

Coordination Committee Meeting
October 5, 2011

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
October 5, 2011 – 12:30-4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
Rio Grande Conference Room**

Conference Call-in Line for October 5, 2011

Toll Free Number: 888-848-6501

Participant Passcode: 56171#

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

Draft Meeting Agenda

- Introductions and Agenda* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 08/07/11 CC meeting summary*
- **Decision** - Nomination of CC co-chair
- Actions, Requests and EC Directives Review (see below)
- **Decision** – Review and Approve CC-led efforts in draft FY2012 work plan*
 - Discuss remaining ongoing and new activities
 - Update on FY11 contracts (PVA-RAMAS model, etc.)
 - Discuss FY12 Contracting Process
 - Deadline for all new FY12 SOWs – December 16, 2011
- Discuss ScW outline/plan for approach to data and literature synthesis
- Discuss review of draft EC summary
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC
- Strengths-based Leadership training (tentatively scheduled for December 9, 2011)

***denotes read ahead**

Next meeting – CC working meeting – October 26, 2011 @ Reclamation from 10:00 am- 4:00 pm; consider attendance by appropriate workgroup members who can inform on proposed new activities for FY2012.

Upcoming meetings

EC meeting – November 3 (8:30 am-4:00 pm) and November 4 (8:30 am-12:00 pm), 2011 @ USACE

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

Joint Workgroup meeting – November 15, 2011, TBD, 9:30 am – 12:00 pm @ COA Open Space Visitor Center

September 7, 2011 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). 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.*
- 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.)*

The EC directives below are reminders and are being addressed by CC actions and requests above.

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
October 5th, 2011 – 12:30-4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
Rio Grande Conference Room**

Actions

- Grace Haggerty and Yvette McKenna will draft a Program Peer Review Process document as a read ahead for a future CC meeting.
- Yvette McKenna and Ali Saenz will update and redistribute the FY12 Planning Spreadsheet with the corrections and changes discussed at the 10/05/11 CC meeting.
- Yvette McKenna, Diana Herrera, and Ali Saenz will cross check the FY12 Planning Spreadsheet with the FY11 Planning Spreadsheet (Continuing Activities) to make sure no activities have been forgotten (ex. Annual Report task missing off FY12).
- ✓ Jim Wilber will forward the USGS email (regarding lack of funding for some water quality monitoring) to Yvette McKenna. – *completed 10/07/11*
- Jericho Lewis will review the ARRA-funded Isleta Phase II habitat restoration project BO to determine what exactly is required in terms of monitoring and compliance.
- Grace Haggerty will ask Anders Lundahl, as the MPT co-chair, to investigate options for Isleta Phase II “topo surveys” of current conditions (as-built design compliance) with the Corps.
- Yvette Paroz will follow up with TSD regarding options for the Isleta Phase II “topo surveys” of current conditions (as-built design compliance).
- Yvette McKenna will discuss the specific sites for the MRG mesohabitat mapping project with Bruce Moring (USGS)/Corps.
-
- Terina Perez will check with Leann Towne to determine if \$50,000 for URGWOM (decreased from original \$100,000) is reasonable for FY12 since less effort should be needed this year.
- Grace Haggerty will ask Nabil Shafike to discuss the riparian model with the Corps in an attempt to avoid redundancy/duplication with their FY12 groundwater/surface water project.
- Jericho Lewis will check on the option years for the Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation project to see if the option years have been exhausted yet.
- Jim Wilber will discuss with Reclamation management the suggestion to have work group attendance added to the COTR duties.
- The PMT will develop a 1-page summary describing the integration/interaction of COTRs with the work groups; including, how COTRs work with the PMT liaisons to provide updates, etc.
- The PMT will review the Program process flow charts and recommend changes to include COTR interactions.

Ongoing Actions/Requests

- ✓ Representatives from the Service were asked to verify that the LTP appendices that relate to the Recovery Plan are the most current versions. (*continued from September 7th; ongoing until the October 26th all-day working meeting*) *It was verified that the RGSM related appendices were current;*
- 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. (*continued from September 7th; ongoing until the October 26th all-day working meeting; please focus on the text and if time, then the future activities*)

Decisions

- Due to lack of quorum, no decisions were made at the October 5th, 2011 meeting.

-

Announcements

- The tamarisk (salt cedar) leaf beetle has apparently been found down south in the Mesilla Dam area.
- John D'Antonio is leaving the State Engineer's office. There may be a lot of changes that ensue.

Next CC Meeting: October 26th, 2011 from 10:00am to 4:00pm at Reclamation

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) CC approval of the 4 CC-led (or CC priority projects); (2) all tabled decision items from October 5th meeting; (3) Review the incorporated changes to the narrative of LTP; (4) review draft future activities in context of the LTP; (5) discuss LTP as a whole; (6) Discuss short-term next steps for the Adaptive Management Plan development;

Upcoming Meetings and Events:

- Program's 10th Anniversary & Open House: October 21st (technical presentations) and October 22nd (public open house with activities for children)
- EC meeting: November 3rd (all day) and November 4th (half day) at USACE

Meeting Summary

Introductions and Agenda Approval: Brooke Wyman brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. A quorum was not present; therefore all decision items were tabled until the next meeting.

Decision – Approval of the September 7th, 2011 CC Meeting Summary: Approval of the September 7th, 2011 meeting summary was tabled until next meeting.

Decision – Nomination of CC Co-chair: Susan Bittick's term as co-chair was up in August 2011 and Brooke Wyman's term is up in January 2012; Brooke has been the non-federal co-chair for the last 3 years. Jim Wilber was nominated for the federal co-chair position.

Actions, Requests, and EC Directives Review:

- *September 7th, 2011 Action Items:*
 - ✓ 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. – *complete;*
 - The presenter was not available; the Salt Cedar Leaf Beetle/SWFL presentation for the Program will be scheduled 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. – *complete;*
 - The 2010 Recovery Plan wasn't finalized at the time of posting so the intent is to ensure that the LTP contains the most current information.
 - It was verified that the RGSM related appendices were current.
 - 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 until the October 26th, all-day working meeting; please focus on the text and if time permits then the future activities.*

- ✓ 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. – *complete;*
 - Reclamation's perspective is that using a contractor for the streamlining ESA compliance work was a good option. Reclamation remains understaffed and overworked at this time. As for the BA related work, Reclamation would like to get to streamlining as soon as possible so using a contractor could be useful/beneficial.
 - ✓ 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. – *complete;*
 - *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*). *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. – reassigned;*
 - The peer review process continues to evolve. Recommendations from peer reviews are sent to the work groups for consideration in developing future activities. There was a historical document that was shortened; but for this effort, a new peer review process has been implemented through the ID/IQ. It is developing into something specific for the Program and it is fairly simple.
 - Because there will always be questions on “who did what and why” and “who made this decision and why” it was recommended that the simplified process be written in order to justify actions/decisions and any case-by-case deviations.
- Action:** Grace Haggerty and Yvette McKenna will draft a Program Peer Review Process document as a read ahead for a future CC meeting.
- ✓ 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.*)- *to be discussed today;*
 - ✓ 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.*)- *to be discussed today;*

The EC directives below are reminders and are being addressed by CC actions and requests above.

- *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; to be discussed today;*
- *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; to be discussed today;*

Decision – Review and Approve CC-led efforts in the draft FY2012 work plan:

- Due to lack of quorum, no decisions were made at today’s meeting. However, attendees did discuss the agenda items and agreed that decisions would be made at the October 26th working meeting.
 - *Discuss Remaining ongoing and new activities:* There are several activities that are CC led efforts: (1) Synthesis of Existing RGSM Literature/Data to Inform LTP priorities and activity development; (2) Adaptive Management Plan Development (V1 to V2); (3) RGSM Studies; (4) RGSM Targeted Study Related to Fish Passage. The spreadsheet has been updated with the estimated costs discussed last month. As soon as Jericho Lewis knows the commitment to funding a new study the contracting process can be initiated with the development of a scope. The date for CC recommended funding still needs to be filled in.
 - Attendees reviewed the CC led activities and made several recommended changes and edits to the spreadsheet.
 - *Synthesis of RGSM Literature/data:* Based on the discussions last month, the estimated starting cost entered as \$50,000 as a place holder.
 -
 - *HR Programmatic Streamlined BA Process:*
 - Regarding the Design and Compliance Support (Row 7), the plan is to award an ID/IQ with up to 5 option years for designing and environmental compliance for proposed, future HR projects. The \$250,000 was the anticipated amount for specific HR consultations for FY12. The Programmatic BA Process could be the first task under this ID/IQ.
 - It was requested that “HR” be added to the beginning of the Design and Compliance Support line.
 - In a brief review of the activity summary, there was already appropriate language to include the Programmatic BA process and the cost estimate of \$250,000 per year matched.
 - *Adaptive Management Plan Development (Line 27):* There are particular details and specific elements that need to be filled out between Version 1 and Version 2 (which is expected to take a year). The CC drafted the version 1 scope but there is still no adaptive management group/committee. The CC will need to discuss who can assist with the short-term effort. This will be added to the October 26th agenda and then elevated to the EC for additional direction/feedback.
 - *Miscellaneous*
 - *USGS Water Quality Data Collection Decreases:* Concern was raised that the state can no longer fund some of the discrete water quality monitoring at some. Attendees wanted to know how important that data is and if the Program should consider funding some of that work in order to prevent any data gaps. In an email that was sent by the USGS, they explained that they have to discontinue sampling twice a year because of lack of funding; this does not impact the continuous water quality sampling. AUSGS representative

contacted indicated that the cost for this sampling ranges between \$6,600 and \$10,600 per year per gage for those 2 samplings.

- *Topo Surveys Project (Line 11):* In response to a question, it was share that *Compliance Related Topo Surveys - Isleta Phase II HR Project* (Row 11) was a new project. There is no activity summary for this project yet. It was explained that this may be Project BO compliance that has to be done for the as-builts for the Isleta Phase II habitat restoration project. The project is entitled “topo surveys” of current conditions since tas-builts weren’t included in the original project plan. This work can also be considered “post construction” monitoring.
 - Attendees discussed options to complete this work without having to fund a separate project/separate line item in the budget. Suggestions included: (1) possibly the Corps to use MPT or 404 monies; (2) TSD is conducting a flyover soon, so may be able to use the LIDAR to accomplish the work;

Action: Jericho Lewis will review the ARRA-funded Isleta Phase II habitat restoration project BO to determine what exactly is required in terms of monitoring and compliance.

Action: Grace Haggerty will ask Anders Lundahl, as the MPT co-chair, to investigate options for Isleta Phase II “topo surveys” of current conditions (as-built design compliance) with the Corps.

Action: Yvette Paroz will follow up with TSD regarding options for the Isleta Phase II “topo surveys” of current conditions (as-built design compliance).

- *USACE Project Revisions:* The Corps has been refining their activity titles and summaries. The USGS mesohabitat mapping in the MRG is included in the Corps projects. They will be mapping specific restoration sites.

Action: Yvette McKenna will discuss the specific sites for the MRG mesohabitat mapping project with Bruce Moring (USGS)/Corps.

- *Sexing Study Update (Line 52):* The Sexing Study came out of the Age and Growth Study. The intent was to use FY11 funds but the contracting office was unable to issue the work before time ran out. This study should be on the FY12 table of funded activities under Criteria 3: RGSM studies.
 - The project has an estimated cost of \$150,000 (as previously recommended). This project was “lumped” under the RGSM Studies at a cost of \$30,000 to \$35,000. Attendees recommended this project be pulled out as separate line item with a \$30,000 designation. The RGSM Studies line item should subsequently be reduced by the same amount (\$30,000).

Action: Yvette McKenna will compare the FY11 Planning Spreadsheet to the FY12 Planning Spreadsheet to make sure all reoccurring activities were carried over (ex. Annual Report task missing off FY12).

- *PVA Consultation (Line 42):* In response to a question on the PVA Consultation activity, it was explained that there is an expected need for additional PVA model support or assistance. Right now, there is \$50,000 for continued model development and delivery (next summer). For FY12, the model will be used to support BA/BO work. It was suggested that both the URGWOM and PVA activities be funded at \$50,000 for FY12.

Action: Terina Perez will check with Leann Towne to determine if \$50,000 for URGWOM (decreased from original \$100,000) is reasonable for FY12 since less effort should be needed this year.

- *Groundwater/Surface Water Interactions in the Riparian Zone (Line 43):* Concern was expressed that this USACE project is redundant and/or duplicating efforts with the existing riparian model that extends from Albuquerque to Socorro. It was explained that the Corps is refining their project to be specific to Highway 380 and San Acacia oxbow sites with a subsequent change in cost. A revised activity summary is expected by October 26th.

Action: Grace Haggerty will ask Nabil Shafike to discuss the riparian model with the Corps in an attempt to avoid redundancy/duplication with their FY12 groundwater/surface water project.

- *Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation:* The Science work group (ScW) is reviewing the data to determine if this project needs to continue. It is assumed there were 2 sampling seasons that have been funded already.

Action: Jericho Lewis will check on the option years for the Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation project to see if the option years have been exhausted yet.

- *Update on FY11 Contracts (PVA-RAMAS model, etc.):*
 - There were 4 HR projects funded: (1) NM State Land Office at \$299,000; (2) ISC/Rio Rancho Project (2.5 years) at \$457,000; (3) Ohkay Owingeh at \$263,000; and (4) Santa Ana at \$296,000. All projects were able to be funded except the Sexing Study for a total of \$1.35 million awarded with FY11 funds. It is assumed that any Program funds applied would be subject to cost share but any additional funds that were not from the Program would not be subject to cost share. However, the division is not known at this time.
 - The RAMAS contract was awarded to Dr. Phil Miller. Dr. Miller is now available to attend the PVA work group meetings. His contract has a specific completion date and has definite delivery (it is not task based). There are 3 specific deliverables: (1) functional PVA model due by June 30th, 2012; (2) Model Orientation and Training due by August 31st, 2012; and (3) final reporting due by September 30th, 2012. There is a provision for the submission for all data used in the development (or included in the model). The only piece that is not included is the RAMAS software itself. The Program will have to purchase a license for continued use.
- *Discuss FY12 Contracting Process:* Attendees requested clarification on the steps involved in the contracting process (ex. a single process or multiple awarding events? How long will work groups have to develop scopes? Etc.).
 - The deadline for all new FY12 scopes is December 16th, 2011. Once an initial scope is drafted by the work group, there will be a period of time for internal iterations with the CC. This time is internal to the Program and has nothing to do with the contracting process. Once the CC approves the scope, it is elevated to Jericho. If the scope is sound, he will issue a solicitation notice and link. However, if the scope needs work, Jericho will have to communicate with the work group co-chairs and PMT liaisons to address any questions or issues. The final scope, as agreed upon, is put in the solicitation package.
 - There are terms and conditions that are Reclamation specific. There are data specific requirements that are also included. After the solicitation is issued, Jericho notifies the appropriate co-chairs and PMT liaison to set dates for evaluation teams - they recommend participants. The TPEC is convened for proposal evaluation and ranking. A technical representative of Reclamation is assigned COTR duties.
 - There are not a lot of new FY12 projects at this time but the process should be started now. After the October 26th meeting, the CC will provide the priorities to the work groups to begin drafting scopes.

- Attendees then discussed the disconnect between the contracting process, COTR involvement, and the work groups. It would be ideal to have the COTRs attend appropriate work group meetings on a regular, predetermined basis (quarterly, 2x year, etc.) to provide contract updates and facilitate the timely review of draft reports. This option is being pursued, but is currently left to the discretion of the COTR's supervisor. Other options that were suggested included: (1) to have a specific coordinator to co-administer all the Program contracts or (2) start an incentive program to recognize/reward responsiveness.
 - The 2010-2011 Program Report format is being updated to include the project COTRs by name as a way to provide recognition.

Action: Jim Wilber will discuss with Reclamation management the suggestion to have work group attendance added to the COTR duties.

Action: The PMT will develop a 1-page summary describing the integration/interaction of COTRs with the work groups; including, how COTRs work with the PMT liaisons to provide updates, etc.

Action: The PMT will review the Program process flow charts and recommend changes to include COTR interactions.

- *Program Website:* Attendees then briefly discussed the current condition of the Program website which is very cumbersome and hard to navigate. There is also a lot of missing information and search issues. It is unknown how the website will be "phased out" when the DBMS comes online. Originally, the website was designed to be an interim data/literature repository but the main purpose was to be the public site. A future activity, when funds are available, should be to "clean up" the website.

Discuss ScW outline/plan for approach to data and literature synthesis: ScW has discussed this task and recommends that the synthesis work be contracted out. It is too much for the work group participants to address. Based on direction from the CC, ScW used the categories in the LTP, recovery plans, and 5-year review to make a recommended list of categories for synthesis. Each category would have to have its own scope drafted. The CC was in general agreement that the ScW work group rank the categories (prioritize) and maybe organize them in groups that could be handled by the same contractor. The CC also suggested the synthesis follow the Water Quality Synthesis format as an example. CC also suggested the ScW consider priority suggestions in terms of those that might inform the consultation. The CC requested that ScW begin to develop and propose a plan that includes recommendations on synthesis objectives, synthesis outcomes, what kind of questions to ask, and details on the format for the deliverables.

- The CC requested that the product be formatted in such a way as to easily transition into a scope of work. The goal is to get to a point of agreement on results/meaning especially from a threats-based basis. Instead of a cut and paste "document of documents", there needs to be a meaningful way of tying information from all the documents together. It would be beneficial to have the data/literature organized in a timeline sequence to see the "string of pearls" developing. The intention of each study needs to be tied into the results in order to understand the meaning. The synthesis should include the information on project accomplishments - such as did that study move us further in understanding the threats-based criteria or did the study answer any of the identified threats in the RGSM recovery plan?
- The San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage peer review panel inquired about "what are the controlling factors" and "what has been learned about the minnow in the last 10 years?" The Program was not able to succinctly address those questions.
 - The following should be considered/addressed as outcomes in the synthesis: (1) summary of project information on what was done, when, what was learned, how the

results informed the next step; (2) what is known from the compilation of all the data (ex. what has been learned over the last 10 years); (3) areas of agreement and areas where there is lack of consensus; and (4) identify the data gaps/missing information.

- It was suggested that the outcome of the synthesis work should result in a document that specifies the state of knowledge including identification of areas of agreement and disagreement, and areas that need continued effort (data gaps). Some members envisioned that one outcome would be a written description of the state of knowledge that contains the areas of agreement; it was hoped that this text could be used by all agencies as a “starting point” for minnow background for all future documents.
- It was also suggested that an independent (standing) science panel to the Program could be responsible for the synthesis. A standing panel could be rotated every few years for different perspectives. However, another opinion suggested that the synthesis work be done separately from the panel – the standing panel would be able to work off the data synthesis.
- It is acknowledged that the synthesis will have to be a “living document” as it will need to be regularly updated with new research.
- Attendees discussed how the synthesis could help address the demographic criteria and threats as specified in the recovery plans. Attendees were reminded that if the Program becomes a Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) then compliance is assessed by the Service through annual sufficient progress. The recovery plan contains the long-range goals to downlist; those are the criteria that the Service believes if met, could result in downlisting and then delisting. Those criteria are reassessed approximately every 5 years during the status review. There are also the associated recovery actions that the Service believes if implemented will lead to reaching those criteria. However, annual sufficient progress will differ from the criteria to downlist. There will be an annual report of sufficient progress based on reducing threats and improving population which may or may not be the downlisting factors. Instead of focusing on the exact “magic” number, the trends showing progress and improvement are the focus.
 - In response to a question on downlisting, it was explained that the way it is written, if the MRG minnow population is “stable” and there are 2 other self-sustaining populations, then the Service will consider downlisting. As defined in the recovery plan, “stable” means a managed population and “self-sustaining” means the population could persist at those levels without additional augmentation.

Discuss review of draft EC summary: The EC draft summary distribution list has been recently expanded to include the EC, CC, and PMT. This means that all executives and all CC members will be receiving the draft summary notes. By the sheer volume, this could become a huge revising effort to incorporate changes/edits. It is recommended that a process be agreed upon that will keep the notes true to what happened during the meeting while still allowing entities to provide clarity on agency positions. To that end, a due date for comments/revisions will be assigned. This will help to save time addressing edits during the EC meeting. All changes should be submitted in tracked changes. Edits should be focused on corrections on regulatory language, restating agency positions for clarification, and editorial corrections. Comments should be consolidated by agency for a single submission (instead of 5 different people providing individual comments). Any update to what was reported in the meeting should be called out (separated) through the use of italics, font color, etc.

- In response to a question on why the meeting summaries have to be distributed to such a large group, it was shared that in many cases an agency’s executive or alternate will not be regularly reviewing the notes so it falls to the CC member. Copying the CC on the distribution helps to ensure that all agencies are given the opportunity to review and provide input. If possible, the agency executive

should submit the consolidated agency comments. However, if this is not feasible, then agencies should delegate a specific representative for this task.

- In summary, the EC note revision guidance includes:
 - 1. A single set of consolidate comments per entity, preferably vetted through the EC member if possible;
 - 2. Use tracked changes to submit edits;
 - 3. Focus edits on editorial (typos), clarification of agency position (updates to be separated with italics or font color), correct use of regulatory terms, etc.;
 - 4. Comments submitted within the set period;
 - 5. Provide comments directly to the note takers and copy the Program Manager;
 - 6. Any conflicts can be discussed at the next EC meeting.

Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC: There were no significant issues to elevate to the EC at this time.

Strengths-based Leadership training (tentatively scheduled for December 9, 2011): This is the second round; if you missed the first round you can still participate. The books have not been distributed yet.

Additional topics/announcements:

- The tamarisk (salt cedar) leaf beetle has apparently been found down south in the Mesilla Dam area.
- John D'Antonio is leaving the State Engineer's office. There may be a lot of changes that ensue.

Next CC Meeting: October 26th, 2011 from 10:00am to 4:00pm at Reclamation

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) CC approval of the 4 CC-led (or CC priority projects); (2) all tabled decision items from October 5th meeting; (3) Review the incorporated changes to the narrative of LTP; (4) review draft future activities in context of the LTP; (5) discuss LTP as a whole; (6) Discuss short-term next steps for the Adaptive Management Plan development;

**Coordination Committee Working Meeting
5 October 2011 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3640	O - PM	ymckenna@usbr.gov
Terina Perez	Reclamation	462-3614	O - PMT	tlperez@usbr.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
Hilary Brinegar (via phone)	NMDA	575-646-2642	P	hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Lori Robertson	FWS	761-4710	P	lori_robertson@fws.gov
Ralph Monfort	UNM	293-5573	O	ralphmonfort@hotmail.com
Ali Saenz	Reclamation	462-3600	O – Admin. Assist.	asaenz@ucbr.gov
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	O – Note Taker	marta.wood@tetrattech.com