

Coordination Committee Meeting
March 7, 2012

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
March 7, 2012 – 12:30 - 4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
San Juan Conference Room**

Conference Call-in Line for March 7, 2012
Toll Free Number: 1-800-790-2051
Passcode: 40514#

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

Draft Meeting Agenda

- Introductions and Agenda* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 02/01/12 CC meeting summary* and review of action items
- **Decision** – Vote in new CC co-chair
- **Decision** – Reprioritize the current FY2012 work plan of activities* using \$____M as base funding *[placeholder in event discretionary Program activity funding is less than \$2.4M]*
- Review CC Charter*
- Review Revised Draft Peer Review Process and Procedures*
- Discuss RGSM Data Synthesis and DBMS integration
- Review Workgroups' 2012 Work Plans*
- Update on Strengths-Based Leadership Training

****denotes read ahead***

Next meeting – CC Meeting – April 4, 2012 (12:30-4:00 pm) @ Reclamation; *propose rescheduling to April 11 as the EC meeting is on March 28*

Upcoming meetings

EC Meeting – March 28, 2012 (9:00 am-3:00 pm) @ Reclamation (w/working lunch)

February 1 CC Actions

- The CC will review their Charter for discussion at the March CC meeting.
- Susan Bittick will check with Cheryl about scheduling the Strengths-Based Leadership Training for May or early spring 2012.
- Yvette McKenna will notify Rick Billings that he has been nominated for CC non-federal Co-Chair. ✓

- Liz Zeiler will provide her recommendations/comments for how the RGSM Data Synthesis can integrate better with the DBMS by February 10th, 2012 to Alison Hutson, Jen Bachus, Vanessa Martinez, and Yvette McKenna. ✓

Continued and Ongoing Actions

- Jim Wilber will draft a paragraph on NEPA compliance to be included under *Section 5.0 Long-term Plan and Environmental Compliance*. (*ongoing from 10/26/11*)
- 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. – related to the above action. (*ongoing from 10/05/11*)
- The PMT will review the Program process flow charts and recommend changes to include COTR interactions. (*ongoing from 10/05/11*)
- Jim Wilber will discuss with Reclamation management the suggestion to have work group attendance added to the COTR duties. (*continued from 10/05/11; pending the completion of the PMT actions related to this topic*)

Recommendations

- Given staff turnover and the governance/voting within the Program (especially going forward), CC members were encouraged to make sure their agency has an assigned primary and alternate representative for each work group (as appropriate). It is especially important for the action agencies and the Service to have a primary or alternate attend every work group meeting.
- Some members requested agencies to identify any possible future actions/activities that could contribute to recovery for inclusion in the LTP. Agencies were asked to please continue submitting ideas, suggestions, recommendations, and possible agency contributions. Remember, these actions/activities are not a commitment but an attempt to record the “full suite” of possible future activities. The purpose is to continue working on developing a complete list of possible future activities so that finalizing the LTP activities table will be an easy task when the deadline approaches.

Reminder

- EC December 8 Action Item - Non-federal signatory entities will submit their 25% cost share reports through FY2011 (including any back years not reported) using the template to the Program Manager. (*Ongoing*)

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
March 7, 2012 – 12:30 - 4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
San Juan Conference Room**

Actions

- Jim Wilber will provide any information or comments Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) has on environmental compliance associated with the Program to the Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) Program Document focus group. *(Replaces action item: Jim Wilber will draft a paragraph on NEPA compliance to be included under Section 5.0 Long-term Plan and Environmental Compliance; ongoing from 10/26/11)*
- Jim Wilber and Rick Billings will review the Coordination Committee (CC) Charter and present any recommended changes or updates to the Charter at the April 2012 CC meeting; CC members can email any comments or recommended changes to Jim or Rick.
- Grace Haggerty will send a draft peer review process to Yvette McKenna by March 8th, 2012 for use by the RIP Program Document focus group. ✓
- The CC will receive a copy of the peer review process in advance of the next EC meeting.
- Yvette McKenna and the Executive Committee (EC) Co-Chairs will send an email to the technical work groups to keep them informed on the possible Program structural changes and RIP transition.

Decisions

- The CC approved the FY2012 Planning Spreadsheet with the exception of the Monitor Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (RGSM) Genetics, Synthesis of Existing RGSM Literature/Data, and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities which are still under consideration and will be discussed further at the next CC meeting.
- The February 1st, 2012 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.
- Rick Billings was elected as CC non-federal Co-Chair.
- CC members agreed to reschedule the April CC meeting to April 11th, 2012.

Requests

- The CC requested that Jericho Lewis review the Monitor RGSM Genetics and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities to see what would be needed for an interim contract to continue the activities, or portions of the activities (i.e. sample collection), until the programs have been reviewed. *Update: Population estimation data collection is a possibility in FY12 since it is within the option period. Data collection for genetics is not feasible as it ends on September 30 (not July as previously thought). A new request for proposal (RFP) for genetics monitoring is required and it must be competed.*
- The CC requested that Jericho Lewis find out what the consequences are for the Monitor RGSM Genetics work should there be a lapse in funding for the last quarter of FY12 (i.e., awarded in October 2012 instead of July 2012). *Update: Jericho informed the ScW that the current genetics grant runs out on September 30, and that if it is an on-going Government requirement, it should be a contract, not a grant.*
- The CC requested that the Science Work group (ScW) discuss the possibility and options for continuing the Monitor RGSM Genetics activity in the interim until the Genetics Program undergoes peer review.

- The CC requested that Jericho Lewis attend the March 20th, 2012 ScW meeting to discuss possible options for continuing the Monitor RGSM Genetics and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities.√

Next meeting: April 11th, 2012 from 12:30 pm to 4:00 pm at Reclamation.

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Discuss draft RGSM Data Synthesis Plan; (2) Review recommended updates/changes to CC Charter; (3) Discuss FY2012 Planning Spreadsheet activities still under consideration (Monitor RGSM Genetics, Synthesis of Existing RGSM Literature/Data, and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities); (4) Review Work groups' 2012 Work Plans;

Meeting Summary

Introductions and agenda approval: Jim Wilber brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was rearranged so that the decision item "Approve or Reprioritize the current FY2012 work plan of activities using \$2,089,290 as base funding" was discussed first.

Decision – Approve or Reprioritize the current FY2012 work plan of activities using \$2,089,290 as base funding: Meeting attendees were updated that Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) Program funding will be \$2,089,290.

- Meeting attendees discussed changes that were made to the 2012 Planning Spreadsheet since the last CC meeting.
 - *Rearing/Breeding Operation and Maintenance (O&M) for the Minnow Sanctuary:* The Minnow Sanctuary O&M was "zeroed" as the facility is not fully operational. Previously obligated funds in this Interagency Agreement (IA) with the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) will be enough to cover the facility's needs for 2012. Reclamation will address engineering issues with the facility.
 - *Synthesis of Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (RGSM) Literature/Data:* It was shared that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) is unable to fund the RGSM Data Synthesis activity. Because the Executive Committee (EC) directed that the data synthesis be a priority activity, a place holder for funding was added for this effort. It was noted that the estimated costs for this activity have increased from \$50,000 to \$210,000 between the last draft of the spreadsheet and the current; the estimated funding would include some data synthesis but could also include acquiring data sets that the Population Viability Assessment (PVA) work group has requested.
 - Several CC members agreed that including obtaining data sets as part of the Synthesis of Existing RGSM Literature/Data activity will need to be approved by the EC because this was not part of the original activity.
 - Jericho Lewis (Reclamation Contracting Officer) is working on determining the cost estimates for obtaining the data. More information is expected by the April 2012 CC meeting.
 - One suggested option to complete the data synthesis would be to have portions of the synthesis completed by the technical work groups and other portions completed with contracted assistance. ScW has expressed this effort is too big for its members to conduct.
 - *Monitor RGSM Genetics:* Concern was voiced that the Monitor RGSM Genetics activity was "zeroed" on the spreadsheet (the activity was "zeroed" at the previous CC meeting).

The Service has expressed concerns that there will be serious consequences for species management and the ability to monitor and compare genetic variation for captive and wild populations should the activity not be funded. The Service representative voiced that the monitoring is needed on an annual basis to ensure that there is current genetic information on the species in case the captive population is needed to save the wild population and to ensure that the captive population is not having a negative genetic effect on the wild species. There is also concern with the effect that the “zeroed” line item would have on the work that is currently being done.

- There are FY11 funds to cover work up to June 2012. *Update: through September 30, 2012.*
- It was commented that the Program has a responsibility to review data and final reports of existing activities before contracts are reissued – the purpose is to consider if modifications or improvements can be made to the project (for example, changes in frequency of the monitoring). This would be a good time to review the genetics monitoring activity as it is in the last year of the grant.
 - It was shared that the ScW had considered making modifications to the monitoring and had developed questions for the Genetics Program peer review (back in 2010). The peer review of the Genetics Program is on hold as the Program develops and approves a peer review process. There was concern that this activity should not be discontinued just because the peer review is delayed.
 - It was suggested that the activity could be evaluated even though the peer review is on hold; however, there was hesitancy to start another evaluation process (that would in essence be an attempt at a review) while the Program is still developing guidance and procedures for all peer reviews.
- Attendees discussed the possibility of continuing the project on an interim contract that could start on October 1st, 2012 and could be funded in the FY13 budget. This is one option that would allow for the Genetics Program to continue as the ScW reviews the reports and the results and determines if any modifications should be made to the project.
 - Because the project is in its final year, even if no changes are made to the activity, the project will still need a new RFP.
 - Jason Remshardt shared that the fisheries facility (Dexter) could continue to collect samples from captive fish without a contract; however, contractors collect their own samples from the wild fish. The wild fish samples are collected in the winter months with data processing usually occurring during the rest of the year - so the data processing may be missed with the project not being funded in the 4th quarter of FY12.
 - CC members wanted to know what exactly would be missed (i.e., data collection, data processing) in not funding the activity during the 4th quarter of FY12. The CC requested that Jericho Lewis find out what the consequences are for the Monitor RGSM Genetics should there be a lapse in funding for the last quarter of FY12 (i.e., awarded in October 2012 instead of July 2012).
- It was also suggested that the CC and the ScW consider making modifications to the contract in case an interim contract cannot happen and there needs to be a 4-year contract with an option year.

- CC members expressed hesitancy to begin a 4-year contract since the peer review has not been completed. There would need to be flexibility for changes or modification built in the contract.
 - It was explained that it may be possible for the contract to be set up so that the first year included only data collection and the subsequent years could be modified as needed. This would allow for data collection to continue while the Program considers how to move forward with the project.
- *RGSM Population Estimation:* A request was made that the CC reconsider funding the Continue RGSM Population Estimation activity (“zeroed” at the previous CC meeting) in light of the Population Estimation and Population Monitoring peer review. The population monitoring is under scrutiny and the Population Estimation activity may be an alternative method to continue to show the status of the species.
 - In response to a question of how the Population Estimation activity is used for revising the recovery criteria, it was explained that the recovery criteria in the Recovery Plan refers to Catch Per Unit Effort (CPUE), so population estimation results are not a part of that determination. The Population Estimation study is an alternative way to look at the population status and connect long-term trend data with what is seen in the population. The study is just starting to get to the point where perhaps that type of evaluation could be done.
 - The Population Estimation activity is in its last contract year and will need to go out for RFP.
 - It was suggested that since the Program is developing a peer review process and looking at how to integrate and develop population monitoring for a RIP that this project not be funded this year. Instead, the Program could focus efforts to analyze the data and complete the peer review.
 - Concern was expressed that the data had not been analyzed and peer review had not been completed.
 - Concern was expressed that losing a year could create “noise” in the data.
 - It was explained that for this activity, data collection is completed once a year. Another suggested option was to only fund data collection in 2012 and delay funding the analysis until FY13. The current funding estimate includes annual recording and reporting.
- Concern was expressed with “holding off” on funding projects with the anticipation that they will be funded in the next budget year. It is not known whether future budget years will increase or decrease even more.
 - The CC agreed to leave the project in the budget at \$135,000; however, the project is still under consideration, and may only be considered for partial funding this year.
- *Continue Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (SWFL) Population Monitoring:* The Continue SWFL Population Monitoring activity has been “zeroed” as the Corps will be funding the project for one year. The Corps will also be funding the Adaptive Management Development activity.
- *URGWOM and PHVA Modeling:* The URGWOM and PHVA Modeling activities have been “zeroed” from the Program budget as Reclamation will be funding the projects in support of their BA needs.

- *Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction:* The Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction activity has been “zeroed” from the Program budget. Ed Kandl, from Reclamation, will take over the data collection and it is expected that he will be discussing the project with the Species Water Management (SWM) work group to include their suggestions in future work.
 - It was shared that the SWM work group still supports/requests an analysis of the Groundwater/Surface Water Interaction data.
- *RGSM PVA Modeling:* Funding for the RGSM PVA Modeling activity has been reduced from \$50,000 to \$25,000 based on a revised cost estimate from the Service.
- *10(j) Reintroduction/Augmentation Support:* The 10(j) Reintroduction/Augmentation Support activity has been “zeroed” from the Program budget as there is sufficient funding in the IA with the Service for this activity through FY2012.
- Attendees agreed that it would be informative to have a breakdown of the costs for data collection and analyses for the Monitor RGSM Genetics and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities and to know what it would cost to fund the 3 months of monitoring that may be missed.
- Consensus was reached and the CC approved the FY2012 Planning Spreadsheet with the exception of the Monitor Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Genetics, Synthesis of Existing RGSM Literature/Data, and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities which are still under consideration and will be discussed further at the next CC meeting. Reclamation will move forward with obligating funds for the approved projects.
- Next steps:
 - The CC requested that Jericho Lewis review the Monitor RGSM Genetics and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities to see what would be needed for an interim contract to continue the activities, or portions of the activities and associated costs (i.e. sample collection), until the programs have been reviewed.
 - The CC requested that Jericho Lewis find out what the consequences are for the Monitor RGSM Genetics work should there be a lapse in funding for the last quarter of FY12 (i.e., awarded in October 2012 instead of July 2012).
 - The CC requested that the Science Work group (ScW) discuss the possibility and options for continuing the Monitor RGSM Genetics activity in the interim until the Genetics Program undergoes peer review.
 - The CC requested that Jericho Lewis attend the March 20th, 2012 ScW meeting to discuss possible options for continuing the Monitor RGSM Genetics and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities.

Decision – Approval of February 1, 2012 CC meeting summary and review of action items:

- The February 1st, 2012 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.
- February 2012 action items:
 - ✓ **The CC will review their Charter for discussion at the March CC meeting.**
 - Complete
 - ✓ **Susan Bittick will check with Cheryl about scheduling the Strengths-Based Leadership Training for May or early spring 2012.**
 - Complete.

- ✓ **Yvette McKenna will notify Rick Billings that he has been nominated for CC non-federal Co-Chair.**
 - Complete.
- ✓ **Liz Zeiler will provide her recommendations/comments for how the RGSM Data Synthesis can integrate better with the DBMS by February 10th, 2012 to Alison Hutson, Jen Bachus, Vanessa Martinez, and Yvette McKenna.**
 - Complete.
- Continued and Ongoing Actions
 - **Jim Wilber will draft a paragraph on NEPA compliance to be included under Section 5.0 Long-term Plan and Environmental Compliance (*ongoing from 10/26/11*).**
 - Ongoing.
 - Attendees discussed that there may be some overlap between this action item and a chapter in the RIP Program Document. To avoid duplicating efforts this action item was changed to: Jim Wilber will provide any information or comments Reclamation has on environmental compliance associated with the Program to the Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) Program Document focus group.
 - It was commented that NEPA and the Program Document are two separate issues and may need to be addressed separately.
 - **The Program Management Team (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. – related to the below action item (*ongoing from 10/05/11*).**
 - It was proposed that this action item and the two below be removed with the understanding that COTR reporting to work groups is an issue that Reclamation is dealing with internally. Templates have been provided to COTR supervisors to keep track of reporting.
 - **The PMT will review the Program process flow charts and recommend changes to include COTR interactions (*ongoing from 10/05/11*).**
 - See above action item.
 - **Jim Wilber will discuss with Reclamation management the suggestion to have work group attendance added to the COTR duties (*continued from 10/05/11; pending completion of the PMT actions related to this topic*)**
 - Jim can be made aware of any changes that need to be made with regard to COTR duties and will pass that information on to Reclamation management.

Decision – Vote in new CC Co-Chair: Rick Billings was elected as CC non-federal Co-Chair.

Review CC Charter: CC members reviewed the CC's role and responsibilities as laid out in their charter.

- It was pointed out that although budget approval is not included in the Charter, the EC granted the authority to the CC to approve the budgets.
- In response to a question on disbanding work groups, it was explained that information on disbanding would be included in each work group's charter. The standing work groups do not

have provisions for disbanding in their charters but the ad hoc work group charters include information on disbanding (proposed end dates).

- It was brought to the CC's attention that the CC member list (as posted on the website) is outdated. It was clarified that the Program mailing list is correct and regularly updated so the CC and work group member lists on the Program website will be deleted.
- It was proposed that the first sentence under the Membership section be changed to: "Each representative to the Executive Committee *is encouraged* to appoint one member to the Coordination Committee" instead of "Each EC member *will* appoint..." as realistically not every EC member has appointed a CC member.
- An additional change that needs to be made to the Charter is that there will no longer be a Chair and Vice Chair - the CC had previously agreed that there will only be Co-Chairs. The CC had also decided to add language to the Charter recommending that there be one Federal and one Non-federal Co-Chair but that it will not be a requirement as it is not always possible. It was pointed out that the CC had also decided that this would apply to the work groups as well.
- Jim Wilber and Rick Billings will perform a more in depth review of the CC Charter and present any recommended changes or updates to the Charter at the April 2012 CC meeting. CC members can email any comments or recommended changes to Jim or Rick. If the CC has agreement on the changes the revised charter will be brought to the EC for approval.

Update on Program Peer Review:

- Attendees were updated that based on a decision from the last EC meeting all Program peer reviews are on hold pending development of a peer review procedure for the Program.
- The RIP Program Document focus group will be including information on peer reviews in the RIP Program Document and they are working on developing a process for peer review. Although the process developed may not be adopted by the current Program, there is no need to duplicate efforts. If the peer review process is ready it will be presented to the EC at their next meeting.
 - In response to concern that approval of the peer review process might be delayed because other components of the RIP Program Document are incomplete, it was explained that the RIP Program Document is a separate process but that this area was melded with the CC's development of a peer review process in an attempt to avoid duplicating efforts. The RIP Program Document will need to include information on a peer review process for the RIP. The peer review process is planned to be an appendix to the RIP Program Document.
 - Grace Haggerty had volunteered to work on a draft peer review process. Grace Haggerty will send a draft peer review process to Yvette McKenna by March 8th, 2012 for use by the RIP Program Document focus group.
 - Attendees discussed that the peer review process will need to describe how a peer review is handled; how the Program will use the results of a peer review; how the Program will deal with minority reporting if there is not agreement on the results of the peer review; how the work groups will integrate the results of the peer review; and procedure to follow if the Program disagrees with the results of a peer review.
 - The intention is for the EC to have discretion on how to address/handle peer review recommendations but to also ensure that funding is not being spent on a peer review that will not be utilized.
 - It was shared that in some of the guidelines for peer review used by federal agencies, the agencies are obligated to respond as to why they did not follow recommendations from a peer review.
 - It was requested that the peer review process be distributed to the CC before it is sent to the EC so that CC members can inform their EC representatives. The CC will receive a copy of the peer review process in advance of the next EC meeting.

Discuss RGSM Data Synthesis and DBMS integration:

- *RGSM Data Synthesis-*
 - Attendees were updated that the ScW discussed the CC's request regarding the draft data synthesis plan and reviewed Liz Zeiler's comments on the plan at their February meeting. The Corps has volunteered staff to compile meeting note discussions pertaining to the decisions the ScW made on the priority of the categories for data synthesis.
 - It was explained that the intention of the draft RGSM Data Synthesis Plan requests that a contractor compile and evaluate available information for a category and summarize the results. The summary of the information could then be reviewed by the Program to evaluate the state of the knowledge in these areas and identify areas where there is dispute on the data and areas where there are information gaps. This is a way to determine where the Program has consensus on the results of studies and areas where more studies are needed.
 - It was asked if it would be realistic to have a contractor perform the evaluation and if a contractor would be able to adequately identify areas where there is or is not consensus on the data. It was suggested that the evaluation could be incorporated as part of a peer review.
 - Ideally, if the DBMS were ready and had all the information populated then it would be the first place to start compiling information. The ScW's initial feedback on the data synthesis task was to wait until the DBMS is fully functional, but this direction was not adopted by the CC.
 - Concern was raised that the scope of the synthesis activity is broad in terms of looking at data and reports. At a minimum, it would be helpful/wise for scientists to confirm/validate the conclusions made.
 - It was commented that the ScW had acknowledged that the synthesis would have to go to the DBMS work group to identify how the synthesis would link to the DBMS (ex. contractor spreadsheet listing reports utilized).
 - Given that the data synthesis will be a very large task, one suggestion was to recommend to the EC that the synthesis task is not realistic at this point. Ensuring that all data are included in the DBMS and continue to be added to the DBMS may be more prudent at this time.
 - There was agreement that it is important to make sure that data are well managed.
 - Because of the size of the data synthesis task, the ScW had anticipated that it would take a few years to complete and had recommended that the synthesis be contracted out.
 - Jim Brooks (Service staff with experience working on the San Juan RIP) shared that when the San Juan RIP was ready to integrate the biology and hydrology, the synthesis of that information was sent to a contractor. The importance of a tight centralized database similar to the San Juan RIP was emphasized.
 - The Program needs a baseline for implementing adaptive management; the synthesis could serve that function. An initial synthesis on water quality would also help to pare down future studies or determine that no further studies need to be completed in that area. It was stated that the BA/BO could serve as the baseline.
 - The intent of the synthesis is to do more than just group all the data in one spot. Right now, each agency goes back to the data to draw conclusions. For example, Reclamation started with the data when they developed the Biological Assessment (BA) and Interstate Stream Commission (ISC) and SWCA went to the data when they did their evaluation. Sometimes there is agreement from other agencies on those conclusions. As opposed to

each agency going back to the data each time they do an evaluation, the synthesis could identify areas where there is disagreement and where there is a common ground to give a starting place.

- It was commented that it is difficult to focus hypotheses in a given area because it is not known where the Program is in agreement. This will help focus adaptive management to areas where more information is needed and areas where there is dispute. The synthesis can help provide a baseline of where there is agreement.
 - There was disagreement as to what the definition of “synthesis” was to the Program and what exactly a synthesis would entail.
 - If the CC cannot define “synthesis” to their satisfaction, this issue might have to be elevated to the EC. It was suggested that it might be better to use the finished/functional DBMS to identify information gaps first.
 - The ScW will be reviewing the draft data synthesis plan again at their March 20th, 2012 meeting with the intention of approving the February edits.
 - The CC will need to determine if pursuing the data synthesis makes sense at this time. One way to address areas of disagreement is to host a facilitated workshop for Program technical members to discuss the reports and their outcomes. However, one downside to this could be that outcomes are dependent on who was present and voiced their opinion.
 - It is important for it be acknowledged that the ScW completed the work that they were tasked with by the CC.
- *DBMS Integration –*
 - Yvette McKenna shared a set of standardized definitions for data sets that is used by the Service (www.fws.gov/stand/). The document is one of many guidance documents but is something tangible that can be used to help the DBMS contractor develop templates for ease in data importing and standardizing data collection. Although it is too late for these standardized definitions to be used in past documents and data, these are standardized definitions that the Service has vetted. Reclamation would like to include similar definitions in contracts for data collection and reporting. The document was distributed to PMT liaisons and workgroup co-chairs. It was commented that this will be useful in maintaining standards as data is input to the DBMS.

Work group Morale and Communication to work groups

- It was shared that many of the work groups have expressed frustration with the lack of direction/guidance (ex. what should they be working on/toward, which work groups will continue, which will be disbanded, which will be combined, etc.) during the proposed changes and restructuring.
 - It was shared that some work groups have discussed using this time to review previous projects and try to have SOWs ready if needed.
 - The draft RIP documents and the proposed structure are available for the work groups to view. The decisions that come out of the meetings are also available. CC members and the PMT were encouraged to utilize meeting notes to convey the decisions and recommendations so that the complete/full CC recommendation is given, particularly when a work group is looking for guidance on a recommendation.
 - It was discussed that the Program will probably not have clarity on the transition to a RIP for a couple of months. Attendees discussed how to forward information on the RIP transition to keep Program members updated besides the brief updates at meetings.
 - With the budgetary realities, not many of the work groups expect to have full workloads for FY12 and some of the work groups have discussed disbanding. SWM work group has discussed using the time to follow up on SWFL monitoring work and taking trips to

the field. The CC was asked for guidance on what the SWM work group can do during this time.

- It was shared that there will be a need for the SWM work group (hydrologists/water groups) to analyze some products from the RIP focus groups but it may be some time before those products are ready to be reviewed.
- There was general agreement from CC members that it would not be prudent to disband the work groups now but work groups could decide not to meet for the time being. The reason is to not lose all function of the organization.
- It was suggested that the Program Manager send an email to the work groups to keep them informed on the possible structural or Program changes. The communication could also come from the EC Co-Chairs as a way to voice appreciation for all the work the groups have been and are doing.
- Yvette McKenna and the EC Co-Chairs will send an email to the technical work groups to keep them informed on the possible Program structural changes and RIP transition.
 - Approving the FY2012 Work Plans would also be an indication that the CC still intends for the work groups to meet even if it is at a reduced frequency. The CC will be reviewing and approving the FY2012 Work Plans at the April CC meeting.

Update on Strengths-Based Leadership Training: It was suggested that the Strengths-Based Leadership training be delayed until July or August 2012 so that the CC can focus on the possible RIP transition as several CC members participate in the RIP document focus groups.

Next meeting:

- The CC agreed to reschedule the April CC meeting for April 11 to accommodate the EC meeting on March 28th.
 - Tentative agenda items include: (1) Discuss draft RGSM Data Synthesis Plan; (2) Review recommended updates/changes to CC Charter; (3) Discuss FY2012 Planning Spreadsheet activities still under consideration (Monitor RGSM Genetics, Synthesis of Existing RGSM Literature/Data, and Continue RGSM Population Estimation activities); (4) Review Work Groups' 2012 Work Plans;

**Coordination Committee Meeting
7 March 2012 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3640	O – PM	yrmckenna@usbr.gov
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	P – Co-Chair	rbillings@abcwua.org
Grace Haggerty	NMISC	383-4042	P	grace.haggerty@state.nm.us
Jim Wilber	Reclamation	462-3548	P – Co-Chair	jwilber@usbr.gov
Hilary Brinegar (via phone)	NMDA	575-646-2642	P	hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu
Jennifer Faler	Reclamation	462-3541	O	jfalder@usbr.gov

Jason Remshardt	FWS	342-9900	O	jason_remshardt@fws.gov
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Ann Moore	NMAGO	222-904	P	amoore@nmag.gov
Jen Bachus	FWS	761-4714	A	jennifer_bachus@fws.gov
Stacey Kopitsch	FWS	761-4737	O – PMT	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD	247-0234	P	brooke@mrgcd.us
Susan Bittick	USACE	342-3397	P	susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
Nathan Schroeder	PSA	771-6719	P	nathan.schroeder@santaana-nsn.gov
Liz Zeiler	NMISC	827-6189	A	elizabeth.zeiler@state.nm.us
Jim Brooks	FWS	342-9900	O	jim_brooks@fws.gov
Rebecca Onchaga	Reclamation	462-3598	O	ronchaga@usbr.gov
Anndra Vigil	Reclamation	462-3612	O	asvigil@usbr.gov
Michelle Mann	USACE	342-3426	O – PMT	michelle.n.mann@usace.army.mil
Ali Saenz	Reclamation	462-3600	O – Program Administrative Assistant	asaenz@usbr.gov
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 ext.139	O – Note Taker	christine.sanchez@tetrattech.com