially funded the construction, operation, and maintenance of three rearing and breeding facilities*. Yvette McKenna will find out when the Program began contributing funding to Dexter and include the information in the 2008 and 2009 Annual Reports.
  - *Water quality management (silvery minnow only)* – this description was based in part on the projects in the 2008 and 2009 Annual Report. It was cautioned that it is very optimistic to assume that the Program would be able to improve water quality. The Program’s role is information sharing, notifications, etc. The Program is not a water quality regulator.
    - It was suggested that the water quality description be rewritten to be more general/broad. The first sentence could be “the Collaborative Program is interested in furthering the understanding of water quality as an environmental indicator for the silvery minnow.”
    - It was also suggested that the second to last sentence be removed because the Program itself doesn’t manage flows. “The overall goal would be to *gather information* on water quality within occupied areas and reintroduction sites to *interpret* recruitment and survival rates.”
  - *Research, monitoring and adaptive management* – It was shared that the fiscal years listed (2006-2007) were taken out of these narratives as they were for 2008 and 2009.
  - *Public Outreach* – There were no comments on the Public Outreach narrative.
  - *Program management* – The Program Manager briefly described several of the changes the PMT made to this narrative. It was suggested that “work group” be added to the PIO reference in the last sentence.

- The Program Manager and PMT will address the recommended changes and will provide to GenQuest. These will then become the 2008 and 2009 Annual Report narratives.
- *LTP Future Activities as of December 2010:*
  - For the first time, the CC reviewed the work group Priority 2 and 3 LTP future activities. Attendees were reminded that the start dates may no longer be applicable as the time frame for developing the LTP has changed. The activities are currently organized by work group but also listing the future activities by LTP category will help to capture the progression and logical order of future activities.
  - It was shared that the future activities will also be reviewed at the work group level as work groups address the SADD peer review recommendations.
  - It was agreed that the CC will make any minor or editorial changes at this time; any major edits/changes or questions will be sent back to the work group or summary author via tracked changes.
    - *Analysis of Recruitment Flow Targets - ScW Priority 2*
      - The project summary indicates that this would be a new study.
      - Attendees discussed the need to have a provision for implementing adaptive management in all the future activities. Originally, Tom Pitts had adaptive management as its own section and while it needs to be applied to all of the future activities, there may be some specific adaptive management future activities. The CC will need to determine how to capture and apply adaptive management to the LTP. Reclamation and the Service are working on “diagrams” to describe this in text form.
      - It is intended that there be a range of future activities for the Program to choose from to show progress towards improving species status and towards recovery. Criteria will be applied and there will need to be annual decisions on which activities can be/should be done that year. The decision making will need to come from the top down and should be based on factors such as water year, budget, priority/requirements, etc. The adaptive management “steps” can be applied to those selected activities.
      - It was discussed that though this project will help to inform the Population Viability Analysis (PVA), the PVA is not dependent on it. Recruitment flow target questions remain but there is a placeholder in the PVA that is based on the best information that is currently available. This study would more rigorously test the volume and duration of a recruitment flow. The results will be used to inform and refine the PVA. It was wondered if there was also an activity for overbank flow.
      - Attendees were unsure what the project duration of “ongoing with a 5 year cycle” meant. This question was recorded in track changes on the summary. Since this project is a Priority 2, the CC instead added “TBD” for the project duration section. The duration will be further defined as project implementation gets closer. It was pointed out that the project description should include a list of projects that must be completed prior to implementation.
      - There were no objections to this project.
    - *Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Ecological Studies Evaluating Habitat Use and Recruitment – USACE Activity*

- Attendees wondered if this activity would be building upon the previous activity.
  - It was commented that the work groups might not be aware of work that other groups are proposing [in their future activities].
  - It was recommended that each activity be reviewed as “standalone” as it would be very difficult to try to link these activities with past, current, and other future activities within this forum.
  - It can be captured in the 2010 Annual Report that these activities were done with the Corps’ authorization and funding. The LTP activity tables can also be used to spotlight the Program agencies’ unique activities. For example, the Corps will be the implementing party for this activity. Attendees were reminded that the Corps’ contributions are not subject to cost share.
  - In previous conversations, the CC has discussed the need to have a more streamlined process for determining what can be applied as cost share. Determining cost share can be difficult – it must be confirmed that things subject to cost share haven’t already been offered as cost share; if a grant is received from another source it can’t be applied as a federal cost share; etc. It was voiced that it would be helpful to have a better mechanism for agencies to determine what can be used as cost share. ISC had generated a document that described what can be applied toward cost share. Yvette McKenna will follow up with Grace Haggerty on a document that ISC generated to describe what can be used as cost share.
- *Geomorphic/Hydrodynamic Data Collection – USACE Activity*
- This is actually a Priority 1 activity that was recently submitted by the Corps and expected to be starting this year.
  - The funding source should be changed to say “USACE”.
  - Stephen Scissons (from the Corps) has developed a detailed SOW and cost estimate for the project that can be shared with the Program. The project is a monitoring of the inlets and outlets. The project will begin with a pilot at the Nature Center and Route 66 sites to test the equipment.
    - It was commented that it might be beneficial for the Reclamation engineering and TSD staff to see the SOW or meet with Stephen. It was said that it would be beneficial to have communication between Robert Padilla (Reclamation) and Stephen Scissons for information purposes and critique purposes.
    - There would also be benefit to sharing what is being planned for the year with other agencies.
    - It was suggested that Corps consider sending Stephen to participate in the MPT meetings as a way to inform/communicate with both ScW and HR members since this study could also apply those work groups.
    - Susan Bittick will communicate with Robert Padilla regarding the *Geomorphic/hydrodynamic data collection* USACE future activity to see if he would like to look over the SOW and meet with Stephen Scissons.
- *Groundwater/Surface Water Interactions in the Riparian Zone – USACE Activity*

- It was verified that this project is not the same project as the SWM work group's *Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction* project although there may be some overlap between the two projects. Since this project has not yet started, it was suggested to make sure the two were complementary. It is unknown if the Corps will be starting this project this year.
  - The CC was briefly updated that the SWM work group has decided to have the *Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction* project continued in-house at Reclamation in order to avoid problems with high costs and late deliverables. The work group had discussed sending the project out for competitive bid but decided to have Ed Kandl at Reclamation do the work as he had expressed an interest and management was supportive. With CC approval Ed will be able to immediately take over the project.
  - The CC had no objections to SWM's proposed project changes.
  - SWM will be modifying the activity sheet to reflect the change in contractor.
  - It was discussed that there should be coordination with the Corps to make sure the two projects complement one another and are not duplicating efforts. Susan Bittick and Terina Perez will initiate communications between Grant Kolb and Ed Kandl to see how the USACE's *Groundwater-Surface water interactions in the riparian zone* project can correspond with the SWM *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction* project.
- It was shared that the Corps has started funding 3 sediment gages by San Acacia Reach that Reclamation will no longer be funding. They will fund the gages through the end of this year with the intent of continuing to fund them beyond that. The gages are at the Puerco, San Acacia, and San Marcial.
- *Hydraulics of Los Lunas Habitat Restoration Site – USACE Activity*
  - Attendees were informed that this activity has been completed and will be included as a past activity. The project will be shown to be completed in the 2011 Annual Summary Report. The project started in 2010 and was completed in 2011. Susan Bittick will give the cost for the *Hydraulics of Los Lunas Habitat Restoration Site* activity so it can be included in the project's activity sheet.
- *Continue to collect and evaluate existing data on water quality and sediment quality and identify future investigations that are needed - ScW Priority 2*
  - The activity sheet indicates that this activity is on hold. This might be because the associated Priority 1 activity had to be put on hold as it was revised to focus more on the evaluation of water quality data as opposed to data collection. The results (answers) from the Priority 1 project may indicate that this project is not needed and could be removed.
  - Attendees discussed the status of the Priority 1 project *Evaluate water quality in the MRG in relation to the RGSM*. This project is the ScW's number 1 priority but is currently the 3<sup>rd</sup> project in the Criteria 3 in the funding spreadsheet. The funding spreadsheet indicates that funding is requested for Objectives 1 and 2 of the project and that CC

recommended Program funds should the Corps be unable to fund. Attendees were updated that the Corps will not be funding this activity as water quality is not a Corps focus.

- Attendees discussed that synthesis of the existing data may be able to be done through an IA with the Corps through the BEMP effort. The Priority 1 could be moved up but it would be difficult to get a contract out this year. More communication with Jericho and the Corps will be needed to see if this is possible.
- *Continue to identify rates of cowbird parasitism - ScW Priority 2*
  - This activity was not reviewed as studies on parasitism are over.
- *Provide recruitment/overbank flows – SWM Priority 2*
  - The Program, Reclamation, and the Corps were added as the funding source.
  - The project was also moved to the Corps folder for tracking purposes.
- *Ongoing DBMS Database O&M – FY13 and annually in future years as needed*
  - Attendees briefly reviewed the DBMS future activities. Contingent on the availability of funds, the Corps is discussing funding the O&M of the database.
- *PHVA Priority 2 Activities –*
  - There are no PHVA Priority 2 activities.
- *PIO Priority 2 Activities –*
  - There are no PIO Priority 2 activities.
  - Attendees discussed the PIO activity to develop a Program Communication Plan. The project would develop a call down list for emergencies for the Program.
    - Attendees briefly discussed the 10-year Anniversary of the Program event being planned for October. The event had been originally planned to coincide with the fall congressional recess but ISC wants to do a bus tour of the Middle Rio Grande for congressionals in August and the idea is to have the 10-year event coincide with that trip. Discussions are still occurring and details have not been finalized (i.e., nothing is definite yet).
    - It was said that it would also be good to get city commissioners involved in this as it is important to “spread the word” and promote the Program.
    - It was commented that making PIO a more “unified effort” is something the Program is struggling with since individual agencies usually have their own public relations staff that handle press releases.
    - Attendees were notified that the Corps will be getting proposals at the end of the week for some signage for the silvery minnow Nature Center project.
- *SAR Priority 2 Activities –*

- The SAR work group does not have any Priority 2 activities; once the Priority 1 activities are completed the work group will have fulfilled its obligations under their charter.
- The read aheads for the SAR Van Tour that the SAR work group participated in will be made into a packet for future reference.
- *Program Management Priority 2 Activities –*
  - There are a few activity summaries that relate to program management that still need to be compiled and reviewed by the CC. These include the 10j activities and descriptions of the IAs for program management staff. An activity summary for a database administrator may also be added in the future.
- *HR Priority 2 Activities –*
  - The HR future activities have been streamlined into phases of restoration work that range from planning, implementation, monitoring, and construction. They will not be reviewed in the same manner as the other activity summaries.
  - It was commented that there may be a need to add an additional phase of HR work as its being recognized by the HR work group that there needs to be maintenance and monitoring of completed sites that could include minimal dredging or removal of non-native species. So an additional HR activity summary may soon be developed.
- *Miscellaneous LTP Discussions*
  - In response to a question of when a draft LTP will be available it was said that once the 2008 and 2009 Annual Reports are completed the LTP will again be the primary focus. The annual reports have been the recent focus and comments are due to GenQuest on May 13<sup>th</sup>. The need for a macro-enabled or linkage software to link the activity table to the activity summaries to make universal changes was again emphasized. A new task order still needs to be written with specifics on the new deliverable before the contractor can give a price estimate. The direction from the EC is to have the LTP in place by September or October of this year. It is unknown how long it will take for the draft LTP to be approved by the Program but the CC in coordination with the work groups is providing the best information they can.
  - Attendees briefly discussed a request from Grace to break habitat restoration out by reaches.
    - It was commented that this is something the work group has moved towards doing internally. This request appears to seek guidance from the CC on the direction of habitat restoration within the reaches.
    - One opinion shared that a developed plan for habitat restoration (for the work group) should not be a part of the LTP itself.
    - It was shared that Reclamation will incorporate a detailed reach-by-reach geomorphic analysis (with focus on how river maintenance activities need to be responsive to different geomorphic-type information) within the BA. This information is expected to be relevant to the HR work group.
    - This topic will be discussed at the next CC meeting as the focus of this working meeting is the LTP.

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

- The CC was asked for input on the construction of the EC agenda – due to the overlap with the Adaptive Management meeting, there will not be enough time to address regular EC business before the AM technical session. The executives might be able to approve the meeting agenda and last meeting minutes prior to the AM workshop. It was suggested that CC members, if interested, attend the AM session on May 18<sup>th</sup> so that the session on the 19<sup>th</sup> can be focused for the EC representatives.
- Potential agenda items included: (1) River drying update; (2) Q/A regarding the Corps' BA;

**Next meetings**

- Adaptive Management Workshop at Reclamation May 18<sup>th</sup> (9:00am to 4:30pm) and May 19<sup>th</sup> (8:30am to 12:00pm) with the EC;
- June 1 CC meeting from 12:30pm to 4:00pm at Reclamation

**Coordination Committee Working Meeting  
04 May 2011 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD	247-0234	P – Chair	brooke@mrgcd.us
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3555	O	ymkenna@usbr.gov
Ann Moore	NMAGO	222-9024	P	amoore@nmag.gov
Ann Watson	Santo Domingo	465-0055	P	awatson@sdutilities.com
Nathan Schroeder	Pueblo of Santa Ana	771-6719	P	nathan.schroeder@santaana-nsn.gov
Terina Perez	Reclamation/PMT	462-3614	O	tlperez@usbr.gov
Susan Bittick	USACE	342-3397	P - Chair	Susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
Hilary Brinegar (via phone)	NMDA	575-646-2642	P	hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu
Jim Wilber	Reclamation	462-3548	P	jwilber@usbr.gov
Matt Schmader	COA	452-5200	P	mschmader@cabq.gov
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	761-4737	O	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	P	rbillings@abcwua.org
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Jericho Lewis	Reclamation	462-3622	O	jlewis@usbr.gov
Susan Kelly (via phone)	UNM	277-0514	P	skelly@law.unm.edu
Ali Saenz	Reclamation/Admin Assist	462-3600	O	asaenz@ucbr.gov
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 ext. 139	O	christine.sanchez@ttemi.com