

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

MEETING SUMMARY

Actions

- Kelly Oliver-Amy will follow up on the action to clarify how much direct contact the ScW work group can have with the Museum, to determine what had already been done, and to help facilitate resolution. If necessary, Kelly offered to contact the Museum herself to find out the total numbers of minnow specimens that have been coming in yearly (especially since 2006).
- Kelly Oliver-Amy will redevelop the ScW project tracking spreadsheet with updates, expected due dates for draft reports for ScW review, and distribute to the ScW work group.
- Yvette McKenna will provide Kelly Oliver-Amy any available status updates on the ScW projects (for inclusion in the updated ScW project tracking spreadsheet).
- Kelly Oliver-Amy will provide the Museum contact information and phone numbers after she is able to identify their preferred contact procedure.
- Yvette McKenna will ask Ali Saenz if she already has the DBMS data templates. If not, it was suggested that an email be sent to Susan Bittick and Mark Doles (cc'd to Lloyd DeWald of DBS&A) asking about the procedure to distribute the templates.
- Yvette McKenna will provide the RIP Action Plan Focus Group meeting schedule and information to ScW members.
- Gary Dean will talk to ASIR to determine when the next installment of the minnow monitoring data is expected (delivery date).
- Mick Porter will send an electronic copy of the Research Symposium Strawman document to Tetra Tech for distribution to ScW.
- Tetra Tech will forward the electronic Research Symposium Strawman document to ScW members for review.
- ScW members will review the Research Symposium Strawman Document and will provide comments to Ali Saenz and Yvette McKenna for compilation.
- Yvette McKenna will send the information on the genetics monitoring grant to ScW members once it has been issued.
- Kelly Oliver-Amy will facilitate an email review of the draft Scope of Work for the Spawning Monitoring & Egg Monitoring in Canals, once it is available. ✓
- Work group comments on the draft Scope of Work for the Spawning Monitoring & Egg Monitoring in Canals are due to Kelly Oliver-Amy by December 21st. ✓
- Kelly Oliver-Amy will look at the Salvage IA to determine if there is any specified report delivery date(s) that need to be considered when scheduling the due date for ScW work group comments.
- Work group comments on the draft 2012 Salvage Report should be submitted to Ali Saenz for compilation. *Note: an official due date will be established after a review of the IA.*
- Yvette McKenna will check with Ali Saenz if individual work group comment forms are being posted to the DBMS (in order for work group members to see how the comments were addressed). These would continue to be password-protected.
- Any suggestions on possible ScW field trips or site visits should be submitted via email to Dana Price for compilation.

- Mick Porter will attempt to have a Cochiti Baseline Study update available for the January ScW meeting.

Ongoing Actions

- Alison Hutson and Mick Porter will work together to explore the use of mixed model tools on the CPUE datasets for the Adaptive Management Recruitment Analysis work (*continued from 11/13/12*).
- Rick Billings will email the ScW the draft HR planning/objectives document. (*from 07/17/12 meeting*)

Decisions

- The November 13th, 2012 ScW meeting notes were approved for finalization with no changes.
- After a review during the meeting and with minor edits, the ScW work group approved the ScW 2012 Accomplishments and ScW 2013 Work Plan documents. For the 2013 Work Plan, K. Patten will be the Alternate for NMDGF and J. Caldwell will be the Primary; in addition R. Houtman is changed to R. Hooper.

Recommendations

- It was recommended that anyone interested in participating in the biology group that is assisting the Minnow Action Team should contact Grace Haggerty to request involvement. This is a more direct way to provide feedback on what can be done next spring to help the minnow population.
- It was suggested a ½ day “discussion” could be explored with Darryl Ahlers and the flycatcher monitoring folks to address the Research Symposium Strawman Items #2 and #4. This could be hosted at their convenience – either in conjunction with a ScW meeting or separately. It was added that this event be routed through Vicki Ryan at Reclamation.
 - It was suggested that the strawman include some language suggesting a symposium structure that incorporates the technical folks as well as the management folks. For example, there could be a topic review, discussion on what is known about that topic, and then pose technical questions in a “technical subgroup” forum. Then the highlights could be reported back to the management audience in a more distilled form to better meet the management needs.
- It was suggested that in place of a full symposium event, several smaller ½ day discussions could be organized. Also, joint work group presentations could help in the interim.
 - It was recommended that the HRW be involved in the ½ day flycatcher discussion event. Members of HRW have been working on prioritization and preparation for the arrival of the salt cedar beetle for the San Acacia Reach. This could be one of the discussion topics.
- It was recommended that Reclamation and the Corps provide monthly updates to the ScW work group as any funding opportunities become available. This could be one way to help keep the work group informed of upcoming work or potential projects. It might also be the “trigger” for ScW to revisit their prioritized projects to determine if the priorities were still appropriate.
- It was suggested that ScW members read the most recent versions of the RIP documents (Program Document, Action Plan, etc.) that will be posted online before the next EC meeting, and come prepared to discuss those at the January ScW meeting.

Meeting Summary

- Jen Bachus brought the meeting to order and introductions were made.
- The November 13th, 2012 ScW meeting notes were approved for finalization with no changes.
- Attendees completed a November Action Item review.

- All but 3 of the November actions were completed as assigned. One action was to be removed as it was addressed during the meeting; one action was reworded to assign the task to Kelly Oliver-Amy; and the final action is ongoing. All of the ongoing and continued action items were addressed except one that will remain ongoing.
- There is still no non-federal nomination for ScW co-chair. This will remain an agenda item until filled.
- After a review during the meeting and minor corrections to the membership list, the ScW work group approved the ScW 2012 Accomplishments and ScW 2013 Work Plan documents with no additional comments or concerns expressed.
- Attendees then discussed the Agenda Item to Approve the Science Team Organization Plan. It was suggested that this topic be tabled and revisited in the future when the EC focus groups are farther along in their development. The most current versions of the RIP documents will be available as read aheads online (for the December 20th EC meeting) on December 13th. However, it was discussed that the most effective option to provide comments and feedback would be through direct participation in the RIP Program Document and RIP Action Plan Focus Group meetings. Members were encouraged to contact Grace Haggerty to get on the distribution list for the RIP Action Plan focus group.
- Attendees then reviewed the 1-page Research Symposium draft strawman document. It is important to keep a balance with the species as well as by work group. The intent was to capture the larger topics and less of the “routine” topics.
 - Concern was expressed that some of the topics are competing with the CPUE work shop and other metrics discussions that have to be addressed during the transition to the RIP. A member responded that while the issues are related, he didn’t see any real overlap. However, any overlap could be eliminated very easily.
 - Members discussed that there needs to be a symposium structure that incorporates the management audience as well as the technical folks.
 - This list of topics might be good for the Minnow Action Team but synthesis of this information for a symposium was acknowledged as a huge undertaking. Some attendees compared it to the data synthesis effort that the ScW work group determined was too tremendous to undertake in-house and recommended the work be contracted out.
 - Since it is highly unlikely that funds will be available for a symposium this year, the work group agreed to keep the document as an informative template that could be referred to once the Program has transitioned to a RIP.
- Thomas Archdeacon then provided an update on the captive propagation numbers. For the second year, 2 distinct colored tags were used to identify fish released in the Isleta Reach versus the San Acacia Reach and help track the upstream and downstream movement of minnows. In the Isleta Reach, approximately 15 minnow passed through the San Acacia Dam downstream; the other 55 minnow remain in the Isleta reach. Albuquerque was not stocked but the emergency contingency plan is in place should the average of the 5 sites fall to less than 0.1 fish per 100 m². Only 1 minnow was caught in the September sampling of the other 15 sites. 297,000 minnow were needed but the only 274,000 could be provided. This resulted in about 5,000 extra minnow in Isleta but 30,000 short in San Acacia.
 - No tagged fish from San Acacia were caught upstream. It might be interesting to mark the Isleta fish with 2 different colors to track their upstream and downstream movements.
- Yvette McKenna then addressed the ScW contracting questions.
 - In response to the question of why a the genetics monitoring was issued as grant when the work group had been told it would have to be a contract going forward, Yvette explained that the genetics work was approved with FY12 funds but was never obligated. It thus became a priority for FY13. The quickest way to get the money obligated in 2013 was to issue as a

- grant. The grant will be competed. Reclamation made this decision; otherwise, it would get “stuck in the bottleneck” and realistically not get funded in 2013 either.
- Regarding an update on the genetics peer review, Yvette explained that the Population Monitoring/Population Estimation peer review was preempted by the EC because there was no official process for addressing the recommendations. Unfortunately, this affected the other peer reviews in process. There is an interim peer review process in place now. It is expected that the Population Monitoring/Population Estimation peer review will be addressed and/or reinitiated with the completion of the CPUE workshop. The CC has considered the genetics peer review for a restart if additional funds become available.
 - In terms of potential upcoming Scopes or Statements of Work that ScW might need to review, it was shared that there are 3 pending ScW reviews: (1) Propagation at the BioPark; (2) the pending Combined Fisheries IA projects; and (3) the Spawning Monitoring & Egg Canal monitoring draft SOW.
- Attendees then began the discussion on the potential review of ScW project priorities. The likelihood of getting funding this year is very slim. It would take \$300,000 to fund the synthesis of data project first and then *additional* money would be needed to cover the genetics peer review. Based on this, ScW members agreed to postpone revisiting the priorities until such a time that additional funding opportunities are available, including for the synthesis of data, as this would be the indicator that other projects would “move up in the queue.”
 - Attendees agreed that the discussion of the RIP documents would be postponed until the January meeting. This will allow time for members to read and review the most current versions which are expected to be available by December 13th. Alternately, ScW members can provide more immediate feedback by participating in the RIP Action Plan focus group directly.
 - The draft 2012 Salvage Report was distributed to work group members via email last week. Typically, the work group gets about 1 month to complete a review and submit comments. Then the contractor usually has 1 month to address all comments and respond with how the comments were considered. Based on this estimated timeframe, the final report would be available by the end of February 2013. There is a comment template form that was distributed with the draft report. Attendees agreed that a “comment due date” will be established after Kelly reviews the Salvage IA to determine if there are any delivery due dates specified. Work group comments should be submitted to Ali Saenz for compilation.
 - Attendees discussed potential field trips or site visits as way to engage with the on-the-ground activities. Currently, there is no running list. Please submit any suggestions to Dana Price so that list of suggested sites can be developed. Several suggestions were mentioned during the meeting: (1) look at flycatcher habitat (out of migratory season); (2) ABCWUA’s drinking water project; (3) PIT tag operations; and (4) Price’s Dairy.
 - In a brief Program Update, it was shared that the EC is scheduled to meet on December 20th from 9:00am to 12:00pm. The main agenda topic is the “discussion of a path toward the 2003 BO expiration.” The draft agenda and read aheads should be available (posted online) by December 13th. At their November meeting, the EC decided not move toward endorsing any RIP documents until the Service’s Draft Species Needs “white paper” has been made available and reviewed. There are ongoing discussions about options to extend the current BO. The CC will meet tomorrow, December 12th, to address the RIP document and activity schedule. They will also be addressing the appendices and updates to LTP narrative. The CC will attempt to assign leads or timeframes to assist in preparing all the appendices, LTP narrative updates, etc. that will be part of the “whole package.” It was shared that the Corps is operating under Continuing Resolution. The majority of their funds are going toward the completion of the USGS Mesohabitat Study.

Next Meeting: January 15th, 2012 from 9:00am to 11:30am at ISC

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Review/Approve Science Team Organization Plan (carried over from 12/11/12); (2) Reclamation and Corps funding updates; (3) RIP documents – review and discussion?; (4) Baseline Study update – M. Porter; (5) Develop process on how draft work group information and/or documents will be included in the DBMS;
 - It was suggested that ScW consider postponing the January meeting until February as there will be no Program note taking available during January. If the work group must meet, it was recommended that a non-federal partner volunteer to provide a note taker for both ScW and HRW meetings.
 - In the event the ScW meeting date changes for January, the USFWS offered its conference room as needed.

- Agenda items for consideration: (1) the work group consider developing and instituting a process where by one of the Program staff has copies of everything so that it can be imported to the database (for draft and old SOWs).

Important Dates/Events:

- December 20th – EC meeting; agenda to include discussion of a path toward the 2003 BO expiration
- March 2013 – new estimated time frame for the CPUE workshop

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program
Science Work Group Meeting
11 December 2012 Meeting – 9:00 AM-11:30 AM
US 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 no changes.

Approval of the November 13th, 2012 ScW meeting notes

- The November 13th, 2012 ScW meeting notes were approved for finalization with no changes.

Announcements

- Congratulations were offered to Stacey Kopitsch and her new little baby girl.

November 13th, 2012 ScW Action Item Review

- ✓ Stacey Kopitsch will follow up with Gary Dean to make sure all of Yvette Paroz's action items will be addressed by Gary or Yvette's replacement(s). – *complete*;
 - As Reclamation's new primary representative, Kelly Oliver-Amy will be taking over most of Yvette Paroz's assignments.
- ✓ Alison Hutson will contact Ali Saenz to determine the process of assigning security (access) levels to users of the DBMS. – *complete*;
 - Yvette McKenna shared that she and Ali Saenz (Program Assistant) assigned initial securities levels to everyone included on the Program's mailing list.
 - There are 4 categories or tiers of access: a category Level 1 is public (restricted) and a category Level 4 is the EC level which has access to all modules, all work group levels, and draft documents. The securities can be modified as needed and appropriate. For example, the EC recently approved a "research level" of access for a UNM student.
 - The access and security authorization are being "spot checked" for appropriateness. Questions on access and securities should be directed to Ali as she works with the DBMS manager with D.B. Stephens.
- Stacey Kopitsch will contact Gary Dean to get clarification on how much direct contact the ScW work group can have with the Museum of Southwestern Biology since the work group is requesting information that is not tied to specific funding or project. If the work group is limited in the amount of contact, it was suggested that the COTR assist in setting up a conference call between the Museum and the work group. – *ongoing; reworded into a new action*
 - This action came from a work group discussion questioning what specimens does the museum have and how many are coming in annually. The work group did not want to overstep contracting or chain of command. The work group is willing to contact the Museum themselves in order to facilitate resolution – if this is appropriate.
 - Understanding what is already in the collection could help inform the Program on appropriate numbers to archive yearly, especially when the minnow population size is "healthier." However, the work group did not want to give the Museum the impression that this request for information was going to lead to future funding or the need for additional space.

- In past, the Service had provided specimens but they are no longer providing any specimens regularly. Basically, only the mortalities from permitted activities go to the Museum. Prior to 2006, ASIR provided a lot of specimens. The Service determined that amount was unnecessary.
- The work group really only needs yearly totals or sums as there is no intention of completing any “in-depth” analysis.
- Gary Dean reported that there is still no response from the Museum. He expects to have to contact the curator directly to obtain this information.

Action: Kelly Oliver-Amy will follow up on the action to clarify how much direct contact the ScW work group can have with the Museum, to determine what had already been done, and to help facilitate resolution. If necessary, Kelly offered to contact the Museum herself to find out the total numbers of minnow specimens that have been coming in yearly (especially since 2006).

- ✓ Comments and edits on the ScW 2012 Accomplishments and 2013 Work Plan are due to Stacey Kopitsch by November 30th. – *complete;*
 - Stacey updated the documents prior to taking her leave. They were provided as read aheads for approval at today’s meeting.
- ✓ It was requested that Reclamation provide a status update on the Genetics Monitoring RFP and Genetics Peer Review. Specifically: what has been done?, has an RFP gone out?, what is the current funding for each, etc. – *complete;*
 - This is an agenda item for discussion at today’s meeting.
- ✓ Stacey Kopitsch will update the ScW 2013 Work Plan with edits discussed during the meeting. Suggested revisions included: – *complete;*
 - Under *Attend CC Meetings*: the Lead will be change to “*Co-chairs, PMT Liaison, or other ScW representatives as needed*”
 - Under *Prioritize Future Activities*: the Due Date will be changed to “*As needed depending on available funding*”; and the Deliverable will include “*Provide the Project Description Template to the CC*”
 - Under *Review of Relevant RIP Documents*: the Due Date will be changed to “*Ongoing*”
 - Under *Coordination with COTR*: change Task to “*Coordination by appropriate COTR with ScW*”; the Due Date will be changed to “*Ongoing – Quarterly*”
 - Under *Review of Genetics Peer Review Report*: the following clarification will be added to the Task: “*Project on hold with no current funding and no new status or information is known at this time*”; the Due Date will be revised as “*TBD - pending update from Reclamation*”
 - Under *Attend Annual Workshop*: the Due Date will be changed to “*TBD - pending scheduling for 2013*”
- ~~Alison Hutson will try to send the most current LTP to ScW members as a refresher on ScW priorities, projects, etc. for continuing members and as information for any new members.~~ – *to omit; completed by update from Program Manager at today’s meeting;*
 - It was shared that the most recent LTP version can be accessed from the Program’s website. The LTP module is secure, so please use your individual or work group login. Once logged in, the path is as follows: Library>> LTP Development Library>> Revised LTP date December 2011.
 - Please remember that the text is now outdated, but the future and proposed activities and tables are there as well.

- ✓ Comments and edits on the ScW 2012 Accomplishments and 2013 Work Plan are due to Stacey Kopitsch (copied to Yvette McKenna and Ali Saenz) via email by November 30th. – *complete*;
 - ScW members were asked to specifically review/correct/edit their agency primary and alternate ScW assignments. – *complete*;
 - Attendees will review agency membership assignments during today’s meeting.
- ✓ Stacey Kopitsch (or Yvette McKenna or Ali Saenz) will revise the ScW 2012 Accomplishments and 2013 Work Plan and redistribute to ScW members as read aheads for the December 11th ScW meeting. – *complete*;
- Alison Hutson and Mick Porter will work together to explore the use of mixed model tools on the CPUE datasets for the Adaptive Management Recruitment Analysis work. – *ongoing*;

Ongoing and Continued Actions

- Gary Dean ~~Yvette Paroz~~ will redistribute the ScW project tracking spreadsheet to work group members. (*continued and reassigned from 10/16/12*) – *ongoing; to omit as Kelly will redevelop the spreadsheet with the most current information*
 - In a brief history of this action, it was shared that about a year or so ago, ScW wanted to have a better understanding and awareness of current projects including expected report due dates and other information important to work group oversight of projects. Yvette Paroz developed a tracking spreadsheet for the work group.
 - It was shared that most of Yvette Paroz’s agreements need to be renewed. As a result, Kelly will basically have to “start from scratch.” Reclamation is having to redo all their contracts as a result of an audit. None of the contracts or agreements could be renewed. The process now involves approval from Denver before they are elevated to the Regional Office. This has extended the approval time by several months.

Action: Kelly Oliver-Amy will redevelop the ScW project tracking spreadsheet with updates, expected due dates for draft reports for ScW review, and distribute to the ScW work group.

Action: Yvette McKenna will provide Kelly Oliver-Amy any available status updates on the ScW projects (for inclusion in the updated ScW project tracking spreadsheet).

- ✓ Gary Dean ~~Yvette Paroz~~ will provide/distribute the previous Spawning Monitoring SOW and reports as guidance documents for the work group to develop the new SOW in November. (*continued and reassigned from 10/16/12*) – *complete*;
 - Updates on the Spawning Monitoring SOW will be discussed during today’s meeting.

- ✓ Gary Dean ~~Yvette Paroz~~ will provide Stacey Kopitsch with contact information and phone numbers for the museum. (*continued and reassigned from 10/16/12*) – *complete*;

Action: Kelly Oliver-Amy will provide the Museum contact information and phone numbers after she is able to identify their preferred procedure.

- ✓ Gary Dean ~~Yvette Paroz~~ will update the Population Monitoring Scope of Work with the following suggestions/changes from the ScW work group: (*continued and reassigned from 10/16/12*) – *complete*;
 - The Population Monitoring package is already in acquisitions. The project has a 1-year timeframe, so if specific language didn’t get address during this “round,” it can be incorporated in either in negotiations or after the 1-year. This is a “status quo” effort basically for one additional year until the recommendations from the CPUE workshop can be incorporated.

- Gary Dean ~~Yvette Perez~~ will check with Ali Saenz on the DBMS data template(s) to include in Scopes of Work. (*continued and reassigned from 10/16/12*) – *ongoing*;
 - It was clarified that there are 2 different “templates.” The first is a boilerplate for the SOWs. Then there is the specific “data template” that will be specific to the type of work being done (ex. genetics data will be different from population monitoring). This is the template that specifies the “format” for the data submittal – what information/data needs to be provided, in what format in order, what scale, etc. in order to be easily imported into the DBMS. The templates are different from the “chain of custody” for data.
 - Lloyd DeWald is D.B. Stephens DBMS manager. However, it was cautioned that since this is a Corps contract, Reclamation is trying avoid the impression that “another federal agency is directing” Lloyd.

Action: Yvette McKenna will ask Ali Saenz if she already has the DBMS data templates. If not, it was suggested that an email be sent to Susan Bittick and Mark Doles (cc'd to Lloyd DeWald of DBS&A) asking about the procedure to distribute the templates.

- Rick Billings will email the ScW the draft HR planning/objectives document. (*from 07/17/12 meeting*) – *ongoing*;
 - HRW is still working on the draft HR planning/objectives document.

Election of ScW Co-Chair (ongoing item until filled)

- In a brief history, it was shared that each work group is supposed to have 2 co-chairs in order to cover all the duties and responsibilities involved. However, ScW has only had 1 co-chair for some time now. Dana Price, with the Corps, is the federal co-chair. It would be ideal to have a non-federal co-chair but even another federal co-chair would be accepted. This is, and will remain, an ongoing agenda item until the position is filled.
- Brooke Wyman, with MRGCD, had expressed a potential willingness, after she returns from leave (expected in January).
- NMDGF is in a period of flux and it is unknown who the official representatives will be.

Approve 2012 Accomplishments and 2013 Work Plan

- Both the ScW 2012 Accomplishments and ScW 2013 Work Plan were provided as read aheads. The draft documents were discussed at the November 2012 meeting, and in email communications since then.
- During the meeting, attendees confirmed the membership list (agency primary and alternate representatives) for accuracy.
 - Attendees discussed that initial or interim assignments made now could always be updated and revised at a later date.
 - For now, John Caldwell will be listed as NMDGF's primary representative and Kirk Patten will be listed as their alternate.
 - Rebecca (Houtman) Hooper will be listed as CABQ's primary representative until her replacement is hired.

Decision: After a review during the meeting and with minor edits, the ScW work group approved the ScW 2012 Accomplishments and ScW 2013 Work Plan documents. For the 2013 Work Plan, K. Patten will be the Alternate for NMDGF and J. Caldwell will be the Primary; in addition R. Houtman is changed to R. Hooper.

Approve Science Team Organization Plan

- The purpose of this agenda item was to provide the opportunity for ScW members to review the proposed RIP Science Team organization plan.

- Under the proposed structure, there would be a Science Overview Team from which smaller focus or action teams could be developed to address specific tasks. The RIP Action Plan document had a proposed Science subcommittee as well as a separate Adaptive Management Team and Water Action Team.
- The intent is to foster better communication by only having a single large oversight group; this way, all members are interacting as a single group for efficient exchange of information. The RIP Science Coordinator could be provided with the responsibility (authority) to assign folks from the panel to subcommittees (or teams) to get tasks/assignments done. The Science Coordinator could be given some power to make sure things are getting done and to assign the appropriate people so that the teams are efficient and working properly.
 - Attendees were updated that the RIP Action Plan document no longer contains references to any specific teams. The RIP Program Document has some groups described in general terms - with an emphasis on adaptive management and some possible focus groups.
- It was suggested that the review of the Science Team Organization Plan be tabled until a future meeting when the EC focus groups have more developed the RIP documents. The most recent (Final Draft) versions will be posted online by December 13th as EC meeting read aheads for December 20th.
 - Members were encouraged to consider the functionality and “communication” between the documents.
 - Attendees discussed inviting the RIP Action Plan Team to attend the next ScW meeting as a way to present the ScW member’s feedback and facilitate “face to face” communication. However, it was cautioned that ScW has not yet had those discussions internally.
 - It was pointed out that the focus groups are comprised of EC members – it is not likely that they would attend a ScW meeting in addition to all the other work they are trying to complete. However, they’ve opened their meetings up for additional participants – it would be better to have ScW participants attend their standing meetings. Interested members should contact Grace Haggerty to be included on the distributions.
 - In the October “round of comments”, the Program Document group did provide a response back to ScW explaining how the comments were addressed and why. However, the overall perception is that the provided feedback/comments are not being addressed and no justifications are being provided. The Program Document group seems to have a good response mechanism but it is not being employed across the board.
- The next step is to wait and review the read aheads (posted online by December 13th) for the December 20th EC meeting. However, providing comments through direct participation in the focus group is the most effective option. Work group members can individually participate through their agency.

Action: Yvette McKenna will provide the RIP Action Plan Focus Group meeting schedule and information to ScW members.

Approve Research Symposium 1-page document

- In a brief history explaining this agenda item, it was shared that the work group wanted to be proactive as possible with the RIP transitions. The Research Symposium had been suggested as one venue for sharing what is learned annually.
 - Mick Porter volunteered to put together a strawman of possible topics. He pointed out the importance of keeping a balance by species as well as by work group (HR vs. ScW). In his strawman of topics, Mick focused on the larger topics and less on the more “routine” topics.

- Attendees briefly conversed about what level of detail would be most helpful – should the strawman include suggestions on who should attend? How the event will be facilitated? Should there be cost estimates included?
 - One attendee expressed the concern that some of the strawman topics are competing with the CPUE work shop and other metrics discussions that have to be addressed during the transition to the RIP.
 - It was responded that the overlap with the goals of the CPUE workshop (and any subsequent workshops that may come out of those discussions) should have been minimized. The strawman topics are focused on habitat, propagation and augmentation, egg salvage, etc.; they are related to the issues for the CPUE workshop but there shouldn't be any real overlap. However, if the concern remains, any identified overlap could be eliminated easily. The strawman is not limited to the topics already identified – any addition ideas or topics can be added as needed.
 - It was pointed out that if the Principal Investigators will be asked to contribute, those requests are not on the current 2013 work plans and contracts.
 - Another member pointed out that there are really 2 groups to consider: the management audience and the technical staff.
 - It was suggested that the strawman include some language suggesting a symposium structure that incorporates the technical folks as well as the management folks. For example, there could be a topic review, discussion on what is known about that topic, and then pose technical questions in a “technical subgroup” forum. Then the highlights could be reported back to the management audience in a more distilled form to better meet the management needs.
 - It was suggested that work group consider postponing elevating the strawman and symposium suggestions at this time because of the tremendous amount of technical expertise and energy that is being required in the near term to plan for what needs to happen this coming spring and because there is no money in the budget to host a 2013 symposium.
 - The “larger” Minnow Action Team is scheduled to meet on January 16th to discuss the water piece and trade-offs.
 - It is unknown when the “next installment” of the minnow monitoring data will be available. Usually, the October sampling data is included.
 - Attendees pointed out the similarities to the data synthesis discussions that ScW has had over last few years. It would be a tremendous effort to pull all the information together. While the strawman list of topics would be good for the Minnow Action Team, synthesis of the information is a huge undertaking and it was cautioned against diluting the focus of the Minnow Action Team.
 - ScW determined that the data synthesis was too huge of a task for the work group (or any current Program group) to take on; the best option is to contract the work out if the Program wants it to be completed timely.
 - It was clarified that the strawman contains a list of possible topics, but it was not envisioned that all 7 would be addressed in a single symposium. Important or critical pieces could be delegated to different groups. The smaller pieces would be more manageable and could be addressed outside of a symposium.
- Since the budget won't allow for a symposium this year, the work group agreed to provide feedback on the symposium strawman of topics to Mick Porter and keep the document as an informative template.

- It was suggested that in place of a full symposium event, several smaller ½ day discussions could be organized. Also, joint work group presentations could help in the interim.
- It was also suggested a ½ day “discussion” could be explored with Darryl Ahlers and the flycatcher monitoring folks to address the Research Symposium Strawman Items #2 and #4. This could be hosted at their convenience – either in conjunction with a ScW meeting or separately. It was added that this event be routed through Vicki Ryan at Reclamation.
 - It was recommended that the HRW be involved in the ½ day flycatcher discussion event. Members of HRW have been working on prioritization and preparation for the arrival of the salt cedar beetle for the San Acacia Reach. This could be one of the discussion topics.
- It was recommended that anyone interested in participating in the biology group that is assisting the Minnow Action Team should contact Grace Haggerty to request involvement. This is a more direct way to provide feedback on what can be done next spring to help the minnow population.

Action: Gary Dean will talk to ASIR to determine when the next installment of the minnow monitoring data is expected (delivery date).

Action: Mick Porter will send an electronic copy of the Research Symposium Strawman document to Tetra Tech for distribution to ScW.

Action: Tetra Tech will forward the electronic Research Symposium Strawman document to ScW members for review.

Action: ScW members will review the Research Symposium Strawman Document and will provide comments to Ali Saenz and Yvette McKenna for compilation.

Captive Propagation Update – final numbers, info on releases, etc.

- Thomas Archdeacon, with the Service, provided a hand out containing maps with the recaptured marked fish.
- For the second year, 2 distinct colored tags were used to identify fish released in the Isleta Reach versus the San Acacia Reach and help track the upstream and downstream movement of minnows. In the Isleta Reach, approximately 15 minnow passed through the San Acacia Dam downstream; the other 55 minnow remain in the Isleta reach. This is the last year of the 5-year study in which the Albuquerque Reach was not stocked. There is an emergency contingency plan in place should the average of the 5 sites fall to less than 0.1 fish per 100 m². However, stocking will resume in the Albuquerque Reach next year regardless. Only 1 minnow was caught in the September sampling of the other 15 sites. 297,000 minnow were needed but the only 274,000 could be provided. This resulted in a shortage of about 30,000 minnow in the San Acacia Reach.
 - No tagged fish from San Acacia were caught upstream. It is possible that some Isleta fish may show up in Albuquerque – if the conditions were right (ex. an open gate at the diversion dam and connected path to the river). ASIR’s data is not yet available and they may have caught some Isleta fish in San Acacia.
 - In response to a question on continuing using multi-colored tags and if the experiment served its purpose, Thomas shared the opinion that it might be interesting to mark the Isleta fish with 2 different colors to track their upstream and downstream movements. However, there are only 2 (maybe) tag colors that can easily be distinguished in the field.
 - Usually, the Propagation group meets around March of each year, but they may have to meet earlier depending on the planning for the spring.

Contracting Discussion with COTR or contracting specialist

- At the November meeting, ScW members had questions relating to the contracting process that only a Reclamation representative could address.
- *Why was the genetics issued as a grant after the work group had been informed it would go out as a contract?*
 - The reason this question came up was because some ScW members (not necessarily all members) were concerned with the mechanism on the funding (grant vs. contract). There are not the same level of controls/oversight or deliverables required in grants. Also, members were concerned with the manner of the change – how the work group was told one thing but it is handled differently on short notice.
 - Yvette McKenna explained that the genetics monitoring interim project had been approved with 2012 funds. But it did not get obligated in 2012. It thus became a priority for 2013. The quickest way for Reclamation to get it obligated in 2013 was to issue it as a grant. Reclamation had to make the decision to issue it as a grant to get it obligated as soon as possible – otherwise it would hit the “bottleneck” and realistically not get funded in 2013 either. It will, however, be competed.
 - The original contract was at the end of the 5-years, so this issuance will be a 1-year base contract with 4 options years. However, the intent is to issue a new and revised contract before the options years have to be employed.
 - Making sure there was no lapse in the collections was driving the urgency.
 - The scope that ScW worked on was considered during in the process.
 - The genetics monitoring project has a pre-validated dated November 15th. It is proceeding through the queue.

Action: Yvette McKenna will send the information on the genetics monitoring grant to ScW members once it has been issued.

- *Updates on the genetics peer review*
 - Several years ago, the genetics peer review as at the top of the ScW recommended priority list. The genetics peer review had been approved by the EC and the process had been started but is now on hold. The genetics peer review is still a top priority for ScW especially as to inform any future changes for the genetics monitoring program.
 - Yvette McKenna explained that the genetics peer review was behind the Population Monitoring/Population Estimation peer review. The Population Monitoring/Population Estimation peer review was almost complete when the EC halted the process because there wasn't an official process on how to address the recommendations. This impacted the genetics peer review as well. Since that time, an interim process was developed and adopted.
 - It is expected that the Population Monitoring/Population Estimation peer review will be resumed (redone) through the interim process once the CPUE workshop is completed.
 - Then the genetics peer review can be restarted. The CC has considered it for a restart if additional funds become available.
- *Spawning monitoring SOW and any other states of work that ScW might be asked to work on?*
 - *Spawning Monitoring SOW*
 - ScW would like to know any upcoming expectations and potential work that they will be asked to contribute to.
 - It was shared that Kelly Oliver-Amy is working on the combined scope for Spawning Monitoring and Egg Monitoring in Canals. The combining of these projects is partially based on the decision from the Service to not

proceed with the Egg Monitoring in Canals. The Program is trying to streamline all related activities and Interagency Agreements (IAs) so it made sense to “roll” the Spawning Monitoring and Egg Monitoring in Canals into a single project while staying within the approved funding from the CC.

- There may be feedback from the Minnow Action Team that could impact this scope but Kelly is moving forward with it “as is” for now. For example, at the biologists meeting yesterday, there was talk about the appropriateness of having a more dedicated egg collection than has been done in the past. So there might be monitoring tie-ins.
- ScW reviewed and developed the scope back in December 2011. With the budget limitations, it is not feasible to do the full scope so the decision was made to just monitor the San Acacia site.
- Ideally, this scope will be finalized and to Jericho Lewis (Reclamation contracting officer) by the end of the calendar year.

Action: Kelly Oliver-Amy will facilitate an email review of the draft Scope of Work for the Spawning Monitoring & Egg Monitoring in Canals, once it is available.

Action: Work group comments on the draft Scope of Work for the Spawning Monitoring & Egg Monitoring in Canals are due to Kelly Oliver-Amy by December 21st.

- *Other Potential (Pending) Scopes or Statements of Work?*
 - ScW members would like a “heads up” on any other scopes or statements that they may be asked to do this year. These could be either the restarts on the Program contract work or 2013 work plan.
- *Service’s ES Office and Fisheries Agreements*
 - It was shared that Reclamation is waiting on the proposal from the Service on their combined fisheries work for an IA. As soon as it is provided, it will be passed along to the ScW work group. It was acknowledged that there is little review time for these agreements. As mentioned previously, Reclamation is trying to streamline by using 1 IA to cover different, related tasks. These are getting very detailed, much like a contract with specified milestones, annual accomplishments, cost estimates, etc. and Reclamation needs to make sure all the requirements are met.
 - In a point of clarification, it was shared that there are 2 agreements with the Service – the one with the ES office is more administrative and related to personnel support than the fisheries one.
 - ScW won’t need to review the administrative/personnel piece.
- *Technical and Administrative Support Contract*
 - The contract for administrative and technical support, including meeting note taking and facilitation, is also being redone. The projected meetings have been pared down – only the EC, CC, ScW and HRW are expected to meet monthly. The remaining work groups will meet less often (quarterly, every other month, twice a year). The CC has reviewed the scope and has approved the costs. As of December 31st there will not be any note taking services. The

acquisition package is ready but is shown as to be awarded in the 2nd quarter (which is anywhere from January 2nd to March 31st).

- *Propagation at the BioPark*
 - The BioPark's partial-year grant is also being worked on. This should be a straightforward one and is listed to be awarded in the 3rd quarter.

Revisit/review the ScW project priorities

- The purpose of this agenda item was to make sure that the ScW project priorities were still appropriately ranked.
- In response to the question of the likelihood of getting projects funding with this and next year budget forecasts, it was shared that the genetics peer review is behind the synthesis of existing data.
 - The data synthesis is currently estimated at \$300,000. Additional funds greater than \$300,000 would be needed to restart the genetics peer review. After that, the next study of ScW to come up would have been the sexing study (estimated at \$50,000) and that project already has a scope.
 - It is highly unlikely that additional ScW projects will be funded in FY13 – there just isn't enough money.
 - It was recommended that Reclamation and the Corps provide monthly updates to the ScW work group as any funding opportunities become available. This could be one way to help keep the work group informed of upcoming work or potential projects. It might also be the "trigger" for ScW to revisit their prioritized projects to determine if the priorities were still appropriate.
- The current "budget" priority is: data synthesis, then genetics peer review, and then the sexing study. In response to a question on whether or not ScW members would "reorder" those priorities to include a 2013 symposium, attendees responded that they *would not* put the annual symposium above the current projects. Attendees agreed that the symposium could be delayed until the RIP is established or other projects funded.
- ScW members agreed to postpone revisiting the priorities until such a time that additional funding opportunities are available, including for the synthesis of data, as this would be the indicator that other projects would "move up in the queue."

Continued discussion of draft RIP documents – if necessary/appropriate

- As discussed earlier in today's meeting, the work group agreed that the next steps would be to review the revised RIP documents that are to be posted at the end of this week. Discussions can be included on the January 2013 agenda. Additionally, members can provide feedback by participating in the focus groups directly.

Time frame for comments on Draft 2012 Salvage Report

- The draft 2012 Salvage Report was distributed to work group members via email last week. Typically, the work group gets about 1 month to complete a review and submit comments. Then the contractor usually has 1 month to address all comments and respond with how the comments were considered. Based on this estimated timeframe, the final report would be available by the end of February 2013.
 - There is a comment template form that was distributed with the draft report. Attendees agreed that a "comment due date" will be established after Kelly reviews the Salvage IA to determine if there are any delivery due dates specified. Work group comments should be submitted to Ali Saenz for compilation.

- Reclamation will provide the comments to the Service who in turn will fill in the column on how comments were addressed and why.
- Members asked if the contractor response comments are still being posted to the website for members to access. This is one way that helps the work group track progress and see how all comments were addressed and why.

Action: Kelly Oliver-Amy will look at the Salvage IA to determine if there is any specified report delivery date(s) that need to be considered when scheduling the due date for ScW work group comments.

Action: Work group comments on the draft 2012 Salvage Report should be submitted to Ali Saenz for compilation. *Note: an official due date will be established after a review of the IA.*

Action: Yvette McKenna will check with Ali Saenz if individual work group comment forms are being posted to the DBMS (in order for work group members to see how the comments were addressed). These would continue to be password-protected.

Tentative field trip ideas and dates (ongoing item)

- This is a standing agenda item to capture any recommended site visits or field trips as a way to engage with the on-the-ground activities.
- Attendees discussed potential field trips or site visits as way to engage with the on-the-ground activities. Currently, there is no running list.
- Please submit any suggestions to Dana Price so that list of suggested sites can be developed. Several suggestions were mentioned during the meeting: (1) look at flycatcher habitat (out of migratory season, coordinate with HRW); (2) ABCWUA's drinking water project; (3) PIT tag operations; and (4) Price's Dairy.

Program Update

- *EC update:* The EC is scheduled to meet on December 20th from 9:00am to 12:00pm. The main agenda topic is the "discussion of a path toward the 2003 BO expiration." The draft agenda and read aheads should be available (posted online) by December 13th. At their November meeting, the EC decided not move toward endorsing any RIP documents until the Service's Draft Species Needs "white paper" has been made available and reviewed. There are ongoing discussions about options to extend the current BO.
- *CC update:* The CC will meet tomorrow, December 12th, to address the RIP document and activity schedule. They will also be addressing the appendices and updates to LTP narrative. The CC will attempt to assign leads or timeframes to assist in preparing all the appendices, LTP narrative updates, etc. that will be part of the "whole package."
- *Other:* It was shared that the Corps is operating under Continuing Resolution. The majority of their funds are going toward the completion of the USGS Mesohabitat Study. In response to a question on the availability of the completed Cochiti Baseline study, it was responded that it is unknown what stage the report is in.

Next Meeting: January 15th, 2012 from 9:00am to 11:30am at ISC

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Review/Approve Science Team Organization Plan (carried over from 12/11/12); (2) Reclamation and Corps funding updates; (3) RIP documents – review and discussion?; (4) Baseline Study update – M. Porter; (5) Develop process on how draft work group information and/or documents will be included in the DBMS;
 - It was suggested that ScW consider postponing the January meeting until February as there will be no Program note taking available during January. If the work group must meet, it was recommended that a non-federal partner volunteer to provide a note taker for both ScW and HRW meetings.

- In the event the ScW meeting date changes for January, the USFWS offered its conference room as needed.
- Agenda items for consideration: (1) the work group consider developing and instituting a process where by one of the Program staff has copies of everything so that it can be imported to the database (for draft and old SOWs).

Important Dates/Events:

- December 20th – EC meeting; agenda to include discussion of a path toward the 2003 BO expiration
- March 2013 – new estimated time frame for the CPUE workshop

**Science Work Group
December 11th, 2012 Meeting Attendees**

	NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	Primary, Alternate, Other
1	Kelly Oliver-Amy	Reclamation	462-3552	koliver-amy@usbr.gov	P
2	Mick Porter	USACE	342-3264	michael.d.porter@usace.army.mil	A
3	Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3640	yrmckenna@usbr.gov	O - PM
4	Thomas Archdeacon	FWS	342-9900 x105	thomas_archdeacon@fws.gov	O
5	Rebecca (Houtman) Hooper	COA	248-8514	rhoutman@cabq.gov	P
6	Gary Dean	Reclamation	462-3601	gdean@usbr.gov	A/COTR
7	Jen Bachus	FWS	761-4714	jennifer_bachus@fws.gov	P
8	John Caldwell	NMDGF	476-8092	john.caldwell@state.nm.us	P
9	Marta Wood	Tetra Tech	259-6098	marta.wood@tetrattech.com	O – note taker