

Coordination Committee Meeting

June 6, 2012

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**Coordination Committee Meeting****June 6, 2012 – 12:30 -3:00 pm****Bureau of Reclamation****Rio Grande Conference Room**

Conference Call-in Line for June 6, 2012

Toll Free Number: Phone: 1-800-621-8611

Passcode: 37447#

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

- Introductions and Agenda* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 05/02/12 CC meeting summary* and review of action items
- Review and Discuss Draft Interim External Peer Review Process* - submit comments to Yvette McKenna by June 13
- Update on Program Document progress
- Update on RIP Action Plan progress
- Update on LTP
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC
- Announcements

denotes read ahead*Next meeting** – CC Meeting – July __, 2012 (12:30-4:00 pm) (*reschedule July 4 meeting*)**Upcoming meetings**

EC Meeting – June 21, 2012 (9:00 am-4:00 pm) @ Reclamation

EC Meeting – July 20, 2012 (9:00 am-4:00 pm) @ Reclamation

May 2, 2012 Actions

- Yvette McKenna will ask Jericho Lewis if the deadline for the draft Scope of Work (SOW) for the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (RGSM) Genetics activity is still May 31st; there is the potential that the due date for SOWs for new activities is now May 15th according to new regional acquisition guidance.
- Stacey Kopitsch will coordinate a meeting between the Science Workgroup (ScW) and Jericho Lewis to refine the SOW to ensure that all comments/edits are included and any contracting issues are resolved. CC member comments on the SOW are due to Stacey by COB on May 9th, 2012 preferably using the comment template form or in track

changes. Unless there are issues with the SOW that cannot be resolved the refined SOW will be considered final when it meets the approval of Jericho and ScW members. If necessary, questions on the SOW could be heard during a special CC session.

- Comments on the draft SOW for the Adaptive Management activity are due to Michelle Mann by COB May 10th preferably using the comment template form or in track changes.

Recommendations

- CC members were encouraged to make sure their agency has an assigned primary and alternate representative for each work group (as appropriate).
- Identify and submit any possible future actions/activities that could contribute to recovery for inclusion in the LTP.

Reminder

- EC December 8, 2011 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
June 6, 2012 – 12:30 -3:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
Rio Grande Conference Room**

Actions

- Yvette McKenna and Ali Saenz will incorporate the changes to the Draft External Peer Review document as discussed. Changes/edits included:
 - Section 6K be changed to “...*if the process or scope was not followed.*”
 - Specificity and verification from the Program Manager be added to Section H (the COTR’s roles and responsibilities)
- Yvette McKenna will send the revised Draft External Peer Review document to CC members for one final review prior to submittal as an EC read ahead.
- Additional comments on the Draft External Peer Review document are due to Yvette McKenna by COB on June 13th in order to be prepared as a June 21st EC read ahead.
- Yvette McKenna will add the approval of the Draft External Peer Review Document as a decision item to the June 21st EC meeting.
- Grace Haggerty will review the Program Document section(s) describing “teams” and will have comments/edits back to the Program Document focus group no later than June 13th.
- Grace Haggerty will provide a copy of the new draft LTP narrative to both the Program Document and RIP Action Plan focus groups by Monday, June 11th.
- Yvette McKenna will revise the draft June 21st EC meeting agenda with the following changes:
 - The agenda items will be reordered to: Consultation Update, Program Document Focus Group Presentation, RIP Action Plan Focus Group Presentation, Approval of CPUE Metrics Workshop, followed by the Interim Metrics discussion.
 - The Interim Metrics discussion will be retitled to: Sufficient Progress Evaluation.
 - The Sufficient Progress Evaluation discussion will be reduced to 45 minutes and will include: (a) W. Murphy’s update on the table of measures; (b) D. Freeman’s update on the Program Document perspective (which discusses the process that RIP will follow for sufficient progress); and (c) P. Redmond’s discuss on his theoretical compliance work.
 - Under the CPUE Metrics Workshop discussion, Item C. will be modified to omit “Peer Review.”
 - Item #12 Decisions for July 20th will be reworded to: *endorse the RIP and related documents as the ESA coverage vehicle.*
- Yvette McKenna will meet with Jericho Lewis to discuss what the steps would need to be taken to “restart” the genetics peer review and possible funding.

Decisions

- With a quorum present and no objections, the May 2nd, 2012 CC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.

Recommendations

- Revising of the External Peer Review document should be captured as an action in the RIP Action Plan.
- As of the meeting, no significant concerns were expressed with the Draft External Peer Review document. With the incorporation of the changes discussed today (and any non-significant changes received by June 13th), the CC recommends the EC approval the interim External Peer Review document.

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

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Farewell to Brian Gleadle; (2) Updates from June 21st EC meeting;

Meeting Summary

Introductions and agenda approval: Jim Wilber brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was approved with the addition of Announcements and a Draft EC June Agenda review.

Decision – Approval of May 2nd, 2012 CC meeting summary and review of action items:

- With a quorum present and no objections, the May 2nd, 2012 CC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.
- *May 2nd, 2012 CC Action Items*
 - ✓ Yvette McKenna will ask Jericho Lewis if the deadline for the draft Scope of Work (SOW) for the Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (RGSM) Genetics activity is still May 31st; there is the potential that the due date for SOWs for new activities is now May 15th according to new regional acquisition guidance. – *complete*;
 - The deadline was May 15th. The Science work group (ScW) did get the monitoring genetics scope to Yvette Paroz by the submittal date.
 - ✓ Stacey Kopitsch will coordinate a meeting between the Science Workgroup (ScW) and Jericho Lewis to refine the SOW to ensure that all comments/edits are included and any contracting issues are resolved. CC member comments on the SOW are due to Stacey by COB on May 9th, 2012 preferably using the comment template form or in track changes. Unless there are issues with the SOW that cannot be resolved the refined SOW will be considered final when it meets the approval of Jericho and ScW members. If necessary, questions on the SOW could be heard during a special CC session. – *complete*;
 - Unfortunately, Jericho wasn't available but everything that ScW has submitted was agreed on at the work group level.
 - Jericho did indicate that this task was "it's in the que" but hasn't been addressed yet.
 - ✓ Comments on the draft SOW for the Adaptive Management activity are due to Michelle Mann by COB May 10th preferably using the comment template form or in track. – *complete*;
 - In a brief update, Susan Bittick provided background on the Adaptive Management (AM) activity. The CC had been given opportunity to provide comments on the AM activity; however, no comments were received. The Corps then extended the original comment deadline and provided a hard copy overview to the EC at the May 15th, 2012 meeting. In order to accommodate signatories who did not have representation at the various Program levels, the Corps also extended the courtesy for those members to review and comment on the actual scope. At that time, a few comments were received. Some of the weaknesses regarding water management were pointed out and the Service provided suggested "expansions" to the concerns and hypotheses originally identified in the AM Plan Version 1 Appendix C. As it stands now, it is assumed that the

Corps will be able to move forward on the AM scope with the incorporation/addressing of those comments.

- Depending on the contracting process, the Corps hopes to have the first meeting with the contractor in August but realistically it probably won't happen until September. The bottom line is that the funds need to get committed this year so the Corps is working very diligently to get everything in place.

Review and Discuss Draft Interim External Peer Review Process - submit comments to Yvette McKenna by June 13

- Drafting an External Peer Review Process was originally a CC-led initiative that was then delegated to the Program Document focus group. The draft document is being brought back to the CC for opportunity to comment. All comments are due to Yvette McKenna by COB on June 13th, 2012 in order to be a read ahead for the June 21st EC meeting.
 - Concern was expressed with language on Page 4, Paragraph E: *The EC will approve or disapprove projects for external peer review.* As written, this language appears could interfere with the CC's authority to approve budget as it sounds like that authority is removed (for peer review projects) since it is tied to the funding. It reads like the peer review projects need extra steps and it might tie up the budget process since the CC cannot approve them. It was discussed that the intent was to require an extra step specifically for peer review projects.
 - Following that logic, it was suggested that due dates need to be established for when peer review projects will be given to the CC in order for the CC to successfully develop the budgets. If there are no place holders and in light of the budget reductions, there might not be money available.
 - It was responded that the target dates are described under other sections. Prioritizations for the upcoming year are to be discussed during the last quarter of the current year (see Section 6B, page 3). This means that in July/August/September, the CC will begin planning for the next fiscal year, including looking at the work plans.
 - Attendees were reminded that the CC is authorized to provide recommendations to the EC for funding but that the EC has always had the authority to override CC decisions/recommendations. As long as the CC has consensus on a budget, it is elevated to the EC as informational. This works because the EC is informed throughout the process so everyone is on the same page.
 - In response to a question on the context of the External Peer Review Document to the Program Document and the revision process (especially in terms of the possible restructuring), it was shared that the External Peer Review Document will be revised as needed. It is a guidance document with the expectation of revisions as needed going forward. The *internal* review guidance will be developed at a later date.
 - The original intent was to have this draft process as an interim guidance to allow the Program to proceed with the CPUE workshop and genetics peer review during this transition period. It was originally intended as an appendix to the Program Document. However, since it is intended to cover the interim period, it could be a standalone reference document.
 - There is the possibility that the External Peer Review Document could be completely "reworked" as the Program moves toward a Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) considering the "players" and contracting vehicles involved could be completely different.
 - Some members shared the opinion that this document could be the guidelines for the peer review and the new RIP manager could prepare a newly revised document with timetables and schedules.
 - Some members suggested the External Peer Review document might be less confusing as a standalone document.

- It was pointed out that updating/revising the External Peer Review document should be captured as an action in the RIP Action Plan.
- It was asked what options the Program will have for EC and CC involvement in selecting the peer reviewers, scope development, etc. What will the EC's role be the peer review process under the RIP?
 - It was responded that a placeholder to discuss the EC's role had been added to the draft document in Section 5A on Page 2. The current opinion from the contracting office is that the EC will be able to decide all the different steps they would like to be involved with. However, due to contracting regulations and requirements, there may be the situation where a project has to be expedited. The more steps the EC/CC is involved in, the longer the process will take.
 - The CC's role is discussed in Sections 6C and 6D - requiring specific review and approval of the scope of work as well as other components of the review.
- Concern was expressed that Section 6K on Page 5 specifies that a peer review report will stand unless the EC determines the process was not followed; however, in the last peer review activity, it was the scope of work that was apparently not followed (according to some Program members). It was suggested that the language be modified to accurately capture this additional reason that a report might not be accepted.
 - Ideally, the EC will approve the scope of work so that this situation will not likely occur again. In order to sure that the document contains a provision, it was suggested the language in Section 6K be changed to "*...if the process or scope was not followed.*"
 - It was also suggested that specificity and verification from the Program Manager be added to Section H with the COTR's roles and responsibilities.
- It was clarified that the "peer review panel" for the CPUE workshop is not a really a peer review - but 3 or 4 independent experts who will attend the work shop and provide written feedback and comments. The format that the San Juan Program uses for their habitat workshops will be modeled. The first day will consist of presentation of papers; the second day will be for questions/comments/discussion. The independent panelists are not active participants. It is more accurate to describe them as independent technical experts or expert science panel. Part of the selection of these individuals will be based on their availability.
- Concern was expressed that in order to be able to move forward with the genetics peer review (and eventually revisit the population monitoring and population estimation peer review) the EC really needs to approve instead of just "bless" the peer review guidance document.
- Additional comments on the Draft External Peer Review document will be accepted until COB on June 13th in order to be prepared as a June 21st EC read ahead. As of the meeting, no significant concerns were expressed with the Draft External Peer Review document. With the incorporation of the changes discussed today, the CC recommends the EC approval the interim External Peer Review document.

Update on Program Document progress

- The Program Document focus group will meet again tomorrow to go through some of the attachments and last minute edits to the document. Until recently, certain sections had been the focus but now it is the whole document, in its entirety. With the exception of several sections (pending issues in front the EC), the document is in decent shape. It will be provided as a read ahead for the June 21st EC meeting and a PowerPoint presentation will be developed.

- Focus group members are pleased with the progress and there have actually been elements of fun.
- The presentations of the Program Document and RIP Action Plan for informational only. Approval by the EC is not scheduled until the July 2012 EC meeting.
- Grace Haggerty shared that she committed to reviewing the section(s) describing the “teams” in order to provide consistency between both documents. She will have comments/edits back to the Program Document focus group no later than June 13th.

Update on RIP Action Plan progress

- The RIP Action Plan focus group is also making good progress. In a brief description of their process, it was shared that the group originally started with a lot of detail on the draft goals, actions, and tasks. Then the group realized that there needed to be broader presentation so they “scaled” back some. However, the recent reviews revealed a lack of “action” language in the Action Plan. So this week, the group worked to include “action” details - words such as provide, implement conduct, etc. The task level is where disagreement and contention are likely to happen. A tool column for contributions (deviations, supplemental water, etc.) that support a variety of level of tasks was also added.
- Attendees were advised the Draft RIP Action Plan will not be a complete version by the June 13th deadline; it is certainly not a consensus document yet. Many of the tasks, responsible parties, tools for implementations, etc. are not fleshed out yet. The sufficient progress sections are pending EC discussions and decisions.
- The focus group has discussed that the RIP Action Plan is very much grounded in the AM process. This makes it challenging to get to some specific tasks and figure out potential costs.
 - Regarding sufficient progress, attendees briefly discussed that Patrick Redmond is drafting more theoretical progress documents than the sufficient progress table that the Service provided.

Update on the Long-term Plan (LTP) Narrative

- The RIP Action Plan focus group received permission from the EC to take the lead on developing a new lead to move forward on a new LTP narrative. The intent is to have both the Program Document and RIP Action Plan focus groups work together on this task.

Draft EC Agenda and Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC

- The draft June 21st EC agenda was provided as a hard copy handout with the caveat that it has not been approved by the EC co-chairs yet. The EC meeting is scheduled for 9:00am to 4:00pm and there will be 2 presentations – one for the Program Document and one for the RIP Action Plan.
 - In response to a concern that there isn’t enough hard copy handouts provided during the EC meetings, it was explained that copies are made for the signatory representative only. However, any handouts are subsequently posted to that meeting’s read ahead document module on the Program website after the meeting.
- After discussion, the following changes to the June 21st EC agenda were suggested:
 - Add a new decision item on the draft peer review process.
 - It was cautioned that even if the EC approves an interim peer review process, the genetics peer review may have to be completely restarted in order to get it back in the cue for FY13. There are some unspent funds being returned but there will (more than likely) have to be a new issuance.
 - This project will also have to go through the appropriate process steps for peer reviews as outlined in the interim process.
 - Reorder the agenda items to: Consultation Update, Program Document Focus Group Presentation, RIP Action Plan Focus Group Presentation, Approval of CPUE Metrics Workshop, followed by the Interim Metrics discussion.

- The Interim Metrics discussion should be retitled to: Sufficient Progress Evaluation.
- The Sufficient Progress Evaluation discussion should be reduced to 45 minutes and include:
 - (a) W. Murphy's update on the table of measures; (b) D. Freeman's update on the Program Document perspective (which discusses the process that RIP will follow for sufficient progress); and (c) P. Redmond's discuss on his theoretical compliance work.
- Under the CPUE Metrics Workshop discussion, Item C. should be modified to omit "Peer Review."
- Item #12 Decisions for July 20th should be reworded to: *endorse the RIP and related documents as the ESA coverage vehicle.*
 - This suggestion was in response to the clarification that it is not possible to have the RIP as both a conservation measure and an RPA. ESA compliance is conferred by the BO and not by a RIP. Therefore, it was suggested the language be changed to "endorse the RIP and related documents as the ESA coverage vehicle."

Announcements

- The Sandia Pueblo Environmental Fair is scheduled on June 29th from 9:00am to 4:00pm. The Public Information and Outreach (PIO) work group will be promoting the Program at this event.
- The Santa Ana Pueblo Environmental Fair is scheduled for August 25th. More details will follow.
- The 2012 UCOWR/NIWR Conference, "*Managing Water, Energy, & Food in an Uncertain World*", is scheduled for July 17th thru 19th at the La Fonda Hotel in Santa Fe.
- There was a recent 2-day EWRI conference on river restoration projects. There was a lot of good information presented and a lot of people attended. The proceedings specific to the Rio Grande will be pulled out and posted to the Program's website.
- Congratulations to Stacey Kopitsch - she is expecting her first baby!

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

- Due to scheduling conflicts, the CC scheduled the July meeting to accommodate Brian Gleadle. Brian has been a Program member since 2006 and is now retiring.
- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Farewell to Brian Gleadle; (2) Updates from June 21st EC meeting;

**Coordination Committee Meeting
6 June 2012 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3640	O – PM	ymckenna@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
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Ann Moore (via phone)	NMAGO	222-904	P	amoore@nmag.gov
Stacey Kopitsch	USFWS	761-4737	O – PMT	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Susan Bittick	USACE	342-3397	P	susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
Liz Zeiler	NMISC	827-6189	A	elizabeth.zeiler@state.nm.us
Lori Robertson	USFWS	761-4710	P	lori_robertson@fws.gov
Ken Cunningham	NMDGF	476-8114	A	kenneth.cunningham@state.nm.us
Eveli Abeyta	Santo Domingo	465-0055	P	eabeyta@sdutilities.com
Michelle Mann (via phone)	USACE	342-3426	O – PMT	michelle.n.mann@usace.army.mil
Danielle Galloway	COE	342-3661	A	danielle.a.galloway@usace.army.mil
Ali Saenz	Reclamation	462-3600	O – Program Administrative Assistant	asaenz@usbr.gov
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	O – Note Taker	marta.wood@tetrattech.com