

Coordination Committee Meeting

June 29, 2011

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
June 29, 2011 – 12:30-4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

Conference Call-in Line for June 29, 2011

Toll Free Number: 1-888-790-3545

Participant Passcode: **#44611**

(1st Committee member or contractor to arrive, please dial in)

Draft Meeting Agenda

- Introductions and Agenda* Approval
- **12:45 pm Presentation** - Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Fish Health Study Results (*J. Lusk*)
- **Decision** – Approval of 06/01/11 CC meeting summary*
- Action Item and EC Directive Review (see below)
- **Decision** – Review draft General Peer Review Procedures*; discuss draft document; and, provide recommendation to EC
- **Decision** – Review and discuss the draft Adaptive Management Workgroup charter*; provide recommendation to EC
- **Decision** – Review and recommend funding O&M for 2 additional USGS gages*
- Discuss workgroup restructuring for maximum effectiveness
- Discuss process for SOW development and review
- Discuss Service staffing assistance for upcoming consultation
- Contract update
 - ScW Activities
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC

Next meeting – CC meeting – July 6, 2011 @ Reclamation from 12:30 – 4:00 pm

- Propose additional CC meeting in July with an open agenda (brainstorm, express thoughts about the LTP, AMP, BO, etc.)
 - CC recommended topics
 - Available dates

Upcoming meetings

EC meeting – July 21, 2011 @ Reclamation from 9:00 am – 1:00 pm

****denotes read ahead***

June 1, 2011 Actions

- Grace Haggerty will follow up 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. (*Ongoing from 5/4/11*)
- Terina Perez will see if the SWM workgroup can provide an updated activity summary and cost estimate for the *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction Project* to the CC at their June 28th meeting.
- Grace Haggerty will ask Rich Valdez how other programs address peer reviews.
- Rick Billings will look into the guidelines that academic institutions use to address peer reviews. ✓
- Jericho Lewis will draft text describing the peer review process for the CC to review for inclusion in the *Peer Review Process* document.
- Comments (by agency) on the *Peer Review Process* document are due to Yvette McKenna by COB June 17th. ✓ *Received comments from USACE and ISC.*
- Stacey Kopitsch will coordinate with Jericho, ScW, HRW, and MPT to have the Food Availability Study reviewed again after the current comments/edits have been incorporated.

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. *On-going*

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
June 29, 2011 – 12:30-4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

Actions

- CC members will review the draft General Peer Review Procedures and send any edits or comments to Yvette McKenna by July 27th.
- Yvette will draft a paragraph to include in the draft Adaptive Management Workgroup charter that describes the transition between Adaptive Management Plan Versions 1 and 2, **and send the revised draft to the CC and work group co-chairs for review.**✓ Revised draft AM charter sent out for review on June 30.
- Ali Saenz will schedule a room at Reclamation for the July 12, 2011 CC meeting.✓
- Grace Haggerty will follow up on a document that ISC generated to describe what can be used as cost share. (*Ongoing from 6/1*)
- Terina Perez will see if the SWM workgroup can provide an updated activity summary and cost estimate for the *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction Project* to the CC at their June 28th meeting. (*Ongoing from 6/1*)✓
- Jericho Lewis will draft text describing the peer review process for the CC to review for inclusion in the *Peer Review Process* document. (*Carried over from 6/1*)

Decisions

- The June 1, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.
- The CC approved funding *for one year* for O&M for 2 additional USGS gages (gages in Sac Acacia and San Marcial).

Requests

- The CC requests that the work group Co-Chairs review the draft General Peer Review Procedures and send any edits or comments to Yvette McKenna by July 27th.

Announcements

- The Bosque from Cochiti to Socorro has been closed until further notice. MRGCD and the City of Albuquerque request that non-emergency work in those areas be postponed.

Upcoming CC Meetings

- **Thursday, July 12, 2011.** Tentative agenda items include: (1) Decision/ Review and discuss the draft Adaptive Management Workgroup charter; (2) Discuss workgroup restructuring for maximum effectiveness; (3) Discuss process for SOW development and review; (4) Discuss Service staffing assistance for upcoming consultation; (5) Discussion on strength based leadership trainings schedule;

- **August 3, 2011.** Tentative agenda items include: (1) Decision/review of the draft General Peer Review Procedures;

Meeting Summary

Introductions and Agenda Approval – Brooke Wyman brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. A quorum was present. The agenda was approved with the addition of a discussion on the schedule for the strength based leadership training and a discussion on the process for adding agenda items.

Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Fish Health Study Results - Joel Lusk, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service), presented the results from his Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (RGSM) Fish Health Study. *Highlights of this presentation are found below; for details, please refer to the actual presentation materials.*

- The goals of the RGSM Health Study are to (a) observe fish health as a water quality integrator; and (b) focus on dissolved oxygen (DO), temperature, and Gross Primary Productivity. The study was also paired with a New Mexico Environment Department survey of toxics/water quality standards; however there's not a lot of robust overlap between the two studies.
- Minnow were collected for health observations which included a pathology assessment, necropsy, genetics, and analysis of body tissues. There was also collection of water quality data such as DO and temperature, and a variety of other field observations were made.
- Fish were sampled from 6 sites along the Rio Grande and are categorized as Year 1 (fish sampled in Summer 2006, Fall 2006, Winter 2007 and Spring 2007) and Year 2 (fish sampled in Fall 2007, Winter 2008, Spring 2008, and Summer 2008).
- Dexter analyzed up to 60 fish per site. No pathogenic viruses were found and no significant relationships were found in the average number of parasites at each site.
- A relationship was seen between temperature and bacteria; increased water temperature was correlated with increased frequency of bacterial infections of RGSM, but not so much bacteria that there would be mortality.
- It was not common for temperatures measured in the thalweg to increase above the threshold of concern for RGSM. The high temperatures occurred in 2006 when the sites would begin to dry. As the water becomes stagnate it picks up heat and begins to approach and exceed the acute threshold for RGSM.
 - **Question:** Is bacteria related to velocity?
 - **Response:** A relationship between bacteria and velocity was not measured.
 - **Question:** How does this compare to fish in a pond environment where the temperatures are relatively high?

- **Response:** The study was done in the river with Bernalillo as a reference site. High temperatures are not usually found there.
- Temperatures for some of the edge habitats rise above the thresholds for concern.
 - **Comment:** The overbank temperatures over different time periods were measured at Interstate Stream Commission (ISC) habitat restoration sites and it's believed that high temperatures are actually advantageous for larval growth. Also, because the water is shallow the temperature will fluctuate with the time of day. It was asked if it's a concern that there might be runoff in the spring with high temperatures in regular overbank areas.
 - **Response:** In transects that were surveyed high temperatures were found on the edges and the river is showing that as the water gets shallower temperatures increase. RGSM can probably sense and prefer certain temperatures and will evacuate if it becomes too hot; it would be nice to know when they need to evacuate. There is also concern about the amount of oxygen as it seems to be a combination of high temperatures and reduced oxygen that affects fish behavior.
- There seems to be a relationship between temperature and fish size; year 2 was colder than year 1 and Year 2 fish were concomitantly smaller.
- Attendees were shown a feeding index of the feeding observations. In Year 1 the fish tended towards having recently eaten whereas in Year 2 the fish had not eaten recently.
- There were also a higher percentage of anomalies found in a variety of organs for Year 2 fish than in Year 1 fish. The majority of the anomalies were found in the opercles. Greater differences in the Health Index were found at the 3 upstream sites during Year 2.
- Fish Opercula Deformity Syndrome (FODS) has been found in 5 species of fish in 2 basins. Hatchery raised RGSM are found with FODS 80% to 90% of the time. The incidence was found to be less severe when the diet of the hatchery fish was changed from a meat based to a spirulina based diet. In a random survey from the collection in the Museum of Southwestern Biology it was found that the frequency of FODS increased for fish collected in the 1980's and the 1990's.
- The top candidate causes for FODS are river temperature and nutrition.
 - **Question:** Is the hatchery still finding as many incidences of FODS?
 - **Responses:** They have reported that they are still seeing it but not as severely.
 - **Question:** How would you design a study to see if the river temperature is causing FODS?
 - **Responses:** Wouldn't design a study for the river yet.
- Temperature based recommendations are to (1) collect and review data on incidence of FODS and their temperature/nutrient regimes at the different refugia/hatcheries; (2) quantify the effects of different temperatures on RGSM embryo/larval skeletal development; (3) quantify river temperature regimes during the RGSM embryo and

larval development and in nursery habitats; (4) survey/evaluate quality larval food availability/timing; (5) evaluate effect of FODS on RGSM feeding and respiration rates; and (6) model effect of operations on river temperatures and the effects of surface and ground water inputs (as necessary).

○ **Question:** At what size does FODS become observable?

- **Response:** For the RGSM Health Study FODS was only observed in fish over 30 mm standard length. This size was selected to standardize operations as there is limited ability for necropsy on smaller fish; however it's very difficult to see opercula when fish are smaller than 30 mm.

○ **Question:** Has Los Lunas seen FODS?

- **Response:** No one has reported seeing it there.

- The amount of oxygen in the water column fluctuates on a diurnal basis based on turbulence, pressure, and the amount coming from plants. As the oxygen increases so does fish biomass (density) and as oxygen decreases fish biomass decreases as well.
- Storm events are associated with quick drops in oxygen. Data from the gage at Alameda is showing that storm events are associated with drops in oxygen. Data from USGS after storm run off at Galisteo Creek and storm runoff from Jemez River are also showing rapid drops in oxygen. Dr. Van Horn's data also shows low oxygen in the Middle Rio Grande (MRG) due to storm water pushing North Diversion Channel stagnant water into the MRG with a resultant drop in oxygen that goes out for miles. Being held in these conditions could induce stress in fish.

○ **Question:** How does the North Diversion Dam affect temperature?

- **Response:** The study did not address how the North Diversion Dam affects temperature.

- Low DO in the MRG associated with storm events could be due to a number of factors: erosion increases sediment and sediment oxygen demand; storm water containing carbonaceous oxygen demand; velocity scour of MRG sediment increased sediment oxygen demand; smothering and/or scour of algal/plant communities; and shading of MRG algae/plants by elevated turbidity.

○ **Question:** Has this been seen in other cities?

- **Response:** Yes it has been seen in other cities in sand bed streams.

- Recommendations based on the data: quantify RGSM chronic/behavioral effects at low oxygen saturation; quantify RGSM avoidance/preference of low oxygen and high temperature environments; and evaluate mechanism of low oxygen events in relation to storm runoff sources/magnitude.

○ The relationship between oxygen and temperature really governs the amount of available habitat. There should not only be monitoring and tracking of data but there should be modeling in a system with a variety of flows.

- Two years of data from ASIR indicate that when the Gross Primary Productivity is higher there is a higher CPUE; however more data is needed. During storm events the sediment is robbing the water column of DO and this is perhaps reflected in fish biomass.
 - **Question:** So, you're saying that primary productivity is a limiting factor on the RGSM?
 - **Response:** I would say that biomass is related to primary productivity. Based on Dr. Van Horn's data I think that light may be limited at lower sites and nutrients might be limiting in upper sites.
- Year 1 didn't have as much productivity as Year 2 and total suspended sediment concentrations were higher in Year 1; though Year 2 did have some suspended sediment.
- Suspended sediment and RGSM CPUE data over time in San Acacia show that RGSM are doing well after the spring runoff but once hit by summer/fall storm runoff the population tends to decrease. However because at some years (2002-03) were affected by drought this correlation is not robust.
- Suspended sediment concentration/Productivity Recommendations: estimate suspended sediment sources and its potential to effect RGSM food and primary productivity by shading (or oxygen demand); and quantify any direct effects of suspended sediment on RGSM health or food resources.
 - High levels of sediment may shade the plant and decrease food availability. Suspended sediment concentration has been found to directly affect warm water fish but it's not known if there is any affect on RGSM.
- RGSM Health Study summary
 - RGSM have elevated anomalies
 - Temperature may be a factor in frequency of anomalies, number of RGSM with bacteria, and RGSM feeding index.
 - Temperature increased during drying/slowing; high at edges.
 - Oxygen reduced by some storm events and may affect RGSM.
 - Primary productivity reduced in Year 1 perhaps due to storm events/elevated suspended sediment in late summer/fall.
 - Elevated suspended sediment in summer/fall may starve some RGSM.
- The floor was opened to comments and questions.
 - **Comment:** It would be interesting to study different reaches to look for correlations between primary productivity, sediment, and minnow growth and numbers.
 - **Question:** Joel was asked if he is aware that the Program is putting together a SOW for water quality.
 - **Response:** The study shouldn't focus on toxins. Physical phenomena are important in the Rio Grande. The Rio Grande is physically degraded and those factors need to be evaluated for the animal.

- **Question:** Are you contributing input to the EPA or other agencies on development of fish health criteria?
 - **Response:** Joel has been looking for metrics of biota that respond to metrics of water quality. Diversity of physical health metrics is something that should be considered. The Rio Grande may be listed for being impaired for DO. There is also not enough of an understanding for how the chemicals react together on the fish to measure toxins. I have been working with the EPA on looking at biological integrity as a way of measuring water quality.
- The report will be available in 2-3 months. It still needs to undergo internal U.S. FWS review. The Program is then expected to provide an internal review.
- **Question:** Would it be helpful to remove a lot of the sediment from the first storm surges?
 - **Response:** The sediment being held back by erosion control measures is the particle size of sand and is not as much of a concern as clay which is not stopped by erosion control. Clay is much lighter than sand and more strongly attenuates light. The volume of water may also be decreasing over time so the concentration of clay may appear to be going up though there is not more clay in the environment.
- Fish Health Study is a suggested topic for the Program technical workshop in the fall.

Approval of the June 1st, 2011 CC meeting summary – The June 1, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.

Action Item and EC Directive Review -

- **Grace Haggerty will follow up on a document that ISC generated to describe what can be used as cost share.**
 - Ongoing. Grace has not yet been able to locate the document.
- **Susan Bittick will discuss the suggestion of a Program-wide technical presentation of the LIDAR data and digital photography with John Peterson.**
 - Complete. There was a presentation on June 22 at the Corps.
- **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. (Ongoing from 5/4/11)**
 - Complete.
- **Terina Perez will see if the SWM workgroup can provide an updated activity summary and cost estimate for the *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction Project* to the CC at their June 28th meeting.**
 - Ongoing. Reclamation is discussing this project internally.
- **Grace Haggerty will ask Rich Valdez how other programs address peer reviews.**

- Grace talked to Rich and he has agreed to look into how other programs address peer reviews; however it may be some time before he is able to complete this task as ISC's contract with SWCA will need to be renewed at the end of June.
- **Rick Billings will look into the guidelines that academic institutions use to address peer reviews.**
 - Complete.
- **Jericho Lewis will draft text describing the peer review process for the CC to review for inclusion in the *Peer Review Process* document.**
 - Incomplete. Jericho has not yet drafted the text; however that portion of the Peer Review Process document will not be reviewed during today's meeting.
- **Comments (by agency) on the *Peer Review Process* document are due to Yvette McKenna by COB June 17th.**
 - Complete. Comments were received from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps) and ISC.
- **Stacey Kopitsch will coordinate with Jericho, ScW, HRW, and MPT to have the Food Availability Study reviewed again after the current comments/edits have been incorporated.**
 - The Monitoring Plan Team (MPT) and CC Co-Chairs determined that there had been adequate review of the document and that there is not a need to be reviewed again by the work groups. The draft document was sent to Jericho.
- The March 29th and April 21st EC directives continue to be ongoing.

Review draft General Peer Review Procedures –

- Rick Billings updated attendees that he looked at the peer review process for scientific journals and the American Chemical Society and both of these sources focused more on the actual process of a peer review and not on the process for utilizing recommendations. Rick also looked at the EPA Peer Review Handbook which also has a lot of information on the legal and scientific reasons for doing a peer review; the Program seems to be using a similar peer review process. It might not be possible to have a process for adopting the recommendations of a peer review as the process seems to be different for each recommendation
 - Two modules on the website were created to house reference documents and website links for other peer review processes. (Library → Peer Review)
- Attendees were updated that the draft peer review explanation has now been split into two documents. One is a detailed document that describes the peer review process being used for the San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage. The other is a document generally describing the process steps that are planned to be used for future peer reviews. The plan is to present the EC with the general peer review process and then once the work group's recommendations have been received the EC will be provided with the complete Fish Passage peer review document.
- One edit was that the document should say independent peer review. It should also be clear what can be subject to peer review; issues, problems, processes, reports, functions are all used in the document but none are used consistently throughout the document.
- The CC was asked if they were in agreement with there being two documents and no objections were made.

- It was proposed that the CC wait until both documents are ready to present to the EC in order to allow for further editing of the documents and to see a more complete picture of the peer review and recommendation review process. This will also give the opportunity for the work group Co-Chairs to review the General Peer Review Procedures document and see if there are any particular steps they want included. If the EC meets in July they can be given an update on the progress of this directive; the EC will also need to determine how they will utilize the CC and work group recommendations.
- There were no objections to postponing a decision on the General Peer Review Procedures. The document will be discussed again at the August 3rd CC meeting. CC members will review the draft General Peer Review Procedures and send any edits or comments to Yvette McKenna by July 27th. The CC requests that the work group Co-Chairs review the draft General Peer Review Procedures and send any edits or comments to Yvette McKenna by July 27th.

Review and discuss the draft Adaptive Management Work group charter

- Attendees reviewed the draft charter and a diagram with the proposed work group structure. Yvette updated attendees that she asked for comments from the adaptive management (AM) contractor and the CC will be reviewing those changes during today's discussion.
- It was discussed that this EC directive is out of concert with the Service's EC action item, for which they have been working with Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and the Corps to propose a plan for establishing the Program as a recovery program in order to support the decision made by the Program in August of 2009 (*The EC action item is: Wally Murphy will draft the descriptions of a Recovery Implementation Program and a Recovery Program, including the processes, elements, documents and agreements required to formalize either program*). As there will likely be a proposed structure that comes along with establishment as a recovery program there was concern that it may be premature to create a new workgroup and Program structure.
 - It was said that the EC directive was likely given so that an AM charter would be available once it is needed. Though the CC and the PMT will follow through with the EC directive several CC members voiced agreement that creation of a charter was premature given the Service's action item.
- The proposed structure for the AM work group would have the technical work group Co-Chairs as the primary members. It was commented that Dave Campbell (Population Viability Analysis work group Co-Chair) will not be able to participate in the AM work group because of his responsibilities to the San Juan program (*Since the CC meeting this statement has been corrected; when an AM work group is formed Dave Campbell will be able to participate and assist in folding the PVA modeling into the Program's practice of AM*).
 - It was acknowledged that there are huge resource issues. In other programs (the Platte River program) the majority of the work is contracted out. For example, in Glen Canyon "professional neutrals" are routinely used in facilitation. The draft AM charter suggests that Decision logs be used versus attempting to come to a full consensus.
- Attendees reviewed the proposed structure for the AM work group.
 - The intent of the proposed structure of the AM work group is to allow staff to continue to contribute their expertise while eliminating compartmentalization in the work groups and

the need for each work group to meet monthly. This structure will hopefully allow the appropriate people to be present at meetings and for the meetings to be more focused by task, activity, and project phase.

- Though the proposed structure currently has a lot of AM work group members, if the Program decides to restructure the work groups there may be fewer members.
- It was also commented that there may be others involved in the workgroups with more technical expertise that might be more appropriate for an AM work group than the Co-Chairs.
- This portion of the meeting was a working session to review the draft AM work group charter.
 - Overview
 - A statement at the end of the charter that explains that the charter is being developed in anticipation of the AM plan and the LTP being completed in 2011.
 - The first paragraph describes how the EC first wanted to wait before an AM group was created but then decided to begin development of the draft charter.
 - The last sentence in the second paragraph was changed to read “The intent is to integrate adaptive management *into the ESA process* in order for management and operational flexibilities to be considered in regulatory decision making *while improving the status of the species.*”
 - The AM contractors had suggested changing the last sentence in the second paragraph to read “The intent is to integrate adaptive management *into the ESA regulatory framework* in order for management and operational flexibilities to be considered in regulatory decision making.” so that there is no question as to why the Program is implementing AM.
 - It was discussed that “regulatory framework” should be removed as it could be referring to either ESA 7 or ESA 6.
 - “...while improving the status of the species.” was added to the end of the sentence. The Service is pro AM for various reasons but mostly in order to improve the status of the species.
 - The 4th sentence in the third paragraph was changed to read “The work group will use a proven AM process (6 step...)”.
 - The AM plan adopted by the Program will be based on the 6-step cycle that was explained at the AM workshops.
 - It was suggested that the CC postpone approval of the AM work group charter as some of the CC members will need to have other members of their agencies review the document before it can be recommended to the EC for approval. It was also suggested that the document be provided to the EC as an information read ahead for their next meeting then EC members that don’t have representation at other levels can provide input before it goes to the EC with recommendation for approval.
 - Attendees discussed how the AM work group will transfer from AM Plan Version 1 to AM Plan Version 2.

- It was said that the AM work group would be the group that would create the Version 2 plan. One of the first actions of this work group would be figuring out where the priorities are for AM.
 - Due to work load contracted support may be necessary for this transition.
 - Attendees agreed to add a paragraph that will discuss the transition from AM Plan 1 to AM Plan 2.
 - Yvette will draft a paragraph to include in the draft Adaptive Management Workgroup charter that describes the transition between Adaptive Management Plan Versions 1 and 2.
- The first sentence of the 4th paragraph will be changed to "...The AM Work Group will remain in place for the same duration as the anticipated ne BO to fulfill the need for: *improving the status of the silvery minnow and flycatcher, sustainable...*"
- Work Group Objectives
 - Some verbiage was removed from the 1st sentence as it was found to be repetitive with earlier verbiage in the document and it was changed to read "The purpose of the AM Work Group is to guide implementation of the Program's AM plan."
 - The last part of the second sentence was changed to read "...match those predicted. *These outcomes will be communicated to decision makers* to learn and adjust future management and policy."
 - The AM Work Group will not be adjusting future management and policy but will be communicated AM outcomes to the CC and EC.
 - Using the AM results to learn and adjust future management and policy should be addressed in the EC and CC charters.
 - The 4th bullet was changed to read "Prioritize and recommend *activities* for *independent* peer review." as the work group could be recommending reports or other activities for peer review.
 - The 5th bullet was changed to read "Continue to support Program *population viability analysis and water operations* models."
 - A portion regarding model training was removed from the sentence because though the Program would like to have the internal capability to do model runs as opposed to using a contracted modeler, the training may not be appropriate for the AM work group.
 - "...ability to meet annual sufficient progress..." was removed from the last bullet as the work group may not have the authority or expertise to evaluate sufficient progress.
 - The task "“Incorporate Program PVA and PHVA model results into work group activities.” will be added to ensure that the results of AM are integrated with PVA and URGWOM so there is not disconnect.
- Work Plan
 - The first sentence of the first paragraph will be clarified that the AM work group will develop and approve the annual *work group* work plan and not the Program's annual work plan; though the AM work group would probably make recommendations on studies to include in the Program annual work plan. The

Program's annual work plan will probably be created by the CC and Program Management Team (PMT) and then approved by the EC.

- Amendment of the Work Group Charter
 - The third sentence was changed to read “The objectives of the work? group may be revisited after *the finalization of the LTP and the AM Plan and establishment of a new BO.*” This edit was made to more accurately reflect the order in which things will occur.
- Meeting attendees agreed to schedule an additional CC meeting for July 12 from 12:30 PM to 4:00 PM at Reclamation. Ali Saenz will schedule a room at Reclamation for the July 12th CC meeting.
- The charter with today's edits will be sent out as read ahead by July 7th in preparation for the July 12th CC meeting.
- Attendees were very briefly updated that TPEC evaluations for the Habitat Restoration RFP will be on July 14th.
- It was shared that the tentative dates for the Program technical symposium/open house are October 21st and 22nd. Possible locations are the Nature Center and City of Albuquerque Open Space. The PMT liaisons have been collecting potential topics from the work groups. There will likely be 6 topics.
- Attendees briefly discussed the RAMAS model contract.
 - The funding the CC had approved for this contract was specifically approved to continue Dr. Miller's contracted work; however Reclamation is unable to sole source any contracts. Dr. Miller can compete if the requirement is issued.
 - Attendees were updated that Jericho Lewis (Reclamation Contracting Officer) cannot move forward with the SOW as there are unresolved comments. The work group has been asked to try to resolve the issues.
 - Concern was expressed that this modeling contract needs to be resolved as soon as possible. And since the PVA's next meeting is tentatively set for the end of July there may be a need for the CC to step in.
 - Though no one at the meeting knew what the comments were exactly it was thought that they were in regard to modeling runs that would be done for the Program and modeling runs that would be completed for the Service consultation.
 - Because the first purpose of the PVA was to support the ESA consultation – first for development of the BA(s) and then to prepare a BO – there is no difference between a “Program” run and a “consultation” run. It's believed that the issue can be resolved.
 - Jim Wilber volunteered to work with Jericho and Yvette McKenna to reconcile the comments. If they are unable to resolve the comment issues then the issue will be elevated to the CC to reconcile via email or at their July 12th meeting.

(Since the CC meeting, the Service made revisions to the SOW and the MRGCD concurred with the SOW as revised by the Service. The Program Manager submitted it to the contracting officer for processing.)

Decision: Review and recommend funding O&M for 2 additional USGS gages -

- Attendees were notified that ISC approached the Program for funding for the operation and maintenance of 2 USGS gages, one in San Marcial and one San Acacia.
 - It was explained that different agencies fund different aspects of the gages and that this request is for the Program to assist with funding for the aspects of the 2 gages that ISC used to fund.
 - As the gages contribute to the Program and BO, meeting attendees agreed to approve one year of funding with the stipulation that funding will be reconsidered next year.
- The CC approved funding *for one year* for O&M for 2 additional USGS gages (gages in Sac Acacia and San Marcial).

All unmet agenda items were tabled for the July 12th CC meeting.

It was announced that the Bosque from Cochiti to Socorro has been closed until further notice. MRGCD and the City of Albuquerque request that non-emergency work in those areas be postponed.

**Coordination Committee Working Meeting
29 June 2011 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3555	O	yrmkenna@usbr.gov
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 – Co-Chair	Susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
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
Grace Haggerty	NMISC	383-4042	P	Grace.haggerty@state.nm.us
Jim Wilber	Reclamation	462-3548	P	jwilber@usbr.gov
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD	247-0234	P – Co-Chair	brooke@mrgcd.us
Lori Robertson	FWS	761-4710	P	lori_robertson@fws.gov
Hilary Brinegar via phone	NMDA	575-646-2642	P	hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu
Ralph Monfort	UNM	293-5573	O	ralfphmonfort@hotmail.com
Justin Reale - presentation only	USACE	342-3138	O	Justin.k.reale@usace.army.mil
Joel D. Lusk - presentation only	FWS	761-4709	O	Joel_lusk@fws.gov
Michael Porter - presentation only	USACE	342-3264	O	Michael.d.porter@usace.army.mil
Ali Saenz	Reclamation/Admin Assist	462-3600	O	asaenz@ucbr.gov
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 ext. 139	O	christine.sanchez@ttemi.com