

Coordination Committee Meeting
October 26, 2011

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Working Meeting**

October 26, 2011 – 10:00 am-4:00 pm

Bureau of Reclamation

Rio Grande Conference Room

Conference Call-in Line for October 26 2011

Toll Free Number: 1-888-566-6146

Participant Passcode: 20418#

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

PARTICIPANTS PLEASE BRING YOUR LUNCH

Draft Meeting Agenda

- Introductions and Agenda* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 09/07/11 and 10/05/11 CC meeting summaries*
- Action Review (see below)
- **Decision** - Election of CC Federal Co-Chair
- **Decision** – Review and Approve CC-led efforts and other Criteria #1 Activities in revised draft FY2012 work plan*
 - Discuss remaining ongoing and proposed new activities
 - Discuss ScW outline/plan for approach to data and literature synthesis
 - Deadline for all new FY12 SOWs – December 16, 2011
- Review revised draft Long Term Plan*
 - Discuss Comments on Text
 - Discuss Future Activities
 - CC Recommendation for November 3-4 EC Meeting read ahead
- Discuss next steps for Adaptive Management Plan development
- Review expenditure reports for the fourth quarter of FY2011*
- Discuss Cost Share reporting through FY2011*
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC
- Strengths-Based Leadership Training (tentatively scheduled for December 9, 2011)

****denotes read ahead***

Next meeting – CC Meeting – November/December 2011 @ Reclamation from 12:30 - 4:00 pm (propose this be scheduled after November 3-4 EC Meeting)

Upcoming meetings

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

Joint Workgroup Meeting – November 15, 2011 from 9:00 – 11:30 am @ Reclamation

October 5, 2011 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. *Information was received from USACE and forwarded to Reclamation staff.*
- 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 to make sure the option years have not 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.

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
October 26th, 2011 – 10:00am to 4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
Rio Grande Conference Room

Decisions

- The September 7th, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.
- The October 5th, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with a correction of “self-sufficient” to “self-sustaining” on page 8.
- With a quorum present and no objections, Jim Wilber was elected as the new CC federal co-chair.

Actions

- Susan Bittick will clarify the “*Establish a relational DBMS...*” activity with the DBMS work group and will report back to the CC.
- Jericho Lewis will take a look at the IceTech contract to determine if the \$29,000 cost estimate is accurate (how the money is spent).
- Jim Wilber, Brooke Wyman, and Yvette McKenna will re-organize the FY12 funding spreadsheet to better reflect required activities (BO requirements and those needed for new BA/BO development) versus BO supportive and workgroup recommended activities. The updated “walk-down” spreadsheet will be distributed to CC members before November 7th.
- Yvette McKenna will query the LTP Draft Document text to for “participant” and “signatory” to check for accurate/appropriate use of each term.
- Jim Wilber will draft a paragraph on NEPA compliance to be included under *Section 5.0 Long-term Plan and Environmental Compliance*.
- In response to a Service comment on including the actual minnow recovery criteria in the LTP, Yvette McKenna will review the criteria and provide suggested revisions to the LTP text in Section 4.1.1 on Page 11.
- Susan Bittick will arrange to have a Corps biologist draft recommended text on the salt cedar beetle under LTP Section 7.7.
- Yvette McKenna will have Vicki Ryan add text clarifying the flycatcher stressors due to physical habitat damage from cattle during drought periods and the cow bird parasitism (LTP Section 7.3).
- Yvette McKenna will query the LTP Draft Document for “MRG” and “self-sustaining” and provide the text references to CC members for consideration in choosing appropriate language/wording for the potential delisting and downlisting of the species. (The intent is to have language that neither forces the MRG into being one of the self-sustained populations nor is misleading in terms of avoiding responsibility.)
- Susan Bittick will clarify the status of the Corps’ IA for RGSM Entrapment (FY08) and returned funds with Diana Herrera (or Jericho Lewis).
- Yvette McKenna will check with Diana Herrera on the FY07 funds (\$327,150 unexpended) for the Sandia HR Construction Project, and whether any deobligated funds are coming back to the Program.
- The CC co-chairs will ask Estévan Lopez to bring up the cost share reporting at the next regular EC meeting.

- Starting today, all Program agencies were asked to capture their FY11 cost share contributions (and any back years that haven't already been reported).

Requests

- The CC requested that the *Increase Understanding of RGSM Life History and Habitat Needs* draft scope be reviewed by both the PVA work group and the Corps's COTR to check for redundancy and/or duplications.
- The CC requested the DBMS work group discuss and recommend whether to transition/move the Program's website over to the database. The DBMS should work with the PMT and PIO. It was recommended the work group consider the role of drafts within the database (due to the search engine functions) and determine if there is a continuing need to keep the Program website (for meeting coordination, read aheads, review of draft documents, etc.).

Recommendations

- With quorum present, the CC recommended that the continuation of the 10(j) Biologist interagency agreement with the Service be discussed at the EC level at their next regular meeting.

Future EC Agenda Items

- Update the EC on the FY11 Expenditure Funds spreadsheet (Dec meeting?)
- Update the EC on the FY11 and Total Cost Share (Dec meeting?)
- Discuss continuation of the 10(j) biologist interagency agreement (Dec meeting?)
- Draft LTP for EC review (Jan meeting?)

Announcements

- Attendees were reminded that the Strengths-Based Leadership Training is tentatively scheduled for December 9, 2011. Please contact Susan Bittick to pick up a work book.

Next CC Meeting: Focused meeting/conference call to discuss the revised draft FY2012 funding spreadsheet on **November 9th (Wednesday) from 3:00pm to 4:30pm** at Reclamation. A conference call line will be set up.

Upcoming Meetings and Events:

- EC meeting: November 3rd (all day) and November 4th (half day) at USACE

Meeting Summary

Introductions and Agenda Approval: Susan Bittick brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. A quorum was confirmed.

Announcements: Attendees were reminded that the Strengths-Based Leadership Training is tentatively scheduled for December 9, 2011. Work books were distributed to those planning to attend. The Program's 10th Anniversary and Open House went very well. On Friday, 45 people attended one or more of the technical sessions; and several hundred people participated in Saturday's events and activities.

Decision – Approval of the September 7th and October 5th 2011 CC Meeting Summaries: The September 7th, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes. The October 5th, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with a correction of “self-sufficient” to “self-sustaining” on page 8.

- **Question:** On page 4 of the October 5th meeting summary, in the “synthesis of RGSM” data discussion, what was meant by adding “BA” to the contracting?

- **Response:** It was a suggested qualifier to better describe the “*HR Design and Compliance Support*” in the FY12 funding spreadsheet. In explanation of the full discussion, Jim Wilber had an action to check with Reclamation on the possibility of using contractor support to work on the programmatic compliance for restoration work. And yes, Reclamation saw this as a valid method to completing the work. No changes need to be made to the draft notes.

October 5th Action Item Review:

- Grace Haggerty and Yvette McKenna will draft a Program Peer Review Process document as a read ahead for a future CC meeting. – *in progress*;
 - Grace explained that the document is in progress but it is not ready yet. She will send the draft to Yvette as soon as possible.
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
- ✓ 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). – *complete*;
- ✓ Jim Wilber will forward the USGS email (regarding lack of funding for some water quality monitoring) to Yvette McKenna. – *complete*;
- 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. – *on-going*;
 - There are on-going communications regarding this action. The activity sheet has been updated to include a range of options and costs. The work cannot be referred to as “as-builts” but there was no inundation of the site since completion. The options will be discussed later today, but in general the Program can opt to do a fine-tuned elevation study or a big-picture LIDAR flyover.
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
 - The information was emailed to Anders; however, the MPT has not met since then. It is hoped that the MPT will be able to provide suggestions/feedback soon.
- ✓ Yvette Paroz will follow up with TSD regarding options for the Isleta Phase II “topo surveys” of current conditions (as-built design compliance). – *complete*;
- ✓ Yvette McKenna will discuss the specific sites for the MRG mesohabitat mapping project with Bruce Moring (USGS)/Corps. *Information was received from USACE and forwarded to Reclamation staff.* – *complete*;
 - The field work schedule is now known but Mick Porter is still looking for volunteers for the USGS field work.
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
 - Leann Towne is not sure the project funding can be reduced at this time. In response to comments on the Draft BA, there are several additional scenarios that have to be

- run. The modeling team has to make some adjustments and rerun the scenarios – this will result in additional, unexpected costs.
 - Attendees agreed to return the line item to the original \$100,000 estimate.
- ✓ 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. – *complete*;
 - Communications with the Corps will continue to make sure there is no redundancy.
- ✓ Jericho Lewis will check on the option years for the Fish Community Sampling to make sure the option years have not been exhausted yet. – *complete*;
 - Yes, all the option years have been exhausted. The expiration is April 2012. The line item on the spreadsheet reflects the assumption that there is one more option year but that is not true. It will have to be competed.
 - Comments on the draft report are due to ScW by November 1st after which the work group can begin to determine the need/level to continue.
- Jim Wilber will discuss with Reclamation management the suggestion to have work group attendance added to the COTR duties. – *on hold*;
 - This action is on hold until the PMT is able to complete the 1-page summary description of need and the updated flow charts. These documents will be used to present the possible expectations and requirements to Reclamation management.
- 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. – *on going*;
 - The PMT liaisons will be following up with each work group to determine the needs.
- The PMT will review the Program process flow charts and recommend changes to include COTR interactions. – *on going*;

Decision – Nomination of CC Co-chair: At the Oct 5th meeting, Jim Wilber was nominated. With a quorum present and no objections, Jim Wilber was elected as the new CC federal co-chair.

Review and Approve CC-led efforts and other Criteria #1 Activities in revised draft FY2012 work plan:

- *Discuss remaining ongoing and proposed new activities:* Proposed new activities are shaded on the spreadsheet. The first page used to be called “Criteria 1” activities; however, some activities on this first page are not tied to a BO requirement but were already approved by the CC. New funding estimates are in red while the black amounts are carried over from last year costs. (Please note that the red values differ from last years costs (new information)). The current total of the “must-fund” and CC priority activities comes to approximately \$2.8 million. In comparison of recent funding, the Program was able to spend \$2.8 million in FY10 and \$3.6 million in FY11. The Corps funded projects are not included in the \$2.8 million calculation/funding. At the October 5th meeting, the CC carefully reviewed the spreadsheet and there was general agreement that the spreadsheet was in good condition. It is thus recommended that the CC not go over each activity individually today.
 - It was suggested the spreadsheet activities be relabeled and reorganized to distinguish/highlight those activities that are BO requirements, those that “support” BO elements, or those that are Program priorities. Failure to complete the requirements results in noncompliance – these are the critical activities. The activities supportive of BO elements do not necessarily result in noncompliance if not funded.

- Part of the concern is the use of the term “requirement” to describe the Criteria 1 as not all the activities in Criteria 1 are a BO requirement.
 - Once there is a new BO, the Program will have to address any changes – this could include re-prioritizing activities based on the new requirements and making decisions on what activities may be important enough to carry forward even if they are no longer BO requirements and determine which activities might be discontinued.
 - It was suggested the Reclamation and Corps annual reports to the Service could be used to relate all the activities in the spreadsheet to an associated RPA element.
 - There needs to be a paradigm shift from just “checking off the box” to progress toward recovery.
- In a working session, the CC reviewed and discussed the ongoing and new activities. The spreadsheet was updated to reflect the CC approval/recommendation date.
- Regarding *RGSM Egg Monitoring in Canals* – for years, the reports have been nothing but presence/absence. However, there is a caveat in RPM 2.1 that requests analysis to determine what, if any, measures need to be taken at those locations. The current contract has been updated for FY12 to include analysis of data from the previous years to determine recommendations and meet this portion of the RPM. The addition of the analysis is not expected to change the project cost.
 - The Program will either have to address the recommendations from the analysis or we will be able to show completion of the work. The hope is to be able to move away from this activity once the analysis is done.
 - In an update on the Bosque Education and Outreach, it was shared that there is now a 3-year ID/IQ contract (with 2 option years) through the Corps; the BEMP activities are no longer cost shared.
 - Regarding *Program Meeting Facilitation*, this line item is for GenQuest to provide Reese Fullerton as a facilitator for Program meetings (ex. EC, CC, PVA, etc.). The \$32,000 estimated cost is based on a general average of the range of potential frequency of meetings. The Program did not actually pay this amount for FY11.
 - Regarding the *FWS Program Management & ESA Support*, this line item is for Jen Bachus’s and Stacey Kopitsch’s positions.
 - Regarding the *Program Technical & Admin Support – Contracted*, this refers to the administrative support of GenQuest and Tetra Tech. This is Option Year 4 and there is one more option year available. Option Year 5 expires on December 31st 2013.
 - Regarding the *Annual Report 2010-2011*, there is an estimated cost of \$30,000 for GenQuest to produce the document. The same format and layout will be used but the text and photos will be updated appropriately. The draft FY10-11 report is expected in spring 2012 so the final report could

be published in the summer. This schedule allows sufficient time for the Corps to provide/include their Program information.

- Regarding the *CP Webpage Hosting & Maintenance*, the estimated cost is \$29,000 for IceTech to maintain the Program website.
 - The CC briefly discussed the future and role of the website once the database is fully functional (next June). There is the option to continue the website as a public interface or for internal Program use (for meeting coordination, read aheads, review of draft documents, etc.). Right now, the website is difficult to navigate and needs to be “cleaned up.” The other option could be to discontinue the website and have the database function for both internal and public use.
- Regarding the Corps’ project *Establish a relational Database Management System (DBMS)*..., there will be a new task order through the ID/IQ with D.B. Stephens to fund the database administrative position. This person will initially be responsible for updating the website, QA/QC, template development and review, developing processes for maintenance and upkeep, testing of the system, etc. The intent is to get the person on board by early spring in order for him/her to be involved before the functional version comes on line in June. The \$80,000 was approved last year but there was a timing issue so it will need to be accomplished with FY12 funds. With no objections, the CC approved the funding the \$80,000 with FY12 money.
- Attendees discussed the history of the *10(j) Biologist Position with the Service*. The EC approved the position with the condition of a 2-year term which was fully funded. There are 2 option years that are not funded.
 - Some members expressed the desire to recommend funding the position for the remaining 2 options year in order to help facilitate the Program’s possible transition to a recovery program. The Program will need the Service’s assistance/lead with finding a 3rd population. Others in support of continuing to fund the position cited the on-going work and relationship building with the pueblos and in the Cochiti Reach. A new person would have to go through the process of getting established relationships which would cause time delays and setbacks. The Program has invested a lot in getting a 10(j) biologist position because the Service has to do the majority of that paperwork and they need the personal in order to accomplish that work.
 - Other members struggled to reach a recommendation and cited concerns that the EC was specific with the 2-year term limit. There was also a legal question regarding the cost share and 10(j) appropriateness outside the Program. The Big Bend work was a requirement; the Program has exceeded its obligation. Some members expected more “concrete materials” coming to the CC for review and discussion after 2 years of work. This raised questions for some members on how effective the position has been and if it was money well spent.
 - Attendees were reminded that while the position is a 2-year term position, after the 4th option year, the position could become

permanent if there were a need to continue. There is a resulting funding concern should that happen.

- If continued, the Program might consider specifying the expected products at the end of the 2 years.
 - It was also suggested that the Program look at the Long-term Plan (LTP) activities to determine what it might really take to accomplish the activities and find other ways of approaching the activities instead of just funding a position (ex. it might be better to have 2 part-time staff with one stationed in TX).
 - In the interim, the CC recommended keeping the position in the FY12 spreadsheet as a place holder for now pending discussions at the EC level.
- Regarding the *Increase Understanding of RGSM Life History and Habitat Needs* project, the CC discussed the need to approve this activity before the work group could begin developing a scope. The funding is requested for Objectives #1, #2, and #3 within this activity.
 - The CC encouraged the work group members to check activities with those funded by the Corps in order to make sure there aren't overlaps and/or redundancies before they develop the scopes.
- Regarding the *Habitat Restoration Implementation* project, the CC reduced the estimated cost place holder to \$500,000 and added a comment that "additional activities up to \$2 million would be considered" contingent of available funds.
 - The average HR project is approximately \$300,000 and most likely could not be less if addressing the compliance. The \$500,000 was considered a good minimum commitment in order to move forward and facilitate the RFP process.
- Regarding the *Design and Environmental Compliance Support for HR Projects*, the \$250,000 is an estimate of what could be awarded through an ID/IQ as a task order for this work. It will not cost much money (\$5,000 to \$10,000) to put an ID/IQ in place. Then if funds are available and if a project is identified, a task order (up to \$250k) for that development could be issued. This activity is to develop a programmatic process for compliance.
- Regarding the *Post Construction Monitoring/Maintenance of Completed HR Projects*, the CC discussed the need for "final" or last stage of restoration projects. The Program spends a lot of money on projects and some of them need to be maintained. This could be ID/IQ (since some work is on tribal or state lands). The concern is that in the long run, the Program could end up spending more money on "new reconstruction" because the upkeep (which should be less expensive) wasn't addressed.
 - This could be connected to the RFP for construction and contractors could be informed about bidding on the follow up maintenance work.
 - In most cases, the work could be issued as a separate RFP but that means the TPEC would have to be strategically chosen.

- To clarify, it was explained that there are 2 separate monitoring tasks: the effectiveness monitoring (Corps funding) and the project maintenance/monitoring.
- Regarding the *RGSM Targeted Study Related to Fish Passage*, the CC agreed to the \$150,000 funding estimate. This project is a joint ScW/HR project that resulted from the San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage peer review.
- The CC discussed the options for the *Isleta Phase II – Geomorphic Monitoring*. The Program could opt to pay \$15,000 for a 1-foot resolution LIDAR analysis or \$25,000 for 0.5-foot resolution LIDAR analysis. If the Program starts doing LIDAR consistently, tracking site changes over the years and capturing detailed elevation surveys will become easier.
 - There is hope that the Program's data collection will become standardized once the database is online.
 - There was general agreement to pay for the 1-foot resolution LIDAR at a cost of \$15,000.
- Regarding the *AM Plan Development V1-V2*, it was recommended the CC hold off committing to \$150,000 estimate since the Version 1 Final will be delivered on October 31st.
- The background on the *Develop and Implement System-wide Monitoring* project was shared.
 - There is a lot going on in the river (trends, river work, other agency work, etc.) that affect the ecosystem, the species, and management. The purpose of this project is to get a “whole” picture analysis of the system. It is basically a way to get the information already available into a useful format. If any negative trends are identified, management could be more proactive instead of waiting until the situation became detrimental and costly. The intent is to have the contractor build a design support tool that “ties” all the pieces together and is interactive (GIS). The HR work group expects the product to help to inform restoration decisions by bring the variables together. How can the Program go forward with AM if it doesn't have a pulse on the system? How do water managers make better, informed decisions?
 - The Corps is funding a small pilot project through their wetland delineation ID/IQ. The pilot work will result in a small reach map and analysis (including vegetation mapping, hydrology, geomorphology, and current projects).
 - It was suggested that in the future the Program could explore linking RiverWare to the PVA models to make a separate system model.
- Regarding the *Floodplain Land Use Impacts Encroachment Study*, the CC was briefed that this was the San Acacia Reach (SAR) ad hoc work group's only priority project. Unfortunately, it remains in Criteria 3 for the second year in a row. Work group representatives expressed frustration that as an

ad-hoc or short-term work group there was no Program support that would cause the project to be elevated before the work group is set to disband.

- Some CC members suggested the expected \$1 million “discretionary” funds be divided up to allow funding at least 1 project from each work group.
- Other CC members suggested the SAR work group explore other funding alternatives such as Water Smart or have this work done as a UNM master’s thesis study.
- Regarding the *Synthesis of the Existing RGSM Literature/Data*, the CC agreed to the \$50,000 as a place holder at the October 5th meeting. This is a SADD Fish Passage peer review recommendation and ScW is working on recommendations on how to proceed/accomplish the task.
- *Discuss ScW outline/plan for approach to data and literature synthesis:* At the October 5th meeting, the CC was updated that the ScW work group brainstormed recommended data categories. Based on feedback from that meeting, the work group then revisited and prioritized the categories. There are now 4 broad/related categories with several subcategories that the work group recommends. ScW members are also developing a table that links the data categories to the threats identified in the RGSM Recovery Plan. There is a previous statement of work that can be revised to cover the data synthesis task for the water quality category.

Review revised draft Long Term Plan:

- *Discuss Comments on Text:* Comments from NMDA, the Corps, the Service, and Reclamation were received. The comments were combined and tracked within the draft document. Most of the comments/recommended changes were editorial in nature but there were a few that required further CC discussion. It was suggested that the PM and team do the technical editing, accept the editorial comments/revisions, and provide the revised draft back to the CC at a future meeting in order to be efficient with time today. It was agreed that the best way to approach the “content” comments was to have the agencies lead the discussion on their feedback.
- In a working session, attendees reviewed the comments and tracked changes.
 - *Definitions:*
 - One suggestion was to expand the CC responsibilities to better match the description in the CC charter.
 - It was recommended to not include “candidate species” in the definitions.
 - Regarding the use of the term “participant”, concern was expressed that “participant” is used interchangeably with “signatory” throughout the document but there are instances where they are not the same. Members suggested removing the term “participant” from the definitions list.
 - “Signatories” should consistently be lower case “s” throughout the document.
 - *Introduction:*
 - Attendees discussed the slightly different wording for the Program goals throughout the document. The concern is that the goals have been considerably paraphrased and it is recommended the text maintain the official language throughout the document for consistency.
 - Attendees discussed the phrasing that the Program provides “ESA compliance.” However, since the Water Authority, the Corps, Buckman, etc.

- all have their own BOs, it was suggested a more inclusive terminology would be that the “Program *provides for* ESA compliance.”
- Under Section 5.0 The LTP and ESA Compliance, attendees discussed in the LTP context is not just ESA but other compliance, such as NEPA, as well. It was suggested the title of this section be revised to “The LTP and *Environmental Compliance*.”
- *NMDA comments for discussion:*
 - The document was very repetitive so NMDA representatives attempted to identify and “clean up” those occurrences.
 - In response to the NMDA question regarding the “findings” of the Service, the last sentence before Section 4.0 will be changed to: *This approach is in alignment with the anticipated Service review and assessment of the Program.*
 - Section 7.0 needs to be condensed and pared down.
 - Regarding Section 4.1.1 on page 10, attendees discussed the down- and delisting criteria. The recovery plan criteria calls for 2 self-sustaining and 1 managed population that are all looked at together; if together they are robust enough and meet the demographic criteria then the Service would consider initiating the downlisting process. No where does it specify that the Middle Rio Grande (MRG) population has to be one of the self-sustaining populations. It was recommended the language in Section 4.1.1 be revised to not specifically stipulate which population would be where.
 - The Program will need to understand what “managed” population means. Unfortunately, the MRG just doesn’t have the habitat due to fragmentation so it might be that it is necessary to always manage this stretch of river.
 - *Service comments for discussion:*
 - Service representatives suggested that the actual recovery criteria be included in the LTP text (page 11), or the heading *Middle Rio Grande Minnow Recovery Criteria* (under Section 4.1.1) be changed to *Preventing Extinction* since that is all it currently describes.
 - *Corps comments for discussion:*
 - In Section 1.0 Introduction, the last sentence before the Program goals are listed implies that adaptive management will focus only on water management. Adaptive management should apply to everything within the Program. It was suggested that the word “water” be deleted.
 - On page 20, Corps representatives suggested a change in language to more accurately reflect the results of cattle and cowbird studies. There are plenty of cattle in the areas but the Reclamation research was focused on cow bird parasitism of the sites. They did not find a difference in cow bird parasitism whether a site was excluded from grazing or not. However, in drought years there are some real physical damage to willow from cattle grazing; this results in a change in the habitat structure (which is different from cow bird parasitism).
 - Under Section 7.4 Population Management – Minnow Only on page 21, it was suggested the wording “...to the point that it becomes self sustaining” be deleted from the 3rd sentence of the first paragraph. The concern is that the

MRG would be constrained or obligated to have 1 of the 2 self-sustaining populations.

- Some members expressed concern that changing to the language to be broader could actually lose the emphasis on the MRG which is the Program area. The concern is that it might be perceived that the Program is trying to avoid responsibility or forward movement.
- *Discuss Future Activities:* CC members discussed having the PMT accept/address the changes to the future activities instead of reviewing the comments individually during the meeting.

Discuss next steps for Adaptive Management Plan development: At this time there is no Adaptive Management work group/committee. CC members were encouraged to start thinking about who will develop an activity summary (if one is needed) to fine-tune Version 1 into Version 2. The purpose of Version 2 was to give more detail on certain aspects of what initial projects might look like. However, since Adaptive Management Plan Version 1 is to be delivered on October 31st, it was suggested the CC not invest the time or energy until it is determined (based on Version 1) if a Version 2 is needed.

- The contractors captured the huge range of potential hypotheses for testing but they weren't hired to prioritize those hypotheses.
- There will need to be more detail on how to take potential hypotheses and the step by step process to implement.
- An AM framework is included in the final Version 1 document and there are suggestions for sequencing of data for most beneficial uses. Version 1 can be used right away without contract support.
 - Some members expressed concern that new hypotheses could overshadow the activities that the Program is already doing that the AM concept could be applied to. Applying the AM to the Program means looking at what we are currently doing instead of just new things.
 - Other members expressed that one main driver for the EC is to move away from 2003 BO flow requirements. That is one priority project to apply the AM to; however, a Version 2 might not be needed to pursue that.

Review expenditure reports for the fourth quarter of FY2011: Attendees reviewed the completed FY11 expenditure report.

- The Corps representatives shared their understanding that all the FY08 funds for the Alleviating RGSM Entrapment have already been returned.
- The CC was updated that the Water Authority has spent about \$40,000 (of \$295,502) on their Flycatcher HR work.
- The “oldest” unexpended funds are from a Sandia Pueblo HR Construction project from FY07.
- The newest Santa Ana project was renamed “Santa Ana HR Bar 3 Modification Project; and the remaining Santa Ana project titles were changed to “Santa Ana HR Monitoring.”

Discuss Cost Share reporting through FY2011: According to calculations, the amount subject to cost sharing is \$58.8 million resulting in a \$14.7 million non-federal cost share. The total reported non-federal contribution to date is \$14.754 million. This is the second year in a row that the cost share requirement has been met and exceeded. There are 3 entities that haven't reported at all yet (City of Albuquerque, Sandia, and APA).

Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC:

- *Update/status on LTP* – The EC will be given an update on the LTP status – the receipt and addressing of agency comments. In the mean time, the PMT will accept the editorial changes. The Draft LTP will be provided to the EC for review at their January meeting.

- The future activities are what has to happen in the near term (1-3 years) but they aren't prioritized among themselves. The funding spreadsheet is the annual work plan. Prioritization would be needed to decrease the planning efforts to bi-annual (like the San Juan - they plan 2 years at a time and only meet twice a year). Thus, the work groups know in advance what the work to be done is.

Next CC Meeting: November 9th (Wednesday) from 3:00pm to 4:30pm (location TBD – Reclamation or ISC). A conference call line will be set up.

Upcoming Meetings and Events:

- EC meeting: November 3rd (all day) and November 4th (half day) at USACE

**Coordination Committee Working Meeting
26 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
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
Hilary Brinegar	NMDA	575-646-2642	P	hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Stacey Kopitsch	USFWS	761-4737	O - PMT	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Ralph Monfort	UNM	293-5573	O	ralphmonfort@hotmail.com
Nathan Schroeder	Pueblo of Santa Ana	771-6719	P	nathan.schroeder@santaana-nsn.gov
Dave Sabo	DOI	801-703-4512	O	dsabo@usbr.gov
Danielle Galloway	COE	342-3661	A	danielle.a.galloway@usace.army.mil
Gina Dello Russo	USFWS	575-835-1828	O	gina_dellorusso@fws.gov
Susan Bittick	USACE	342-3397	P – Co-Chair	susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	P	rbillings@abcwua.org
Ali Saenz	Reclamation	462-3600	O – Admin. Assist.	asaenz@ucbr.gov
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	O – Note Taker	marta.wood@tetrattech.com