

Coordination Committee Meeting
September 7, 2011

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

Draft Only

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**Coordination Committee Meeting****September 7, 2011 – 12:30-4:00 pm****Bureau of Reclamation****Rio Grande Conference Room**

Conference Call-in Line for September 7, 2011

Toll Free Number: 1-888-603-7917

Participant Passcode: 68718#

(1st Committee member or contractor to arrive, please dial in)**Draft Meeting Agenda**

- Introductions and Agenda* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 06/29/11 CC meeting summary*
- Actions, Requests and EC Directives Review (see below)
- **Decision** – Program support for travel costs for:
 - Workgroup participants?
 - Invitational travel for presenters?
- Update on draft LTP*
 - Review content and discuss
 - Determine timeframe for review
 - Determine reviewers (CC to EC/Program)
- Discuss FY12 Work Plan*
 - CC-led efforts
 - i. Peer Review of additional projects/Utilization of Peer Review Recommendations
 - ii. Synthesis of Literature/Data
 - iii. LTP
 - iv. Adaptive Management?
- Reclamation update on proposed Program BA for streamlining ESA compliance for HR projects
- Discuss USGS surface water/groundwater study – final phase*
- Update on Strengths-based Leadership training (tentatively scheduled for December 9, 2011)
- **Additional topics to be added by CC representatives**
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC

***denotes read ahead**

Next meeting – CC meeting – October 5, 2011 @ Reclamation from 12:30 – 4:00 pm

Upcoming meetings

EC meeting – September 20, 2011 @ Reclamation from 9:00 am – 1:00 pm

10-yr Collaborative Program Anniversary @ Rio Grande Nature Center, Friday, October 21 - Technical Presentations; Saturday, October 22 – Open House

EC meeting – November 3, 2011 @ USACE (all day)

Joint Workgroup meeting – November 15, 2011, TBD, 8:30 am – 12:00 pm (tentative)

Aug 3, 2011 CC Actions

- Ali Saenz and Yvette McKenna will redistribute the NM contact information for spills and fish kills with the updated NM Department of Game and Fish phone numbers. – **Updated email was resent on 8/4/11.**
- The CC will review the revised draft General Peer Review Procedures and send comments and edits to Yvette McKenna by August 24th, 2011.
- 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) Incomplete. Jericho has not yet drafted the text; however that portion of the Peer Review Process document will not be needed until the CC reviews the more historically based document.*

Aug 3, 2011 CC Requests

- The CC requests that the ScW take the lead on synthesis of data/literature and use the ISC's submittal for the 5-year minnow review and the existing LTP categories to develop a **plan** for the synthesis of literature/data.
- The CC requests that the ScW and HRW work to modify the ScW activity *Better understand fish movement (RGSM longitudinal movement)* to include research of minnow movement below San Acacia Diversion Dam and other diversion structures during the critical low flow summer months.

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
September 7, 2011 – 12:30-4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
Rio Grande Conference Room**

Actions

- Stacey Kopitsch will request a presentation synopsis and a cost estimate for travel expenses from the Salt Cedar Leaf Beetle specialist to assist the CC in determining if they would like to invite him to present at the October 21st, 2011 Program Technical Presentations. *✓ Presenter was not available; will reschedule Salt Cedar Leaf Beetle/SWFL presentation for the Program at a later date.*
- Representatives from the Service were asked to verify that the LTP appendices that relate to the Recovery Plan are the most current versions.
- Comments/edits on the draft LTP text are due to Yvette McKenna (with cc to Ali Saenz) by COB October 14th, 2011 in order to be incorporated for review at the October 26th, 2011 CC meeting. *Ongoing*
- Jim Wilber will find out if having a contractor work on a proposed Program BA for streamlining ESA compliance for habitat restoration projects will work for Reclamation.
- Jen Bachus will send Kevin Buhl's contact information to Yvette McKenna and Ali Saenz for distribution for those interested in assisting Kevin with light field work. *✓*

Ongoing Actions/Requests

- Jericho Lewis and Yvette McKenna 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).*
- The CC request that the ScW take the lead on synthesis of data/literature and use the ISC's submittal for the 5-year minnow review and the existing LTP categories to develop a plan for the synthesis of literature/data. *(Carried over from 8/3; The ScW will finish addressing the CC's request at the upcoming September 20th meeting.)*
- The CC requests that the ScW and HRW work to modify the ScW activity *Better understand fish movement (RGSM longitudinal movement)* to include research of minnow movement below San Acacia Diversion Dam and other diversion structures during the critical low flow summer months. *(Carried over from 8/3; The CC request will be addressed at the upcoming September 20th ScW and HRW meetings.)*

Decisions

- The August 3rd, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.
- The CC agreed to reschedule the regularly scheduled November CC meeting for October 26th, 2011 in order to accommodate for the November 3rd, 2011 all day EC meeting.

Announcements

- Kevin Buhl will be in the Albuquerque area for research until September 23rd and could use some assistance with light field work; Jen Bachus will send Kevin's contact information to Yvette and Ali for distribution to the Program.

Next CC Meeting: October 5th, 2011 from 12:30 PM to 4:00 PM at Reclamation

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Review ScW outline for approach to data synthesis; (2) Continue to discuss FY12 Work Plan; (3) Update on Strengths finders

Upcoming Meetings:

- EC meeting - September 20th, 2011 at Reclamation from 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM
- CC meeting - October 26th 2011 ALL DAY MEETING 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM - Tentative agenda items: (1) Review the incorporated changes to the narrative of LTP; (2) review draft future activities in context of the LTP; (3) discuss LTP as a whole
- EC meeting – November 3rd, 2011 at USACE ALL DAY and November 4th, 2011 at USACE HALF DAY session

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 reordering the agenda to move discussion on the SW/GW Interaction Study to after review of the Actions, Request and EC Directives, a correction that the *August 3rd* CC meeting summary will be up for approval, and the addition of an announcement under Additional Topics.

Decision – Approval of the August 3rd, 2011 CC Meeting Summary: The August 3rd, 2011 Coordination Committee (CC) meeting summary was approved with no changes.

Actions, Requests, and EC Directives Review:

- August 3rd, 2011 CC Actions:
 - Ali Saenz and Yvette McKenna will redistribute the NM contact information for spills and fish kills with the updated NM Department of Game and Fish phone numbers.
 - Complete; an updated email was resent on 8/4/11.
 - The CC will review the revised draft General Peer Review Procedures and send comments and edits to Yvette McKenna by August 24th, 2011.
 - Complete.
 - 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*).
 - Not yet completed. Now that the more historically based document outlining the peer review process has been reviewed by the CC, Yvette McKenna will be working with Jericho to draft this portion of the *Peer Review Process* document.
- August 3rd, 2011 CC Requests:
 - The CC requests that the Science Work group (ScW) take the lead on synthesis of data/literature and use the ISC's submittal for the 5-year minnow review and the existing LTP categories to develop a plan for the synthesis of literature/data.
 - Ongoing. The ScW began discussion on this request at their August meeting and initially interpreted the request as being tasked with completing the entire synthesis internally; it has since been clarified that the ScW is to develop a *plan* for data synthesis and will be addressing the CC's request at their upcoming work group meeting on September 20th, 2011.
 - The CC requests that the ScW and HRW work to modify the ScW activity *Better understand fish movement (RGSM longitudinal movement)* to include research of minnow movement below San Acacia Diversion Dam and other diversion structures during the critical low flow summer months.
 - The ScW and Habitat Restoration Work group (HRW) will be discussing this CC request at their upcoming September 20th, 2011 work group meetings.
- Directive from April 21 Executive Committee (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.
 - The CC continues to address this request as they develop the *Peer Review Process* document.
- Directive from March 29th EC meeting:
 - The EC directed the CC to continue the “synthesis of all existing data” discussions and brainstorm how to accomplish the synthesis work. It was recommended that these discussion take place simultaneously with the LTP development as the synthesis work may inform LTP priorities and activities.
 - Ongoing; the CC has requested that the ScW take the lead on developing a plan to address data synthesis.

Discuss USGS GW/SW Interaction Study – Final Phase: Meeting attendees discussed the contract renewal with the USGS for the *GW/SW Interaction Study*.

- Representatives from the Species Water Management (SWM) work group voiced concerns that (1) they were unable to review the SOW and there are aspects of it that they may not necessarily agree with and (2) that because of issues with untimely deliverables and high costs they had agreed to put the project up for bid and not continue with the USGS. It was explained the SWM work group had wanted to evaluate whether the project should continue but because they did not receive reports they were unable to make an informed decision. Since the data is utilized by URGWOM the work group agreed that the project should continue at a reduced level and be put out for bid in an attempt to resolve some of the issues. The SWM work group began work on a modified SOW but learned that a lot of the details of the transition (well ownership and locations) needed to be determined before the SOW could be completed. To avoid a data gap, Reclamation initially volunteered to take over data collection but it turns out that Reclamation did not have the capabilities to take over data clean-up. The work group voiced frustration that the project was delayed and that their work to develop a new SOW was nullified.
 - It was recognized that Reclamation’s attempts to take over the project were ill advised in hindsight and apologies were made for the delays that this caused. It was explained that the interim agreement was a solution to prevent a lapse in data collection, to allow for completion of the overdue deliverables, and to allow for transition of the project to a new contractor.
 - It was pointed out that although the interim contract was put in place to prevent a lapse in data collection, the loggers have not been maintained or recalibrated since August of 2010. A data gap may be inevitable as the data may not be useable. Concern was also expressed about the reports being completed under an interim contract when completion of the reports was already funded in the initial contract.
 - It was explained that since Interagency Agreements (IAs) do not use invoicing it is not known which portions of the report development were billed but as there is funding left over after the initial IA expired, and similar to the amount proposed to cover report generation, it is assumed that not all of the funding for the reports was spent. The funding leftover from the initial IA will be deobligated and returned to the Program.
 - It was shared that Mike Hamman (Reclamation Area Manager) will be meeting with the USGS Area Manager to discuss the issue of untimely deliverables.
 - As it is likely that a new contract will not be awarded until after the first quarter of 2012, the interim contract will allow for the SOW to be completed and put out for bid. The interim contract will also keep the project ongoing and if approved for funding the study can be funded in 2012 even if the budget is not known because ongoing projects are allowed to be funded.

- Some CC members suggested the interim contract be modified to include quarterly in-person updates to the SWM work group from USGS and that the COTR for the project work closely with SWM work group. Attendees also said that it would also be nice to know where the overdue reports are in USGS internal peer review process.
- Representatives from SWM verified that they have no intention of continuing a long-term contract for this project with USGS.
- Though the interim contract has already been awarded, the contract can still be amended or terminated. The SWM work group can provide comments on the SOW and it can be amended as appropriate.
- It was suggested that the SWM work group complete the new SOW by October 1st, 2011 and then the interim contract can be terminated once the new contract is awarded in 2012.
- It was commented that it might be helpful to have Yvette or Jericho at an upcoming SWM meeting to address any issues the work group may have.
- The request was made to Matt Martinez and Hilary Brinegar to consider serving as the SWM non-federal co-chair.

Decision – Program support for travel costs: Attendees discussed whether the Program should provide travel costs for work group participants to attend meetings or to invite presenters.

- Attendees were updated that SAR work group was informed about a FEMA meeting in Texas and it was thought that it might be beneficial to attend the meeting. Though the SAR work group has since reconsidered, having determined it would be more appropriate for Socorro County to reach out to FEMA, this was seen as an opportunity for the CC to consider funding travel requests.
 - Concern was expressed about using Program funds for events/activities/meetings that are outside the Program's boundaries and outside of the river basin. The CC was in agreement that this would not be a good precedent.
- The CC then discussed whether the Program should fund travel costs for an invited presenter for the October 21st Program Technical Presentations. It was explained that a Salt Cedar beetle presentation had been planned as one of the workshop topics. However, none of the local experts are available to present so it had been suggested that an expert from Northern Arizona University present on the beetle. If it is decided that funding his travel would be outside of Program support then the topic can be removed from the agenda.
 - ScW and HRW will be viewing a presentation on the beetle from the Tamarisk Coalition; a presentation with a more broad opinion on the beetle and SWFL use of salt cedar might be more appropriate for the technical sessions.
 - The CC requested a cost estimate and a synopsis of the specialist's presentation in order to determine if it would be appropriate to invite him to present at the Program Technical Presentations.

Update on draft LTP: Meeting attendees reviewed and discussed the content of the draft LTP.

- The majority of the recent edits to the draft LTP text were made for consistency, other major changes were presented in track changes and discussed in the meeting, including:
 - The addition of a disclaimer from the recovery plan that explains that all the activities included in the LTP are voluntary and are not binding any agency in anyway and that all agencies have attempted to use the best information available to produce the LTP.
 - It was suggested that the disclaimer should be listed in the table of contents as it could read that the whole Recovery Plan is in the LTP.
 - It was suggested that sections 6.1 (Minnow Recovery Plan Elements and Actions) and 6.2 (Flycatcher Recovery Plan Elements and Actions) be included in section 4.0 (Relationship to Species Recovery Plans) in order to avoid confusion as Section 6.0

- (Collaborative Program Categories) should only contain information about the Program's plan and not the Recovery Plans.
- The LTP text was clarified from the EC retreat notes that the Program agreed to transition to a recovery program while still being cognizant of the MRG elements.
 - It was pointed out that Section 3.1 (Basics for LTP Major Revision) contains a lot of changes. Some of the bullets that had been previously marked as EC decisions are now included under "There was also discussion and general agreement on the following:" as a review of the EC 2009 Retreat notes found that these were not decisions but topics that the EC had general agreement on.
 - It was suggested that the point of the statement "As agreed upon by the EC, the LTP would provide the basis for the Service to determine compliance with the ESA by including:..." in section 3.3 (Relationship of Annual Work Plans and Budgets to the LTP) also be included in the introduction.
 - It was commented that it is now possible to see how the LTP would give the basis for determining compliance and how there will be another annual process each year where the Program will determine their priorities and formulate an annual work plan.
 - It was suggested that a section with a detailed, procedural description for how the annual work plan will be developed from the LTP be added.
 - It was also suggested that there be more discussion on how the adaptive management process would tie into the annual work plan.
 - A representative from the Service explained that though the LTP in the BO will be the basis for the annual sufficiency evaluation other components will be included in the evaluation as well. It was suggested that the introduction also clarify that the LTP will one of several components used for annual sufficiency evaluation.
 - It was suggested that the highlighted text on page 11 pertaining to 10(j)) efforts include clarification that though two of the populations are outside of the Program's funding authority the Program has been supportive of the efforts by supplying fish and technical expertise. One suggested text was "Two of the populations must be outside of the MRG and, therefore, are not within the Program's authority of the Collaborative Program; however the Program is supportive of these efforts."
 - Though content from the recovery plans is included for context, it was suggested by one attendee that the species Recovery Criteria not be included in the LTP as not all agencies are in agreement on that criteria. Instead, it was suggested that the Recovery Criteria be referred to as a general guidance for the activities discussed in the LTP.
 - It shared that Tom Pitts may be available to attend the November EC meeting as he is under contract with Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority (ABCWUA).
 - It was pointed out that a paragraph that describes the Program's adaptive management efforts in 2010 was added on page 25 under section 7.6 (Research Monitoring and Adaptive Management). The Program still needs to describe how adaptive management will feed into Program activities.
 - It was suggested that adaptive management be discussed separately from research monitoring in its own section.
 - It was recommended to ask the Service how they would like to see adaptive management laid out in the LTP.
 - It was also suggested that in 7.6 that the minnow and flycatcher be discussed separately in 2 brief paragraphs.
 - The representative from the Service was asked to verify that the appendices that relate to the Recovery Plans are the most current versions.

- The CC discussed the timeframe for review of the LTP. No decisions on LTP content or changes were made by the CC during the meeting.
 - The CC decided to reschedule their November meeting to October 26th, 2011 in order to accommodate the all day EC meeting on November 3rd, 2011.
 - Because there are several documents out for Program review, CC comments on the draft LTP will be due by October 14th. This allows time for the comments to be incorporated/addressed before the CC reviews them again at the October 26th CC meeting. The October 26th, 2011 CC meeting will be an all-day meeting from 10:00 AM to 4:00 PM to focus on the draft LTP.
 - Concern was expressed with the timeline for the CC to review the draft LTP in its entirety before it is sent for EC review. It was suggested that the Future Activities be included even though they have not been prioritized by the CC.
 - There was concern with the activities being sent to the EC for review before they have been reviewed by the CC in the context of the entire LTP.
 - There was concern expressed that the timeline to move forward on the LTP for the upcoming consultation is very tight and should not be delayed.
 - The CC agreed to present only the draft LTP text as an overview to the EC at the November EC meeting but will put forth the entire document for their review as a read-ahead, with a disclaimer that the Future Activities have not been approved by the CC. The CC also agreed to discuss at its October 26th meeting in further detail what will be presented to the EC on November 3rd.

Discuss FY12 Work Plan: Meeting attendees discussed the Work Plan for FY 2012 (FY12).

- Reclamation shared that the amount of funding for FY12 is not yet known. It is likely that the government will be under a continuing resolution again. The CC discussed what amount of funding the CC would be willing to spend on several of the projects and whether the CC would like to fund the activities.
- The CC discussed 3 activities that the CC has taken the lead on: *Synthesis of Data*, *Adaptive Management Plan Development*, and the silvery minnow targeted study related to fish passage: *Fish Movement*. These would be brand new contracts and SOWs will be needed by December 9th, 2011. Although it's not known how much funding will be available, the contracts can be competed and then awarded once the amount of FY12 funding is known.
 - *Synthesis of Data* –
 - Funding for this item would include any SOWs for contracted support that the ScW determines would be needed.
 - It was suggested that the proposed activity for synthesizing water quality data be added in to this activity. This would allow for the ScW proposed priority activity for *Water Quality Data Synthesis* to be eliminated from the work plan table.
 - It was suggested that data synthesis be funded annually in order to keep the synthesis current and updated with new data.
 - The CC estimated a placeholder of \$50,000 for this activity; this estimate can be revised and adjusted once the ScW and HRW work groups provide feedback. Attendees then briefly discussed that a synthesis of the data would include a narrative of all the known data with good citations – the purpose is to describe all the information (including competing information) with the highlights of that body of research. So far the synthesis would only include data related to the minnow.

- *Adaptive Management Plan Development* –
 - Funding for this activity would include contracted support to transition from Adaptive Management Plan Version 1 to Version 2. The Final AM Plan Version 1 will be delivered at the end of October.
 - It was suggested that Version 2 of the AM Plan be a pilot version that is more focused and only includes the projects that will be planned for the next couple of years as it is not likely the Program will be able to include all the hypotheses.
 - The CC agreed to put \$150,000 as a funding placeholder.
- *Fish Movement* –
 - The CC estimated this cost to be \$150,000.
- Attendees were updated that the *Assessment and Monitoring of RGSM Genetics* activity is in its final year. A new contract is needed if the CC would like to continue the activity.
 - The funding for the peer review of the RGSM Genetics is secured and Jericho will be negotiating with the reviewers.
- Attendees also suggested an estimated funding cap of \$2 million for *HR Implementation and Construction*.
- The CC will further review the FY12 Work Plan at a future meeting.

Reclamation update on proposed Program BA for streamlining ESA compliance for HR projects:

At the last CC meeting, it was discussed that Reclamation would need to be the action agency for a Programmatic BA for streamlining ESA compliance for HR projects. The CC was updated that although Reclamation is supportive of a Programmatic BA for HR, due to the current water management consultation, Reclamation would be unable to take the lead on a Programmatic BA until 2013.

- It was shared that the Service continues to support a Programmatic BA as a way to streamline the ESA compliance process for HR projects.
- Another representative shared that considering that compliance is a huge cost to the Program and there are 3 HR projects coming up, it was suggested that a Programmatic BA be pushed forward sooner than 2013 and to utilize contracted support to work on the Programmatic BA for Reclamation.
 - Although it seems unlikely that a hired contractor would save time (since Reclamation staff would be needed to oversee the contractor), Jim Wilber will find out if it would be possible.

Additional topics/announcements:

- Jen Bachus announced that Kevin Buhl will be in the Albuquerque area for research until September 23rd and has extended an invitation for anyone interested in helping with light field work; Jen Bachus will send Kevin's contact information to Yvette and Ali for distribution to the Program.

**Coordination Committee Working Meeting
7 September 2011 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3640	O	yrmkenna@usbr.gov
Nathan Schroeder	Pueblo of Santa Ana	771-6719	P	nathan.schroeder@santaana-nsn.gov
Terina Perez	Reclamation	462-3614	O - PMT	tlperez@usbr.gov
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	P	rbillings@abcwua.org
Ann Moore	NMAGO	222-9024	P	amoore@nmag.gov
Jericho Lewis	Reclamation	462-3622	O - CO	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
Jen Bachus	FWS	761-4714	A	jennifer_bachus@fws.gov
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	761-4737	O - PMT	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Julie Alcon	USACE	342-3281	A	julie.a.alcon@usace.army.mil
Hilary Brinegar	NMDA	575-646-2642	P	hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Liz Holmes	NMDA	795-2459	O	eholmes@nmda.nmsu.edu
Matt Martinez	MRGCD	247-0234	O – SWM	mmartinez@mrgcd.us
Ali Saenz	Reclamation	462-3600	O – Admin. Assist.	asaenz@ucbr.gov
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 ext. 139	O – Note Taker	christine.sanchez@ttemi.com