



Draft Summary
San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program
Biology Committee Meeting
San Juan Public Lands Center
Durango, CO
19-20 November 2013

Attendees:

Biology Committee Members:

Bill Miller, Chair – Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Jacob Mazzone – Jicarilla Apache Nation
Brian Westfall – Bureau of Indian Affairs
Jason Davis – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2
Mark McKinstry – U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Benjamin Schleicher – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6
Vincent Lamarra – Navajo Nation
Harry Crockett – State of Colorado
Eliza Gilbert – State of New Mexico
U.S. Bureau of Land Management – absent
Tom Wesche – Water Development Interests
Dave Gori – Conservation Interests

Program Office – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2:

David Campbell
Sharon Whitmore
Scott Durst

Peer Reviewers:

Brian Bledsoe – Colorado State University
Steve Ross – University of New Mexico

Interested Parties:

Dale Lyons – The Nature Conservancy
Robert Findling – The Nature Conservancy
Steven Platania – American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers
Mike Greene – PNM
Stephen Saletta – PNM
Carrie Lile – Southwestern Water Conservation District
Chris Cheek – Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife
Bobby Duran – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Susan Behery – Bureau of Reclamation
Ernie Teller – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Nate Franssen – University of New Mexico
Patty Corbetta – BHP Billiton
Ben Zimmerman – Southern Ute Tribe
Michael Howe – Bureau of Indian Affairs NIIP
Brent Uilenberg – Bureau of Reclamation

Changes to agenda:

- McKinstry and Cheek will inform group of updates needed to PNM fish passage.
- Include update on Ridges Basin from Uilenberg.

Approve draft summary from 3 September 2013 July conference call; review Action Item list:

- No additional comments on draft summary. Crockett motioned to approve summary and Davis seconded. Approved unanimously.
- Crockett provided update on non-native fish stocking procedures. Colorado Parks and Wildlife has revised the draft stocking policy that is basically in agreement with New Mexico's policy. Crockett will send draft to Program Office for distribution to the other signatories for one final review before the policy is finalized. Updated due date: 2 January 2014.

Discussion of Environmental Flow Recommendations for the San Juan River SOW submitted by Program Office:

- Campbell clarified that the Fish and Wildlife Service requested the SOW prepared by TNC and he has prepared written comments to BC comments on the SOW.
- Campbell reviewed his responses to some of the BC comments. Campbell views an RFP process as counterproductive because the work may be conducted by someone outside of the SJRIP. The project is intended as a collaboration effort by Program participants. The Program Office is leading the review and revision of flow recommendations with TNC facilitation and BC participation.
- The past flow recommendations have largely been met. However, it is not clear if the purposes of those flow recommendations have been achieved. Lamarra indicated he would examine if the flow recommendations' purposes have been met by the past flow managed flow releases in his upcoming habitat report.
- Flow should be reviewed and revised as part of a greater whole and the intention is to approach this process from a holistic perspective.
- The Hydrology Model should be completed in FY2014 and will be used to inform this process as well. Depletions and climate change should be evaluated as part of the flow recommendations revision process.
- A budget was not included in this initial SOW because of the preliminary nature of the SOW.
- Roles for reviewing and revising the flow recommendations should be consistent among SJRIP documents. For example the LRP and Program Document currently are in conflict on responsibility for this process.
- The group discussed the need to integrate fish community data with the flow recommendations revision. Teasing apart the effect of any single management activity will be difficult because these effects are confounded and the data is "noisy."
- Campbell asked for written review of the draft SOW by all BC members and Peer Reviewers by 13 January 2014 for further discussion at the February meeting. Campbell will distribute a cover letter along with his written response to previously received comments.

Discussion of 2014 LRP, 2015 priorities, and data integration past results and future needs:

- Miller indicated some sections of the LRP duplicate each other and there should be more focus on native species in Element 2 that would improve organization of the document.
- Whitmore asked for guidance on improving the draft this year. She is working with Jim Brooks to include benchmarks for recovery and include a "road map" for recovery in the LRP. These benchmarks should be tied to monitoring data but what these benchmarks will be is yet to be determined.
- Whitmore will send a list of status updates that are needed from each PI in the LRP. Status updates by PIs and BC review of current version of LRP should be completed by 31 December 2013.

- Wesche indicated that outstanding items addressed in the Sufficient Progress Report should be included as tasks in the LRP.
- The group discussed entrainment issues and the need to re-evaluate entrainment. The Hogback Fish Weir is completed but additional work may be needed to determine the weir's effectiveness. The BC should review the Renfro et al. (2005) report and continue this discussion at the February meeting.
- Greene offered an open invitation to survey the reservoir at PNM to determine if any fish are being pumped from the river.
- The group discussed the need to review past decisions on passage issues in the lower Animas River, the role of Lake Powell and the need for passage over the waterfall, and the value of conducting population estimates for T&E fish compared to using CPUE data.
- Evaluation of passage at Fruitland and APS needs to be scheduled and budgeted with Reclamation. The BC should review the Stamp et al. (2005) report and make a recommendation to the Program Office regarding the need for additional passage at these locations.
- BC reviewed the list of priorities for 2014:
 1. ESA compliance activities (O&M of existing facilities, SJRB Hydrology Model)
 2. Augmentation, including production, stocking, and evaluation
 3. Efforts to document recruitment
 4. Data integration in association with upcoming revision to flow recommendation
 5. Integration of general biological data
 6. Non-native monitoring and control
 7. Fish monitoring (in order of priority: larval, small-bodied, and adult)
 8. Habitat monitoring
 9. Peer review
- Priorities #4 and #5 should move up while #3 should move down for the list of 2015 priorities. Also, peer review should be included with ESA compliance activities since it is required.
- Franssen provided an update on the integration activities associated with his SOW. (1) "Effects of nonnative fish removal on native and nonnative fishes in the San Juan River" presented to BC during February and May meetings and is under revision with *Fisheries*. (2) "Factors driving the spatial distribution of Colorado pikeminnow and biotic factors limiting recruitment success" presented to BC during the February and May meetings and is available online in *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*. (3) "Growth and movement patterns of Colorado pikeminnow and relation to environmental variables in the San Juan River" presented to BC during February and May meetings and has been accepted for publication in *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*. The following activities will be completed during 2014: (4) "Environmental drivers of spawning and recruitment success of channel catfish." (5) "Influence of flow manipulation, non-native fish removal, endangered fish augmentation of the fish community of the San Juan River." (6) "Quantify razorback sucker stocking and population estimates to assess future stocking needs." (7) "Assess survival of Colorado pikeminnow to determine if current stocking numbers will meet goals of augmentation."

Update on reduced target baseflows and shortage sharing – Behery:

- Heavy rains through September have pulled minimum forecast above shortage sharing levels. There is currently a 120,000 af buffer in the reservoir to avoid a shortage sharing situation.
- If the winter precipitation is low it will be possible to return to a possible shortage sharing scenario.
- Releases will continue at 250 cfs as long as baseflows of 500 cfs can be maintained through critical habitat.

Update on phase 2 of habitat restoration efforts – Westfall and Findling:

- Currently in site selection phase. A recent field survey was a follow up to an earlier remote sensing exercise. Focus is on restoring disconnected secondary channels that can be accessed with heavy equipment.
- A single site at RM 136.4 has been identified for moving forward.
- Other sites were eliminated because of the extent of non-native vegetation and degree of channel incision.

Update of PIT tag reader installations at Mexican Hat and PNM and value of antenna at McElmo Creek – McKinstry:

- The installation at Mexican Hat was cancelled because of problems with the bladder dam and proximity of bedrock to river bed. This work will be rescheduled in 2014 during low flows following spring runoff and prior to monsoon season.
- The PNM installation is scheduled for the first week of December but may be postponed so the weir area can be de-watered.
- The installation of a reader at Hogback will start once the Hogback canal is dewatered.
- The reader at McElmo has detected 302 razorback suckers and 113 Colorado pikeminnow. Nate Cathcart will provide an update to the BC during the February meeting.

Colorado pikeminnow Recovery Team update – Campbell:

- Crockett and Gilbert are also on the Recovery Team representing their respective states, Colorado and New Mexico.
- Delist demographic recovery criteria for the San Juan have been revised to 400 adults (from 800) based on riverwide productivity estimates.
- Additionally, recovery goals for the San Juan River have been revised to be “and” rather than “or” so recovery for the species must include the San Juan River.
- Demographic criteria have been removed for downlisting. For downlisting threats need to be addressed and there should continue to be some positive population response.
- Campbell clarified that the recovery plan serves as guidance and is not regulatory.
- Campbell will distribute a table of identified threats and associated write-up for input from the BC.

Revision of protocols and modification of contract for habitat and temperature monitoring – McKinstry:

- Temperature monitoring will be removed from the Lamarra & Miller SOW and will be conducted by USGS. Temperature monitoring by USGS will allow for real-time data collection.
- Lamarra and Miller will continue to include analysis and synthesis of temperature data in their report.
- Although the overall costs of the Lamarra & Miller SOW remains constant, the SOW needs to be modified because the work is changing. All deliverables for this SOW will remain the same but data QA/QC will be conducted by USGS.
- McKinstry does not know when USGS will update their gages to collect temperature data so data collection will continue as described in the Lamarra & Miller SOW until those updates can be completed.

Process of renewing Peer Reviewer contracts and replacing Ron Ryel – McKinstry:

- Ron Ryel has retired and will not return to the SJRIP. McKinstry described some constraints with replacing Ryel such as having peer reviewers available across recovery programs and contracting with small firms.

- The group discussed ideas for replacing Ryel and suggested someone with statistical and ecosystem expertise such as Wayne Hubert. Others suggested Paul Holden or Dave Propst.
- The Program Office will look into seeing if Hubert is available as a peer reviewer.

Plans for upcoming work in Lake Powell – FWS R6 and UDWR:

- Plans are in place to survey the Colorado River arm of Lake Powell in 2014. Remote detection with SURS will be used more extensively. There have been some fish from the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell that have been detected remotely in the main channel of Lake Powell.
- The work in the Colorado River arm will be on all T&E species.
- There is no work scheduled beyond 2014.

Flexibility in timing non-native fish removal and other sampling to maximize efficiency – McKinstry:

- Efforts to reschedule sampling trips to maximize efficiency have been occurring to some degree. In the shorter upstream sections of the river there is more flexibility but it is not feasible to reschedule sampling trips in the longer middle section of the San Juan River that last for 10 days.
- Sampling efficiency appears to be related to turbidity and not flow.

Shifting non-native fish removal effort from lower to middle San Juan River in July and August – Hines and Davis:

- Increasing non-native fish catch rates in the middle section of the San Juan River and stable low catch rates in the lower river have prompted discussions of shifting effort from the lower to the middle section of the river. Duran identified times and locations in the middle section of the San Juan River where channel catfish are most abundant.
- UDWR has proposed shifting 1 or 2 trips to the middle section of the San Juan River while NMFWCO suggests moving as many as 4 trips. They will continue these discussions and update the BC during the February meeting.
- Population estimates should continue in the lower river and the effect of one-year of shifted effort can be evaluated after the 2014 sampling season.
- Any changes in the non-native fish removal effort will need to be reflected in SOWs although any changes should be budget neutral.

Monitoring protocols to document juvenile razorback sucker per captures by UDWR – Hines and Platania:

- UDWR collected small razorback suckers this past summer, 71 and 55 mm TL. ASIR identified these as age-0. Fish of this size move from backwater to main channel habitats during late summer. Fish of this size class have been more abundant as more larval razorback suckers have been detected in recent years.
- Platania will check how old fish of this size would be in the Upper Basin where water temperatures are lower than the San Juan River.
- There is no need to alter non-native fish sampling protocols to capture age-0 razorback suckers because efforts are in place to document age-0 razorback suckers in the San Juan River with the larval fish monitoring program.

Protocols for measuring non-native fish TL, potential bias of measuring first 25 from sample – McKinstry:

- Because length-weight relations can be derived with existing data, is it necessary to measure weight and SL in addition to TL? Also little is done with SL data so is it worth continuing to collect it?

- Should there be some other method of sub-sampling TL of non-native fish that is less biased than “blind grabbing” the first 25 fish? Length data collected during Adult Monitoring is used to evaluate effects of non-native fish removal on length of channel catfish.
- The group discussed perhaps measuring all the fish in a single sample once per day during non-native fish removal efforts. Davis and McKinstry will write-up a draft protocol for the February meeting addressing these concerns.

Ridges Basin update – Uilenberg:

- Reclamation met with FWS-R6 to determine if the fish escapement efforts for Ridges Basin are in compliance with the reservoir’s BO.
- Because of monsoon rain, there has been no need to release water from the reservoir. FWS-R6 has not yet provided their determination but Reclamation hopes this will be resolved by summer in the event they need to take additional action to be in compliance with the BO.

PNM fish passage upgrades – McKinstry and Cheek:

- Heavy sedimentation and clogged screens have made the PNM fish passage inoperable during parts of each year.
- Cheek will prepare a list of repairs that need to be made so the passage can operate more efficiently for Uilenberg so the contracting process can begin to resolve these issues.
- The passage has operated selectively as intended per past BC discussions. Cheek suggested opening the passage from March to September rather than April to October to better coincide with observed fish movement patterns.

Protocol for recaptured non-native fish with KSU floy tags and PIT tags – McKinstry:

- Fish (including channel catfish) that have been PIT tagged and floy tagged as part of Nate Cathcart’s study should be returned to the San Juan River following recapture. The movement data that can be obtained from multiple recaptures outweighs the benefit of removing tagged non-native fish from the San Juan River.
- Reclamation is attempting to fund additional work related to this study.
- Cathcart will present his latest findings at the February BC meeting.

Scale collection protocols for natal origins study – Platania:

- ASIR will work with field crews to ensure that kits for scale collection are in place for the coming field season.
- Various protocols need to be communicated consistently among all PIs prior to the field season. Additionally, data collection across projects needs to be standardized.
- The group discussed holding some kind of conference call or webinar before the start of each field season to ensure the appropriate protocols are being consistently followed across all SJRIP projects.

Discussion of general database issues and development of a joint database SOW with Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program – McKinstry and Durst:

- Dave Speas developed a RFP to create an online searchable database that would be used by both recovery programs. Data entry would be carried out by PIs. Reclamation would fund development but database maintenance would be funded by the recovery programs. Campbell indicated that costs would need to be known before the SJRIP could support such a database.
- PIs should work with Durst to ensure data is in standardized formats.
- A “master” PIT tag database would be useful to track the initial implanting of any PIT tags between the two recovery programs.

- The group discussed concerns about this data being publically available because of private and Tribal landowner privacy issues.
- PIT tag data obtained with remote PIT tag readers will increase the amount of data that needs to be stored and sorted.
- The BC will draft of memo to the Program Office voicing their concerns on such a database that will be forwarded to Speas.

Process for reviewing SJRIP reports and papers based on SJRIP data submitted to publication – McKinsty and Franssen:

- Additional detail has been included in the SOW defining the deliverables that will be provided.
- Because the BC has received updates on the results these projects at past meetings, is there a need for additional review of manuscripts submitted for publication by the BC? Could draft manuscripts be given to BC members at the same time they are submitted for publication? Franssen expressed concern that if manuscripts are distributed concurrently with submission to a journal, the review process could be compromised.
- Franssen will present major findings at or before the February meeting so the BC is kept in the loop on the results of his research.

Options for holding meetings remotely, GoToMeeting, Adobe Connect, or other webinar format – Miller:

- The Program Office cannot initiate these meetings due to various issues but Keller-Bliesner and TNC will look into their ability to host webinar format meetings and will follow up with the group on possibly conducting a trial run prior to the February meeting.
- The group discussed holding remote meetings for all meetings except the February and May meetings.

SJRIP representation at non-native fish workshop 4-5 December 2013 and Researcher's Meeting 14-15 January 2014 in Grand Junction, CO – Campbell and Miller:

- Miller and Campbell encouraged SJRIP attendance and participation in these upcoming meetings.

Process for documenting BC decisions (memo to Program Coordinator) – Miller:

- In order to document and track important decision points Miller recommended that memos be prepared by the BC and addressed to the Program Coordinator. These memos would then be forwarded from the Program Office to the CC.

Recap decision points and review assigned action items:

- Campbell will send out a cover letter and responses to comments on the Environmental Flow Recommendations for the San Juan River SOW.
- PIs will update work status in LRP by 31 December 2013 (Whitmore will send a reminder what she needs from each PI).
- BC will provide comments on current version of LRP.
- BC will review Renfro et al. (2005) and Stamp et al. (2005) reports prior to the February meeting.
- Whitmore will add interim benchmarks to LRP.
- Lamarra will test to determine if purposes of flow recommendations have been met.
- Reclamation will provide an update on the feasibility of fish passage at Fruitland, APS, and the lower Animas River and also provide an update on the status fish escapement at Ridges Basin.
- BC will draft memo on database RFP that the Program Office will forward to Speas.

3 December 2013

- Hold “pre-field” meeting to ensure all protocols are being consistency followed and ensure data is being collected in standardized manner. Use this meeting to test remote meeting options. BioMark has reader that can be used for electronic data entry.
- Follow up with NNF stocking procedures.
- TNC will revise Environmental Flow Recommendations SOW.

Schedule February meeting:

- 26-27 February 2014 in Durango. The Program Office will look into holding the meeting at Fort Lewis College. McKinstry will see if Hubert is available for this meeting.

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG

(Updated 3 December 2013)

| Item No. * | Action Item | Meeting/O rigination Date | Responsible Party(s) | Due Date | Revised Date | Date Completed |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Provide RBS/CPM stocking/capture/recapture data | | P.I.'s to the Program Office | Annually before Jan. 1 | | |
| 2 | Provide Preliminary Draft Report Presentations | | Project Leads (authors) | Annually at Feb. meeting | | |
| 3 | Review LRP | | BC | Annually at fall meeting | | |
| 4 | Review Peer Review Comments from the February and May meetings | | BC | Annually at fall meeting | | |
| 5 | Provide Draft Reports | | Project Leads (authors) to Program Office | Annually by end of March | | |
| 6 | Scopes of Work | | Project Leads to Program Office | Annually by end of March | | |
| 7 | Provide Final Reports | | Project Leads (authors) to Program Office | Annually by end of June | | |

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG

(Updated 3 December 2013)

| Item No. * | Action Item | Meeting/O rigination Date | Responsible Party(s) | Due Date | Revised Date | Date Completed |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| 8 | Annual Data Delivery | | Pls to Program Office | Annually by June 30 | | |
| 9 | T&E Species Data | | BC to Program Office | Annually by Dec. 31 | | |
| 10 | Annually compile T&E data and Program progress into summary to address overall Program recovery goals/objectives for presentation at annual meeting | | Program Office/BC | By Annual Meeting in May | | |
| 11 | Distribute Consolidated Data and list of annual data collected and available in the Program's database | | Program Office to BC | Annually by Jan. 31 | | |
| 12 | Recapture analysis on PIT tagged fish | | Durst | Annually by March | | |
| 13 | Coordinate CPM stocking closely with Reclamation to avoid negative impact due to high flows/releases | | Project Leads | Annually | | |
| 14 | Waterfall Inundation Whitepaper – review past meeting summaries, determine what is needed, and provide report at the next meeting. | 05/18/07 | Program Office | 12/07/07 | Not a current priority | |

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG

(Updated 3 December 2013)

| Item No. * | Action Item | Meeting/O rigination Date | Responsible Party(s) | Due Date | Revised Date | Date Completed |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|------------------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------|
| 15 | Revise RBS Augmentation Goals (based on the outcome of experimental stocking) | 5/10/10 | FWS Fisheries/Program Office | 5/2011 – provide update and extend as needed | ongoing | |
| 16 | Develop a detailed outline for San Juan River Recovery Program case history manuscript | 11-5-08 | Propst/Miller | | | On hold |
| 17 | Pursue Non-native fish stocking procedures | 11/5/09 | Crockett and Gilbert | 12/1/09 | 1/2/14 | |
| 18 | Pursue effects study on Hg/pikeminnow with other groups/programs | 1/14/10 | Program Office lead | ongoing | | |
| 19 | Discussion of what is the appropriate number of fish to stock | 3/23/10 | BC | ongoing | | |
| 20 | Southern Ute funding of Population Model | 5/10/10 | Miller | 11/2010 | ongoing | |
| 21 | Work with I&E Coordinator to determine feasibility of brochures and signs | 11/10/10 | PO | 2/24/11 | Ongoing | |
| 22 | Prepare memo to CC conveying BC recommendation to conduct a feasibility study on removing fish barriers in the lower Animas River | 7/9/12 | PO | 8/20/12 | 5/7/13 | |

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG

(Updated 3 December 2013)

| Item No. * | Action Item | Meeting/O rigination Date | Responsible Party(s) | Due Date | Revised Date | Date Completed |
|---------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 23 | NNF workshop recommendations to Davis | 2/21/13 | BC | 3/18/13 | | |
| 24 | Pros and cons of moving non-native removal trips from lower to middle sections of river | 5/7/13 | Davis | 6/28/13 | | |
| 25 | Complete Threats Assessment draft | 5/7/13 | TNC | 6/28/13 | | |
| 26 | Provide written comments on TNC SOW reviewing and revising flow recommendations | 7/2/13 | BC to PO | 8/30/13 | 9/20/13 | 11/1/2013 |
| 27 | Evaluation of effects of lower target base flows during stocking | 9/3/2013 | Davis to BC | | | 9/20/13 |
| 28 | Determine if past flows met intended purposes of the flow recommendations | 11/19/13 | Lamarra | 2/26/14 | | |
| 29 | Review of Environmental Flow Recommendations for the San Juan River SOW | 11/19/13 | BC and Peer Reviewers | 1/13/14 | | |
| 30 | Review and status update of LRP | 11/19/13 | BC and Pls | 12/31/13 | | |
| 31 | Check availability of Wayne Hubert to serve as SJRIP peer reviewer | 11/19/13 | McKinstry and PO | 1/13/14 | | |

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG

(Updated 3 December 2013)

| Item No. * | Action Item | Meeting/O rigination Date | Responsible Party(s) | Due Date | Revised Date | Date Completed |
|---------------|--|---------------------------------|----------------------|----------|-----------------|-------------------|
| 32 | Draft protocol for measuring non-native fish during removal passes | 11/19/13 | McKinstry and Davis | 2/26/14 | | |
| 33 | Memo voicing concerns of joint database SOW prepared by Speas | 11/19/13 | BC to PO | 2/26/14 | | |

* Items were re-numbered after changes were made

Yellow highlight indicates annual action items

Green highlight indicates new action items

Red highlight indicates completed action items that will be removed from the next iteration of the Action Item Log

Annual SJRRIP Cycle (Oct. 1 –Sept. 30)

January 2011 version

| Date | Annual Tasks | PO | CC | BC | P.I. |
|-----------|---|----|----|----|------|
| Oct. | Reclamation administers contracts | X | | | |
| Nov. | BC Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify questions for annual data integration Review data integration results from previous year Discuss Program priorities LRP review and provide recommendations (pros and cons) to Program Office | X | | X | |
| Dec. 31 | RBS/CPM stocking/capture/recapture data to Program Office | | | | X |
| January | Notification/update of Program rosters/ mailing lists | X | | | |
| January | Executive meeting (Program Office; Reclamation Fund Manager; CC and BC Chairs) to do preliminary planning for upcoming year | X | X | X | |
| January | Updated LRP to BC and CC for review | X | X | | |
| Jan. 31 | Distribute consolidated PIT tag data and post other data | X | | | |
| February | BC Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare for Annual Meeting Provide preliminary results; draft report presentations Review updated LRP Review annual data integration priorities | X | | X | X |
| February | Final updated LRP to CC (with explanation of input included/not included) | X | | | |
| Feb/Mar | Approval of yearly LRP | | X | | |
| March | Annual guidance/solicitation for SOWs based on LRP/list of prioritized projects | X | | | |
| March 31 | Draft reports due/SOWs to Program Office | | | X | X |
| April | Preliminary draft Annual Workplan and Budget | X | | | |
| May | Annual Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program overview P.I. presentations Review preliminary draft AWP Committee reports | X | X | X | X |
| June/July | Draft Annual Workplan and Budget | X | | | |
| June 30 | Provide final reports and data sets | | | | X |
| August | Tech review of draft AWP; recommendations with pros and cons to Program Office | | | X | |
| August | Revise AWP based on input and transmit final draft to CC with documentation of all input | X | | | |
| Sept. | Review and approve final AWP | | X | | |
| Sept. | Post final AWP to website | X | | | |