

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program
Science Work Group Meeting
17 May 2011 Meeting – 9:00 AM-11:30 AM
Interstate Stream Commission

Action Items:**San Acacia Fish Passage Peer Review Recommendations**

- At a later ScW meeting, the workgroup will compare the peer review recommendations with the LTP to determine if those recommendations are incorporated in the LTP. This will be a future ScW agenda item.

Population Monitoring and Population Estimating Peer Review

- Review and discuss the revised formalized process for peer review from CC when it is completed in order to respond accordingly.

Fish Health Study

- Peter Wilkinson will ask NMED's new Water Quality Bureau Chief to provide a fish biologist to actively participate in this project.

Status of Augmentation and RGSM Genetic Variability SOW

- Peter Wilkinson will send augmentation articles from the west coast to all members.

Comparison of fish passage peer review recommendations with LTP activities

- Jen Bachus will send out the two peer review documents for individuals to review on their own.
- ScW will then schedule a discussion meeting to prepare recommendations to submit to CC.

Other Action Items from April 2011 Science meeting:

- Douglas Tave will ask Jericho about adding fish sexing information to the Age and Growth study.
- Peter and Mickey volunteered to write the scope of work and get it on the June CC meeting agenda.
- Rick will attend the CC meeting and will support the request.
- Peter will ask CC who will administer Science Adaptive Management in the future (centralized or decentralized approach).

Continuing Actions from February 2011 Science meeting:

- Stacey Kopitsch will ask Monika Mann (PMT Liaison to DBMS) if the DBMS can provide a list of references they have for water quality data. April 2011 update: This request has been made; waiting to receive this information.

Meeting Summary:

1. April Minutes will be considered at the June meeting.
2. Action Items from previous meetings were reviewed (see below).
3. Updates were given on draft Program reports out for ScW review and their due dates.
4. The Evaluate Water Quality activity summary was reviewed by ScW, including possible funding for this year.
5. Adding sexing information to the Age-Growth study was discussed and ScW agreed to ask CC to approve adding sexing to this project.

6. Augmentation and RGSM Genetic Variability SOW – Small group has developed the SOW to the extent possible; any further work on this SOW depends on response from Reclamation.
7. EC and CC Updates – meetings announced. CC is working on LTP.
8. Comparison of fish passage peer review recommendations with LTP activities – ScW is requesting the LTP from the CC in order to complete this task. ScW will review and comment on whether peer review recommendations are included in the latest version of the LTP once that document is received from the CC, and will discuss during a ScW meeting for any recommendations to CC.

Meeting Notes:

1) *Introductions and Agenda Approval*

- Those present introduced themselves to the Group.
- Co-Chair added one item under Discussion Items – Draft Reports out for review. There were no other changes and the agenda was approved as amended.

2) *4/19/11 ScW Meeting Minutes*

- Approval of April minutes will occur at the June ScW meeting so workgroup participants have enough time for review .

3) *Action Item Review*

- San Acacia Diversion Dam Fish Passage Peer Review Recommendations
 - Determine if peer review recommendations are incorporated into LTP – **On this agenda**
- Augmentation and RGSM Genetic Variability SOW Development
 - Alison Hutson will check with Jeanne Dye to see if BOR has the genetics data needed for this study. Alison submitted the request to Jeanne Dye to see if needed and **this is in progress.**
 - Stacey Kopitsch, Alison Hutson, Jen Bachus, Peter Wilkinson, Douglas Tave and Dana Price agreed to constitute the small group that will draft a SOW by May 15 – The group met the first week in May and will give update later on during today’s meeting – **in progress.**
 - Stacy will email the small group to schedule meeting to complete the task – **completed.**
- Population Monitoring and Population Estimating Peer Review
 - Science is requesting CC to identify a process for incorporating peer review findings across all peer reviews done by the Collaborative Program, and to identify how the Science workgroup is involved. – In Progress.
 - An update on this action item was shared with ScW. The CC met earlier in the month and the topic of identifying a process for incorporating peer review finds across all peer reviews and how ScW would be involved came up for discussion. The CC is working on a process document presently and will be on a future CC agenda – **in progress.**
 - ScW discussed there are two aspects of “peer review” – external peer review conducted outside the Program, and then review by Program participants of program draft reports.
 - ScW attendees discussed it would be good to for ScW to receive feedback on how reviews by ScW of Program reports are incorporated in those documents.

- The CC is currently updating the peer review process document and is focusing on external peer reviews.. ScW can review this process and see what can be applied to the process for workgroup review of Program draft reports.
- ACTION ITEM: CC is revising the external peer review process. ScW will look at it when it comes out, determine what can be applied to workgroup review of Program draft reports, and forward any recommendations back to the CC.
- EC Update
 - The April 21 meeting took place – **completed**.
 - The May 19 EC meeting will start at 8:30 a.m.
- CC update
 - The May 4th meeting was from 10 a.m. until 4 p.m. and focused on the LTP.
- Adaptive Management update
 - The two-day workshop will start Wednesday May 18.
 - Co-Chair reminded ScW if anyone is interested in attending the Adaptive Management meetings and didn't get the email from Yvette McKenna to please let Yvette know.
 - The three-day workshop was held April 5-7– **completed**.
- Other Action Items From April 2011 ScW Meeting
 - Alison Hutson will ask Jericho about adding fish sex information to the Age and Growth study. Alison was not present – **in progress**.
 - Stacey will check on the draft report due date for the Age and Growth Study. **Completed**.
- May Science Meeting
 - Possible joint ScW and HrW presentation by AMAFCA on stormwater program – The presentation will take place at 11:30 and is being done by the ABCWUA – **completed today**.
- Continuing Actions from February 2011 Science Meeting
 - Stacey will ask Monika (as PMT Liaison from DBMS) if DBMS can provide a list of references that have for water quality data – **still waiting for that information; Contractor is working on it but no due date yet**.

4) Discussion Items

- Co-Chair reminded ScW attendees there are two draft reports out for Science review:
 - *The Effects of Nutrient Availability on Periphyton* – comments on that draft report are due to Stacey Kopitsch by May 24th.
 - *Age and Growth* – the draft report is also out for ScW review and comments are due to Stacey Kopitsch by May 31st.
- Status of Evaluate Water Quality in the MRG project
 - A read ahead of this activity summary was provided for this discussion item and copies were available at the meeting.
 - ScW was asked to look at the activity summary during the meeting and ScW approved for this final draft (dated December 7) to go to CC.

- At this time, there is potential funding this year for just the first two objectives.
 - The Co-Chair explained earlier conversations in ScW meetings that development of this study came from discussions of temperature data from various Program studies that had not been extracted and reviewed. It would be extracted from other studies also.
 - It was shared that the Corps has funded the Van Horn sondes – 4 of them from Bernalillo, along I-25 down the river. They were waiting to hear back from USGS about reinstallation of a temperature probe at the Alameda gage that was originally funded by the City of Albuquerque.
 - In conversations with MRGCD they mentioned they might install temperature probes at each of their diversions (Isleta and San Acacia). They did not recommend at USGS gages at these diversions because of probes deep in the water.
 - Many GS stations collect temperatures so they are set up but maybe not budgeted for collecting the data.
 - Some probes were intermittent on collecting proper temperatures.
 - ScW had questions about how this Evaluate Water Quality study could interface with results from the fish health study that Joel Lusk presented at last month's Science meeting. The draft report from the fish health study is currently in development. A suggestion was made that when ScW is tasked with developing the SOW for the "Evaluate Water Quality" activities, this SOW could be run by Mr. Lusk for his input to help interface with results of the fish health study.
 - ScW discussed that it has a process-related question on how it could assemble a panel of water quality experts outside the Program, including someone from NMED. What is the process for being able to assimilate expertise from outside the Program into the Program workgroup process.
 - It was recommended to put a placeholder in the references section of this activity summary for the Fish Healthy Study report and to add a statement that the report is pending.
 - Peter suggested the Water Quality bureau of NMED become involved in this. He noted they had a new bureau chief so the message to the CC would be to add this entity to this work. They have a fish biologist.
 - Some ScW attendees discussed that having a panel of water quality experts from outside the program would be great and it was part of the NMED Water Quality Bureau's mission.
- Age-Growth Sexing
 - ScW discussed adding sexing information for specimens used for the Age and Growth study, and agreed that this would be good information. If there is sex dimorphism it would be worthwhile to have that information and it was not in the original contract.
 - Stacey Kopitsch clarified that the addition would have to go through the approval process.
 - The next CC meeting would be June 1 and is this soon enough to forward this discussion to the CC? Stacey Kopitsch will send the ScW request to Jericho to ask if it is possible to add sexing to the current contract and how long those specimens will be with the contractors.

- Stacey Kopitsch will email ScW for volunteers to write a SOW on the sexing work by June 27th). Stacey will also look for a copy of the existing SOW for the age and growth study in case this work can be added to that contract.
- Peter and Mick volunteered to help with the SOW. Mick would try to get either Douglas or Alison to help.
- Rick volunteered to support this request at the CC meeting
- Status of Augmentation and RGSM Genetic Variability SOW
 - At the April ScW meeting volunteers agreed to write a SOW. This group met the first week of May and drafted a SOW for this study to the extent possible. The group identified some key questions related to what data are available to work with. A draft SOW was sent to BOR and any further work by this group depends on what response is received from BOR. This activity is in progress.
 - Peter Wilkinson found some augmentation articles from the west coast and will send them out to ScW this week.

5) Program update

- EC update
 - Stacey reported the next EC meeting will be on Thursday May 19 and will cover Adaptive Management. A technical workshop meeting for Adaptive Management would also occur Wednesday May 18 from 8:30 -1:00
 - Rick reminded ScW attendees that a PVA workgroup meeting was also coming up on May 24th.
- CC update
 - Stacey reported CC was resuming its focus on the LTP. The draft is due in September or October 2011.
 - The next CC meeting will be on June 1st. It is a regular business meeting and the agenda was not available yet.

6) Comparison of fish passage peer review recommendations with LTP activities

- It was clarified that this action item came out of the CC request that at a future meeting, ScW would determine if the recommendations from the fish passage peer review are included in the LTP.
- In preparation for today's ScW meeting it became clear that ScW does not have access to the latest LTP document.
- ScW discussed how to approach this action item and request from the CC what document ScW needed to look at.
- ScW has available (as read aheads and copies for this meeting) the two documents they have now that summarize the peer review recommendations.
- It was asked if ScW would have a special session for doing this action item.
- Two options were offered for discussion: once the LTP is available, ScW members review and provide recommendations individually, or ScW meet to review it as a group.

- ScW decided to review individually, collect comments and then meet as a group and try to incorporate them.
- Stacey Kopitsch will inform the CC that ScW is requesting the latest version of the LTP in order to complete this action item.
- A time for ScW discussion will be scheduled after the LTP document is made available by the CC, and ScW members have time to conduct individual reviews on their own.

7) *Other Matters*

- A question was raised about the driver behind the Adaptive Management plan. In science, adaptive management can be a very positive tool for hypotheses and a true adaptive management program. It was expressed that it may be a question back to CC about who administers that in the future. It was also shared that this was a good question and something that is being discussed as part of the Adaptive Management effort, but no one knows yet how this will look.
- Ideas regarding adaptive management were discussed among ScW attendees. One perspective shared was that much of Adaptive Management could be activity-specific. There would be certain agency leads and Program workgroups would deal with different pieces of the Adaptive Management effort. The process would receive input from Fish and Wildlife similar to what they are doing right now.
- ScW discussed the need for a specific process to be in place, and shared thoughts on how Adaptive Management could benefit decision-making by having a structured process in place for learning from the science conducted. This can help with future efforts by ScW to write SOWs for projects.
- The current group of individuals participating in the Adaptive Management plan development process is communicating with the CC and EC before any decisions are made on how Adaptive Management will occur within the Program.
- The effort to develop the Adaptive Management process is currently underway and anyone from ScW can participate in that effort. Any requests for decisions by ScW evaluating what Adaptive Management looks like should consider the process that is still being developed.
- It was suggested that a good example for Adaptive Management to look at is the Cochiti Deviation and target that in fish management or a habitat that results in more fish. This could be monitored through PVAs. It was suggested that Adaptive Management interface with PVAs where hypotheses can be addressed.
- It was suggested that a good starting point for Adaptive Management is a decentralized approach, with involvement of the PVAs on minnow related matters but there are also other things outside the realm of the silvery minnow PVAs. For example, geomorphology would be difficult for the PVA Workgroup.
- A previous presentation by Mark Stone to the Habitat Restoration Workgroup was referenced as a useful model. It was really well presented in a diagram. Mr. Stone has a model that would really strongly connect with a PVA. The idea was shared that this is a productive area for adaptive management.
- Another ScW attendee stated that model sounds similar to what Ken Bovee did for the San Acacia Fish Passage. These would be valuable discussions to have Frank Harvey down and hopefully those projects had aspects of geomorphology now.
- It was discussed that ScW should ask CC whether to have a centralized or decentralized approach to adaptive management. ScW continues to be interested in knowing what the process will look like once that is developed.
- ScW attendees shared ideas on Adaptive Management but there was no formal decision or consensus during the meeting. Several in ScW favor a decentralized approach so that any of the

workgroups can have justification for a presentation on what they would like to see done differently, giving everyone access to utilization.

8) *Discussions with Mr. Roland Pentilla, with Albuquerque Stormwater Management.*

- Prior to the presentation, the members of the Science Workgroup had a discussion with Mr. Pentilla on his work with stormwater management.
- Mr. Pentilla provided information on the history of stormwater management in Albuquerque and emphasized that New Mexico was the only state in the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Region 6 that did not have primacy. That means the permits are not administered locally and instead are administered out of Dallas (EPA Region 6). NMED does serve as the enforcement arm for the EPA for investigating incidents.
- The lack of primacy has presented challenges because there is no one in New Mexico to write or issue a permit for stormwater management. Those permits had to be written and issued from Dallas.
- The City of Albuquerque monitors stormwater runoff as required by its permit. There has been a history of issues with data collection and processing, and in determining which agency is responsible for analysis of this data.
- Mr. Pentilla shared that PAHs are the biggest problem the City has with stormwater runoff. Primarily these come from parking lot and roof sealants. Another issue for stormwater is the use of leaf blowers that blow materials on to the streets and eventually into the runoff. There are also PCBs all over the City (banned in the late 1970s).
- Mr. Pentilla discussed some of the controversy surrounding rainwater capture and use of cisterns and how New Mexico is different than what is done in other states.
- The City is focused on low impact development right now. Mr. Pentilla expressed that stormwater is part of the equation for the silvery minnow right now, and that about 1/3 of the City drains through the North Diversion Channel (NDC).
- Mr. Pentilla also shared with ScW that the NSF (National Science Foundation) had conducted a review of the EPA's effectiveness with stormwater permitting.

The ScW meeting ended at 10:30 a.m.

9) *City of Albuquerque presentation on Albuquerque's Stormwater Program*

This presentation was not included in the ScW meeting notes.

Next ScW Meeting June 21, 2011 from 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 am at Interstate Stream Commission

Science Workgroup (ScW) Meeting Attendees**May 17, 2011 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.**

Name	Agency	Email
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	rbillings@abcwua.org
Michael Porter	Army Corps of Engineers	Michaelid.porter@usace.army.mil
Dana Price	Army Corps of Engineers	Dana.m.price@usace.army.mil
Stacy Kopitsch	FWS	Stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Peter Wilkinson	NMISC	peter.wilkinson@state.nm.us
Jen Bachus	FWS	JJennifer_bachus@fws.gov
Mark Brennan	FWS	Mark_brennan@fws.gov
Andrew Monié	NMDGF	Andrew.monie@state.nm.us
Roland Pentilla	COA	rpentilla@cabq.gov
Carl Boaz	GenQuest (Note taker)	