

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program Science Work Group Meeting

17 July 2012 Meeting – 9:00 AM-11:30 AM

Army Corps of Engineers

MEETING SUMMARY

Actions

- Rick Billings will check with Rebecca Houtman to determine feasibility of COA filling the non-federal Science co-chair position.
- Jen Bachus will ask Jason Remshardt for the timing and details on the next Propagation Meeting.
- Stacey Kopitsch will forward the museum minnow sample inventory request to Yvette Paroz.
- ✓ Dana Price will follow up with Yvette Paroz on the *Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation* RFP, due date for the draft report, and the potential for scheduling the contractor to present the draft report to the work group (tentative for August meeting?). >> *Due date is Friday 7/20; Yvette Paroz is checking with the contractor about a presentation*
- ✓ It was requested that Yvette Paroz ask the *Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation* contractor how much time they would need to present their draft report results to ScW. The time frame might guide the decision for a separate meeting. – *in progress*;
- Alison Hutson will provide a “lessons learned” presentation on the LLSMR spawning study at the September ScW meeting.
- ✓ Stacey Kopitsch will resend the ScW project report comment tracking module information (path and password) to ScW members. *Completed 07/18/12*
- Alison Hutson will contact Yvette Paroz to arrange a possible presentation by ASIR on the RGSM Spawning Monitoring for September or October.
- Jen Bachus will ask Yvette Paroz for updates on the minnow sanctuary.
- Brooke Wyman will ask for updates on the *Monitor Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Genetics* project at the next CC meeting and will request that the ScW work group receive notices when a solicitation is being issued.
- ✓ Stacey Kopitsch will send out the most recent *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Population Monitoring* project report to ScW members and will check with Yvette Paroz on making sure ScW is included in the review process since ScW is listed as the lead work group. *Completed 07/18/12*
- Jen Bachus will check with Yvette Paroz to determine the differences between the *RGSM Augmentation and Monitoring* project and the *Continue RGSM Augmentation and Monitoring* project.
- Stacey Kopitsch will check with Gary Dean for the dates/information on the *Eval. Estrogenic BioMarker/Water Toxicity* contract.
- Dana Price will look into scheduling a joint workgroup presentation by MPT or update on the monitoring efforts in late winter/early spring.
- Rick Billings will email the ScW the draft HR planning/objectives document.
- Mick Porter will draft a 1-page strawman proposal on a Program-wide research symposium for the ScW work group to review and discuss.
- Members will brainstorm a list of ScW field trip ideas and dates; suggestions will be sent to Dana Price before the August meeting.
- ✓ Alison Hutson and Dana Price will email the ScW concerns about possible loss of historic knowledge to Yvette McKenna and the CC co-chairs. – *The joint ScW/HRW statement of concern about the RIP was out to work group members and was elevated to the CC.*

- ✓ Rick Billings will forward the possible loss of institutional knowledge concern to the HR work group to see if HR members would like to be included in the request. – *completed 07/17/12*
- Alison Hutson will confirm the ScW/HR meeting schedule at ISC and make the appropriate date changes for November (to be 13th)

Meeting Summary

- Jen Bachus brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was approved with the addition of sub-bullets under #7 *Collaborative Program Tracking sheet*, including a discussion on ScW involvement in contracted projects, a discussion on a yearly symposium to cover updates from research, and a discussion of future field trips by ScW participants.
- With no objection, Dana Price was elected the federal ScW Co-Chair. There is still a need for another co-chair. It is preferable to have a non-federal co-chair but a federal volunteer would also be acceptable.
- The approval of the May 15th, 2012 ScW meeting notes was postponed until the next meeting to allow time for ISC to review the spawning study section for accuracy.
- The May action item is ongoing.
- The work group then discussed the museum inventory request for Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (RGSM or minnow) samples. There was confusion as to what the work group wanted. It was clarified that:
 - The ScW work group is requesting a catalog listing of all archived silvery minnow samples on the Rio Grande - with an emphasis on the number of samples and number of fish in the samples by year and by reach from the beginning of archiving until now. A computer print-out “data dump” of all information on the entire collection would be fine. The work group would also like to know about the potential ability for the museum to store more minnow samples if requested (storage size availability).
 - The purpose of this request is to help the work group know what is currently in the collection in order to: (1) determine if there is a need to increase the archived sample size for future use; and (2) identify what that need might be and how that may assist assessment of Program successfulness.
- Attendees then reviewed the contract tracking spreadsheet. Development of this spreadsheet was in direct response to the work group concerns that the work group is not often aware of project timelines and deadlines. More often than not, the work group will write and submit a scope of work but never be informed if/when the project was funded, if/when awarded, etc. The work group would like to have a better process in order to be more involved after a scope is written. This is one way for the group to have better “connection” with the projects and to try to keep track of what updates and reports are expected.
 - In a line by line review, attendees then briefly discussed each ScW project.
 - ScW members were assigned projects to “follow” based on their agency affiliation.
- Attendees then discussed the need for a centralized “venue” for Program members to be able to learn about all the current and ongoing Program projects. While each work group has presentations on their individual projects, there is a need for “cross-over” so that no one is working in isolation and everyone can be updated on what others are doing. It was shared that one item of the draft RIP Action Plan specifies a regular research symposium - so this is in-line with the thinking for the future.
- Members also discussed scheduling field trips and site visits as a way to have increased awareness and connectedness to projects. These can be done in months that the work group has less regular business to address.
- In the Program Update, it was shared that the EC is scheduled to meet this Friday, July 20th from 9:00am to 4:00pm. There are a lot of critical decision items on the agenda. The pivotal decisions involve reconfirming commitment to a RIP and selection of the RIP management (options include

federal lead, non-federal lead, or a 3rd party lead). Some ScW members expressed concern that the transition to a RIP and the sudden disbanding of work groups/committees could result in a loss of the historical information and institutional knowledge that is held within the work group. The processes are not simple and if the active participants are “removed” then there is a real possibility of losing efficiency as well.

- The ScW would like to elevate this concern to the CC with the following statement:
 - *The Science work group is concerned that in the development of a new RIP structure the technical expertise, institutional knowledge, effectiveness of existing programs and contractual work, etc. that is held within the work groups could be lost. ScW respectfully requests the opportunity to be involved in the transition discussions and provide input into the future structure of science under the RIP.*
- The next CC meeting is scheduled for August 1st from 1:00pm to 4:00pm.
- **Important Dates/Events:**
 - July 23rd and 24th – PVA meeting
 - Mid-August (to be determined) – PVA training
 - August 28th (afternoon) and August 29th (morning) – database training sessions
 - September 6th (morning) – database training session
 - September 18th from 11:00am to 12:00pm – joint presentation: USGS mesohabitat work
 - October 16th from 11:00am to 12:00pm – joint presentation: Darryl Eidson’s Sediment Study
 - November 13th – ScW meeting (rescheduled to accommodate the Thanksgiving holiday)
 - November 13th from 11:00am to 12:00pm – joint presentation: Climate Change in the MRG basin;

Next Meeting: August 21st, 2012 from 9:00am to 11:30am at ISC

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Propagation Meeting updates (?); (2) draft ScW planning/objectives document – why projects are important and the risk of not funding; (3) Research Symposium 1-page document review; (4) tentative list of field trip ideas and dates; (5) approval of May 15th and July 17th meeting notes
- September agenda items: (1) Kevin Buhl’s estrogenic biomarker presentation; (2) “lessons learned” presentation on the LLSMR spawning study; (3) ASIR spawning monitoring presentation?
- October agenda items: (1) ASIR spawning monitoring presentation?
- November/December agenda items: (1) ISC spawning study results presentation; (2) discussions on the continuation of the LLSMR spawning study and what people want out of the project; (3) MPT presentation or update on the monitoring efforts
- Future agenda topics: (1) joint session with HR; (2) future PVA scope(s) for next steps/next work (not expected until summer of 2012);

Specifics on Upcoming ScW Meetings:

- ScW will continue to meet at the ISC facilities on San Antonio.
- The November meeting will be rescheduled to November 13th to accommodate the Thanksgiving Holiday.

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program
Science Work Group Meeting
17 July 2012 Meeting – 9:00 AM-11:30 AM
Army Corps of Engineers

Meeting Notes

Introductions and Agenda Approval

- Jen Bachus brought the meeting to order and introductions were made.
- The agenda was approved with the addition of sub-bullets under #7 *Collaborative Program Tracking sheet*, including a discussion on ScW involvement in contracted projects, a discussion on a yearly symposium to cover updates from research, and a discussion of future field trips by ScW participants. The Election of ScW Co-Chairs was changed to Agenda Item #2.

Election of ScW Co-Chairs

- Dana Price, with the Army Corps of Engineers, has volunteered to be the federal co-chair for the Science (ScW) work group. Her election was motioned and seconded. With no objections, Dana was welcomed as the federal co-chair.
 - Dana will now be the primary work group member for the Corps and Mick Porter will be their alternate.
- There is still a need for a non-federal co-chair to replace Alison. It is preferable to have a non-federal co-chair but a federal volunteer would also be acceptable.
 - The co-chair duties (especially Coordination Committee (CC) meeting attendance) can be rotated between the co-chairs in order to distribute the work load and to make sure that there is ScW representation at all key meetings. Representation of ScW can even be done by other work group members as needed and appropriate.

Action: Rick Billings will check with Rebecca Houtman to determine feasibility of COA filling the non-federal Science co-chair position.

May 15th, 2012 ScW meeting notes

- The approval of the May 15th, 2012 ScW meeting notes was postponed until the next meeting to allow time for ISC to review the spawning study section for accuracy.

April Action Item Review

- *Alison Hutson will contact Teresa (at Dexter) to possibly arrange a presentation/meeting with the ScW work group around the time of one of their facility visits. The requested presentation would focus on the General Fish Health Assessment – what do they do? How often? What is the cost? Etc. (From 4/17/12) – ongoing;*
 - There is a tentative Genetics and Propagation Meeting for the 3rd week of August. This might be an ideal time to schedule a presentation if possible. Dexter could either attend the regularly scheduled ScW meeting or a separate meeting could be planned to accommodate their schedule.

Action: Jen Bachus will ask Jason Remshardt for the timing and details on the next Propagation Meeting.

Announcements

- There were no announcements.

Review Museum Inventory of Minnows

- In previous discussions, there had been a suggestion (in response to the age and growth study) to have more minnow specimens preserved at the museum for future studies. At the April 2012 meeting, ScW members pointed out that no one knows what minnow samples the museum is being given to archive each year and there is a storage space issue/concern.
 - In a brief history, it was shared that prior to 2006 all minnow samples were preserved. Concerns of preserving too many fish resulted in a shift to only preserving the incidental mortalities and larval samples. There needs to be a “balance” of preserving enough representative samples without having to store too much or remove too many fish from the population. The work group needs to determine a reasonable number of samples to annually archive.
- Yvette Paroz did contact the museum, but there was confusion as to what the work group was actually requesting. They would like to see the request in writing to be able to properly address it.
 - The work group would like to determine a reasonable number of samples to archive annually – in order to have a balance of preserving enough representative samples to be useful but not having to store too much or remove too many fish from the population. In order to begin this process, the work group requested that the museum provide an inventory print out of archived samples since no one knows what is being held in the collection at this time. It would be good to know what the museum is currently getting each year.
 - What is currently in the archives? By year and by reach/location information.
 - What is the sample size of each?
 - It was cautioned that there needs to be a clear idea of what the intended future use of the samples might be before the archiving is increased again. How many samples would/could be needed to assess Program successfulness?
- The ScW work group is requesting a catalog listing of archived silvery minnow samples on the Rio Grande with emphasis on the number of samples and number of fish in the samples by year and by reach from the beginning of archiving until now. A computer print-out data dump would be fine. The work group would also like to know about the potential ability for the museum to store more minnow samples if requested (storage size availability).
 - The older samples would not be destroyed to make room for new samples.

Action: Stacey Kopitsch will forward the museum minnow sample inventory request to Yvette Paroz.

Collaborative Program Tracking Sheet

- Yvette Paroz developed a contract tracking spreadsheet for the current Program projects. The spreadsheet should be current through June.
- Development of this spreadsheet was in direct response to the work group concerns that the work group is not often aware of project timelines and deadlines. More often than not, the work group will write and submit a scope of work but never be informed if/when the project was funded, if/when awarded, etc. The work group would like to have a better process in order to be more involved after a scope is written. This is one way for the group to have better “connection” with the projects and to try to keep track of what updates and reports are expected.
 - Individual members could be responsible for tracking 1 or 2 of their own agency projects to keep handle on (1) when quarterly/draft reports are due; (2) what pieces/components of the project are active; (3) where in process the work is; and (4) when a presentation or update needs to be added to a ScW agenda, etc.
 - Any needs, questions, or concerns must go through the COTR.

- *Individual Project Review* (please note that the name in parenthesis after a project title indicates the ScW member responsible for follow up/tracking of that project)
 - *Sexing Study* – this project was a component of the RGSM Life History study and is related to the age and growth work (size differences between male and female). A scope was written in August 2011 but it was never funded. It will remain on the list as a placeholder for next year (unless reprioritized). This project could theoretically be done at any time since the minnow samples are stored at the museum.
 - *Continue RGSM Population Estimation* (Alison) – this project was not funded in 2012
 - *Independent Peer Review* – the Program is still developing an interim peer review process that needs to be approved by the Executive Committee (EC)
 - *Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation* (Dana) – this project is also known as the gear study. The report has been delayed until July. Yvette Paroz was going to provide a copy of the RFP once it was located. It would be a good model for future RFPs since feedback from the ScW work group was used to refine the proposal and the contractor is obligated to present to the work group every year. There should be a presentation in conjunction to the draft report expected in July.
 - The work group might have to consider a special meeting for a presentation in order to accommodate contractual timeline considerations. A separate meeting might be appropriate to ensure adequate feedback and question/answers. It would be ideal to have the presentation provided during the draft comment period.
 - It was requested that Yvette Paroz ask the *Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation* contractor how much time they would need to present their draft report results to ScW. Their time estimate might inform the decision for a separate meeting.

Action: Dana Price will follow up with Yvette Paroz on the *Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation* RFP, due date for the draft report, and the potential for scheduling the contractor to present the draft report to the work group (tentative for August meeting?).

Action: It was requested that Yvette Paroz ask the *Fish Community Sampling Methodology Evaluation* contractor how much time they would need to present their draft report results to ScW. The time frame might guide the decision for a separate meeting.

- *Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Spawning and Recruitment Study at the Los Lunas Silvery Minnow Refugium (LLSMR)* (Alison) – this is an ongoing project; however, it is not currently on the list for funding next year. ISC has been doing the work on their own but it is unknown if they will continue to do so. A quarterly report was completed at the end of May, but until the harvest in October, there will not be a lot of information.
 - In a brief review, it was shared that the LLSMR did 3 spawning trials this year. Larval fish have since been observed. LLSMR staff thinks that the fish spawned the first 2 events. But it is not likely that there will be a size difference between the groups since they are only a week apart. It will be very difficult to determine which trial produced what.
 - Subsequent sampling has indicated that the fish are already nearing or at 30 mm, so they are doing great.
 - ISC will be doing a second year of the food availability study with Becky Bixby.
 - The cost of this year of the project is relatively low: ~\$500 for the PIT tags, staff time (SWCA) to help harvest, possible permitting, etc. ISC will find out from Reclamation where the budget is. Unspent money is

usually not carried over. Without harvesting, there is no real information at this time.

- For this year's grow out underway, the preferred time to harvest would be in October for stocking of the river in November. This time frame is consistent with the practice at other facilities.
 - It was suggested that the LLSMR consider taking the samples earlier in the year (instead of waiting until October) in order to collect data and information.
 - Jason Remshardt thought the larval fish were already passed the window for using the light traps since they were already a week old – at least actively swimming – before ISC even knew they were there.
 - However, it was suggested that the LLSMR consider using the light traps as a continual monitoring tool to track the first appearance of larvae in the traps as a way to see when the first spawn might have occurred.
- It was suggested that there be continued discussions on the continuation of this project to determine what people want to see come out of it. As a first step in continued discussions, the work group requested a “lessons learned” presentation as way to capture questions, get feedback, and develop a workable plan for next year.
 - Last year, the fish were already gravid when tagging occurred. Only 60 of the 100 fish survived – it is believed that the tagging was just too stressful. This year, the tagging occurred earlier and the fish had time to adjust. Only 1 fish (out of 100) was lost.
 - Last year, around September/October, the fish guts were empty. A food availability study was done and the results/information is just now becoming available.

Action: Alison Hutson will provide a “lessons learned” presentation on the LLSMR spawning study at the September ScW meeting.

- *RGSM Rescue/Salvage* (Jen) – this is another ongoing project. The draft report was received May 2nd and the work group comments were submitted to Reclamation on June 18th. There is a work group module on the Program's website to capture and track comments and Primary Investigator (PI) responses.
 - Committees & Work Groups >> ScW – Science Work Group >>> WorkGroup Document comments & responses

Action: Stacey Kopitsch will resend the ScW project report comment tracking module information (path and password) to ScW members.

- *RGSM Egg Monitoring in Canals* (Jen) -
- *RGSM Augmentation and Monitoring* (Jen) – there are 2 augmentation and monitoring projects on the spreadsheet. This project is for the completion of the 2011 project. The draft report came out in January or February. The *Continue RGSM Augmentation and Monitoring* project is for 2012. It was requested that Jason Remshardt (or someone else in the Propagation work group present updates on these projects after the next Propagation meeting. *RGSM Spawning Monitoring* (Alison) – the report appears to be due in August.

Action: Alison Hutson will contact Yvette Paroz to arrange a possible presentation by ASIR on the RGSM Spawning Monitoring for September or October.

- *FWS Rearing/Breeding O&M* (Jen) – an electronic copy of the 2011 report was received via email. It was not out for comment. The facilities' reports tend to be report-outs of what was done so they typically aren't open for comment (i.e., only a final copy is provided for informational purposes).
- *COA Rearing/Breeding O&M* (Rebecca) - as mentioned above, only final reports are provided for informational purposes.
- *Rearing/Breeding O&M ISC naturalized refugium* (Alison) -
- *FWS Rearing/Breeding O&M (Minnow Sanctuary)* (Jen) – no updates were available at the meeting and there is no information on the spreadsheet for when reports are due.

Action: Jen Bachus will ask Yvette Paroz for updates on the minnow sanctuary.

- *Monitor Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Genetics* (Brooke) – the scope was submitted by the deadline but apparently Jericho Lewis (Reclamation's contracting officer) received a lot of other submittals as well. This line item is to address (finish out) the current project. The final report should be available in October.

Action: Brooke Wyman will ask for updates on the *Monitor Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Genetics* project at the next CC meeting and will request that the ScW work group receive notices when a solicitation being issued.

- *Continue RGSM Population Monitoring* (Alison) – work group members expressed appreciation that ASIR's reports are usually received timely and with plenty of opportunity for comment.
- *Continue Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Population Monitoring* (Stacey) – these project reports are always in the same format (even the same title except for the date). ScW members expressed interest in being involved in the review process and seeing the draft reports and presentations, especially since the work group is the lead for this project.

Action: Stacey Kopitsch will send out the most recent *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Population Monitoring* project report to ScW members and will check with Yvette Paroz on making sure ScW is included in the review process since ScW is listed as the lead work group.

- *Continue RGSM Augmentation and Monitoring* (Jen) – it is assumed that this project is for 2012 but Jen Bachus will confirm any differences with Yvette Paroz.

Action: Jen Bachus will check with Yvette Paroz to determine the differences between the *RGSM Augmentation and Monitoring* project and the *Continue RGSM Augmentation and Monitoring* project.

- *Eval. Estrogenic BioMarker/Water Toxicity* (Stacey) – This is Kevin Buhl's presentation that has been delayed. The first year of the study was lost because the fish provided didn't survive. They were able to complete some lab work but none of the field studies. The lab analyses have been completed and Kevin should be able to present to ScW in September.

Action: Stacey Kopitsch will check with Gary Dean for the dates/information on the *Eval. Estrogenic BioMarker/Water Toxicity* contract.

- *RGSM fecundity study* – this project was not funded. It was another smaller study that was broken out from the larger RGSM Life History study.

- *USFWS Fish Health Study* (Jen) – comments on the draft report were submitted to Reclamation last night.
- *Increase Understanding of RGSM Life History and Habitat Needs Through Focused Scientific Studies* (funding requested for objectives 1-3 only.) – this is the broad Long-term Plan (LTP) study that was broken down into smaller, less expensive studies that could be accomplished relatively quickly and thus have more likelihood of securing funding.
- *Monitor Habitat Restoration Projects for Effectiveness* – ScW members expressed interest in having a joint presentation from the Monitoring Plan Team (MPT).
 - This has been an “in-house” effort. There have been 2 poor flow years so there is no fisheries work being done.

Action: Dana Price will look into scheduling a joint work group presentation by MPT or update on the monitoring efforts in late winter/early spring.

- Research Symposium:

- Attendees then discussed the need for a centralized “venue” for Program members to be able to learn about all the current and ongoing Program projects. While each work group has presentations on their individual projects, there is a need for “cross-over” so that no one is working in isolation and everyone can be updated on what others are doing.
- It was shared that one item of the draft RIP Action Plan specifies hosting a regular research symposium - so this is in-line with the thinking for the future. How it is accomplished, however, might be greatly influenced by the RIP management structure which is yet to be determined.
- Members discussed taking a proactive role and beginning some of the work now. The first recommended step was to draft a one-page proposal for the CC and EC to consider.
 - Some members shared the opinion that the past symposia have been missing the “how to move forward” context. The presentations are focused on what was done and what the results were. There needs to be more discussions on how the results inform Adaptive Management (AM).
 - In response, it was cautioned that Reclamation’s contracting office will have to be involved and in agreement with that. There have been contract issues/concerns expressed in the past with the possibility of contractors “drumming up” work. In fact, contractors have been specifically instructed to *not* provide suggestions/opinions/paths forward/etc.
 - However, it was mentioned there should be some way to openly discuss the science and ways to move forward without compromising individuals for future contracted work.
 - Some members suggested that volunteers from ScW and HR could provide overviews of the project reports/presentations and complete their own evaluation in order to inform the rest of the Program how the data could move the Program forward.
 - ScW members requested a copy of HR’s planning/objective document in order to use it as a template to develop their own document linking objectives/purposes to actual projects. While project explanations or justifications are provided in the action plans and work plans, they usually only consist of 1 or 2 sentences. Having an existing planning document would help

facilitate effective prioritization and communication of need to the CC and EC.

- Especially with the transition to a RIP, future projects will have to be “manageable” (in terms of size) and quickly completed in order to have timely results to inform AM.
- One goal is to see increased representation and participation at the symposia from all levels of the Program, but most specifically the executives and decision makers. This is one reason to determine the AM context of study results.
 - If it is not possible to have the contractors include links to AM in their conclusions themselves, then ScW members could work through the studies/project results and make the recommendations.

Action: Mick Porter will draft a 1-page strawman proposal on a Program-wide research symposium for the ScW work group to review and discuss.

Action: Rick Billings will email the ScW the draft HR planning/objectives document.

- *Future ScW Field Trips:*
 - Another way for ScW members to have increased awareness and connectedness to projects is to schedule regular field trips and/or site visits. These can be done in months that the work group has less regular business to address.
 - New members expressed interest in field trips as a way to become familiar with the work and projects being implemented.
 - It was suggested that the work group consider scheduling 1 field trip per quarter.
 - Members were asked brainstorm a list of trip ideas and dates and send suggestions to Dana Price.

Action: Members will brainstorm a list of ScW field trip ideas and dates; suggestions will be sent to Dana Price before the August meeting.

Program Update

- *EC update:*
 - The EC is scheduled to meet this Friday, July 20th from 9:00am to 4:00pm. There are a lot of critical decision items on the agenda. The pivotal decisions involve reconfirming commitment to a RIP and selection of the RIP management (options include federal lead, non-federal lead, or a 3rd party lead).
 - It is speculated that the EC will opt for a 3rd party lead. ISC, Reclamation, and the Service have discussed this option at length and apparently Reclamation does have a grant process to accomplish it.
 - There will be a new “executive manager” or “program manager” position. This individual will answer directly to the EC. There will also be a science coordinator position and possibly even an outside science panel. The intent is to get the management structure and the new program manager in place and functioning within the next 6 months.
 - It has been proposed that the CC will be disbanded and the EC will then depend on the manager and the science panel.
 - Some ScW members expressed concern that the transition to a RIP and the sudden disbanding of work groups/committees could result in a loss of the historical information and institutional knowledge that is held within the

work group. The processes are not simple and if the active participants are “removed” then there is a real possibility of losing efficiency as well.

- The tentative restructures have proposed less working groups. The existing work groups would be reorganized into “implementation teams” which would be task oriented.
- It was suggested that ScW members raised these concerns to their CC and EC members.
- Some members also suggested that an official work group request to be involved in the transition be elevated to the CC.
 - At lot would be lost if all work groups suddenly dissolve: technical expertise, institutional knowledge, effectiveness of existing programs and contractual work, etc. Therefore, it was suggested the work group request the opportunity to be involved in the discussions and provide input into the development of the detailed structure of the new RIP.
 - *The Science work group is concerned that in the development of a new RIP structure the technical expertise, institutional knowledge, effectiveness of existing programs and contractual work, etc. that is held within the work groups could be lost. ScW respectfully requests the opportunity to be involved in the transition discussions and provide input into the future structure of science under the RIP.*
 - The EC is also developing a demographic workshop that will be focused on: how to monitor minnow, how CPUE data can/should be used, and how the Program can move forward with this information. Approval of the proposed workshop is on Friday’s EC agenda; once approved, the workshop planning will move forward. It is assumed the workshop will be held mid- to late October.

Action: Alison Hutson and Dana Price will email the ScW concerns about possible loss of historic knowledge to Yvette McKenna and the CC co-chairs.

Action: Rick Billings will forward the possible loss of institutional knowledge concern to the HR work group to see if HR members would like to be included in the request.

- *CC update:*
 - The next CC meeting is scheduled for August 1st from 1:00pm to 4:00pm. At their last meeting, the CC agreed to return to the 1:00pm to 4:00pm time frame. Their last meeting was focused on updates on the status of the RIP documents. They should begin discussion of the FY13 budget soon.
- *Important Dates/Events:*
 - July 23rd and 24th – PVA meeting
 - Mid-August (to be determined) – PVA training
 - August 28th (afternoon) and August 29th (morning) – database training sessions
 - September 6th (morning) – database training session
 - September 18th from 11:00am to 12:00pm – joint presentation: USGS mesohabitat work
 - October 16th from 11:00am to 12:00pm – joint presentation: Darryl Eidson’s Sediment Study
 - November 13th – ScW meeting (rescheduled to accommodate the Thanksgiving holiday)
 - November 13th from 11:00am to 12:00pm – joint presentation: Climate Change in the MRG basin;

Next Meeting: August 21st, 2012 from 9:00am to 11:30am at ISC

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Propagation Meeting updates (?); (2) draft ScW planning/objectives document – why projects are important and the risk of not funding; (3) Research Symposium 1-page document review; (4) tentative list of field trip ideas and dates; (5) approval of May 15th and July 17th meeting notes
- September agenda items: (1) Kevin Buhl’s estrogenic biomarker presentation; (2) “lessons learned” presentation on the LLSMR spawning study; (3) ASIR spawning monitoring presentation?
- October agenda items: (1) ASIR spawning monitoring presentation?
- November/December agenda items: (1) ISC spawning study results presentation; (2) discussions on the continuation of the LLSMR spawning study and what people want out of the project; (3) MPT presentation or update on the monitoring efforts
- Future agenda topics: (1) joint session with HR; (2) future PVA scope(s) for next steps/next work (not expected until summer of 2012);

Specifics on Upcoming ScW Meetings:

- ScW will continue to meet at the ISC facilities on San Antonio.
- The November meeting will be rescheduled to November 13th to accommodate the Thanksgiving Holiday.

Science Work Group July 17th, 2012 Meeting Attendees

	NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	Primary, Alternate, Other
1	Stacey Kopitsch	USFWS	761-4737	stacey_kopitsch@FWS.gov	A - PMT
2	Alison Hutson	ISC	841-5201	alison.hutson@state.nm.us	P – Temp Co-chair
3	Dana Price	USACE	342-3378	dana.m.price@usace.army.mil	P – New Federal Co-chair
4	Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	rbillings@abcwua.org	P
5	Kelly Oliver-Amy	Reclamation	462-3552	koliver-amy@usbr.gov	P
6	Brooke Wyman	MRGCD	247-0234	brooke@mrgcd.us	P
7	Jen Bachus	FWS	761-4714	jennifer_bachus@fws.gov	P
8	Mick Porter	USACE	342-3264	michael.d.porter@usace.army.mil	A
9	Kirk Patten	NMDGF	476-8103	kirk.patten@state.nm.us	P
10	Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	marta.wood@tetrattech.com	O – note taker

