

August 26, 2003

**San Juan River Basin
Recovery Implementation Program
Coordination Committee
February 26, 2003
Meeting Summary**



Coordination Committee Members

Brian Hanson (for Joy Nicholopoulos, Chairman)
Larry Crist (for Henry Maddux)
Dan Israel
Bob Krakow
Scott McElroy
Tom Pitts
Stanley Pollack
Lester Taylor
Brent Uilenberg
John Whipple

Representing: _____

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ute Mountain Indian Tribe
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Water Development Interests
Navajo Nation
Jicarilla Apache Nation
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
State of New Mexico

Hydrology & Biology Committee Members:

Ron Bliesner
Jim Brooks
Steve Harris
Paul Holden
Randy Kirkpatrick
John Leeper
Chuck McAda
Bill Miller
Pat Page
David Propst
Tom Wesche
Shirley Mondy, Program Coordinator
Marilyn Greenberg, Program Assistant

Representing:

U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Water Development Interests
Jicarilla Apache Nation
Water Development Interests
Navajo Nation
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
State of New Mexico
Water Development Interests
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others Present

See Attachment A

Welcome and Introductions

Brian Hanson, acting for Joy Nicholopoulos, welcomed the attendees, who then introduced themselves.

Review and Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved with the following additions: a discussion of the Arizona Public Service Fish Passage and a discussion of the Long Range Budget.

Approval of September 25 Meeting Summary

The meeting summary was approved with no changes.

Review of Action Items

Shirley Mondy reviewed the list of action items from the September 25, 2002 Coordination Committee meeting.

1. Shirley Mondy/FWS will pursue reduced overhead charges from the Denver Finance Center. She may request/require help from Tom Pitts and others.
This action item has not yet been addressed.
2. A subcommittee of the Coordination Committee (Brent Uilenberg, Tom Pitts, Randy Seaholm, John Whipple, Stanley Pollack, and any other interested members) will review the Long Range Plan for the management perspective and recommend changes. The subcommittee will work with the Biology and Hydrology Committees as necessary. Recommendations will be sent to the full Coordination Committee for review.
One conference call has taken place.
3. Shirley Mondy will send out an electronic version of the Long Range Plan.
This has been done.
4. The Hydrology Committee is to devise a set of recommendations that would help define "extreme conditions" for variations from the base flow recommendations. Triggers should be developed for the Bureau of Reclamation to consider.
This will be discussed during the Hydrology Committee Update later in this meeting.
5. Comments on the Navajo Dam EIS were due November 4, 2002 (later changed to December 4, 2002).
6. At the next Biology Committee meeting, the following items should be discussed:
 - ◆ What are the effects of keeping the flow at 350 cfs through the winter to April 1, 2003?
 - ◆ How are the recovery goals going to be integrated into work plans, the LRP, and augmentation plans?
 - ◆ What is the status of the Augmentation Plans and do they reflect the recovery goals and timelines for recovery?
 - ◆ Discuss with the Upper Basin the use of some of their ponds for rearing fish instead of building additional ones. It appears that the Upper Basin Program has extra space that could be utilized if there are no problems with transporting fish across state lines.
These will all be discussed during the Biology Committee Update.

7. The Service is to check with the City of Durango to see if they want to reopen their consultation in order to possibly get their \$50,000 back. Randy Seaholm will help with the discussions. Shirley Mondy will discuss this with the Grand Junction FWS office, as this was their biological opinion.
It has been determined that the Service does not want to give the \$50,000 back because the construction has occurred. The City of Durango has paid the money to the Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Ponds have been constructed by the Program. The city will be requesting reinitiation of consultation.
8. Shirley Mondy will develop a tracking system for deliverables outlined in the scopes of work. From that system, a late projects list will be developed and circulated to ensure prompt delivery of products.
Shirley has started to develop a tracking system for deliverables in an Excel spreadsheet format with products and due dates. This will be sent out to the committees when all the data has been entered and verified with the principal researchers.
9. Brent Uilenberg will discuss with Reclamation contract folks about holding some funds (10 - 25%) back until all products are delivered. What are the implications to interagency agreements, state agreements, and university agreements?
Brent stated that he can hold some funds until all products are delivered in future contracts, but that cannot be done with old/existing contracts.
10. Scopes of Work
 - ◆ GIS - include contract and coordination with Upper Basin and Glen Canyon to see if databases can be linked and utilized by all parties.
 - ◆ Population Model - add a sentence or two under the methods section about the recovery goals and how the model will address them.
 - ◆ PNM Fish Passage Operation - Jeff Cole (Navajo Nation) will be submitting a scope of work for this. It might include maintenance of the NIIP rearing ponds as well. This will be reviewed by the committee at the next meeting.
 - ◆ PAH Study - FWS is asked to review the need for the continuance of this study.
 - ◆ Capital Projects - delete fish screens from the work plan; increase expenditures at the PNM facility to \$600,000.
Revisions in the above SOW's have been completed. The Service has not yet reviewed the necessity for continuation of the PAH Study. BLM submitted the scope of work and it was approved.
11. A subcommittee of the Coordination Committee and the Chairs of the Biology and Hydrology Committees will discuss the possible need for a revised contracting procedure for FY 2004 to better meet contracting needs. If it is determined that a change is necessary, the subgroup will suggest a new process.
This has been started and will be reported on later in this meeting.

12. Steve Platania will develop talking points regarding the availability of the GIS data to the public for discussion at the next meeting. The points should include what should be considered in releasing data.
Steve Platania will discuss GIS database access in this meeting.
13. Shirley Mondy will send out a revised Program document within the next couple of weeks.
This has been done.
14. The next meeting is February 26th. It is hoped that this will be following or preceding a Biology Committee meeting. It is hoped that Hydrology Committee members would also attend. (No action needed.)

Update on Long Range Plan Subcommittee

Tom Pitts stated that the Long Range Plan had been reviewed by the Biology Committee and was sent to the Coordination Committee. He thought that the LRP is quite general and it is difficult to correlate the LRP to the annual work plans and that there are some gaps between the LRP and the recovery goals. **Tom Pitts agreed to compare the LRP to the specific recovery goals and to the specific items in the budget to see how well they correlate. The subcommittee will then convene to discuss the LRP [Brent Uilenberg, Tom Pitts, Randy Seaholm, John Whipple, Stanley Pollack, and any other interested members]. Tom Pitts will get the revised document out to the subcommittee.**

Update on Budget Subcommittee

Brent Uilenberg stated that the subcommittee [Brent Uilenberg, Tom Pitts, Dan Israel, Tom Chart, Pat Page, Scott McElroy, Shirley Mondy, and Pat Postell] has had several conference calls and have looked at other programs around the country to see how they deal with contracts. The Biology Committee took a large step forward on February 25th in defining upcoming projects that the Program needs to be involved in. Defining how to contract for those services still needs to be defined. One perspective is to ensure that the research and science is protected by a process that includes review by parties other than Biology Committee members. The second perspective values retaining the expertise and continuity that has been established thus far in the research of the Program. Are Biology Committee members eligible to compete for SOWs, and if they are, then who will review those SOW? There is a subcommittee conference call scheduled for March 28th at 10 a.m. to continue this discussion. The subcommittee hopes to have recommendations for the Coordination Committee by their May 15th conference call.

Coordinator Update

Shirley Mondy commented that the Biology Committee meeting was very productive and it is unfortunate that more of the Coordination Committee could not be there. The meeting was scheduled specifically so that the Coordination Committee could participate.

Shirley Mondy had received no comments on the Program Document. Some appendices are still needed. ***If anyone who was with the Program from the very beginning can assist with identifying the appendices, please let Shirley know. Shirley will complete the Program Document, send it out to the Committee, and add it to the website. The Committee should forward any other changes to Shirley Mondy by March 15th so that she can send***

them out to the Committee for approval. The Program Document may need to be reviewed and updated every year.

There needs to be a 1991 ALP baseline table discussion added to the next Coordination Committee meeting agenda. The baselines have changed significantly since 1991. John Whipple thought that this table should be updated to include baselines that have changed since then. **Shirley Mondy will send out current baseline, with strikeouts, from the last Biological Opinion and the Coordination Committee can vote on it via email.**

Some contractors did not receive funding until January 2003. As a result, the Integration Report has been delayed. Bob Krakow and Tom Chart have worked hard to get the money to the contractors, but things were held up along the way. This and other coordination actions should facilitate funding being received in a timely manner in the future. Bill Miller has not received any notice/heard about/received regarding his funding. **Shirley Mondy will check with Tom Chart on the status of FY03 funds and will send the status out to the listserve.**

Shirley Mondy has attended nine meetings or conference calls since the last Coordination Committee meeting. Shirley Mondy and Larry Crist attended the Upper Colorado River Compact Commission meeting and gave an update. The Commission was happy to receive news and updates from the San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program.

Biology Committee Update

Bill Miller stated that augmentation plans have been finalized and recovery goals were incorporated into the plans. They have been sent out via email and will be posted to the website.

The Biology Committee determined that more rearing ponds were needed. There is money in the 2003 budget for this. The Biology Committee will evaluate the productivity of the existing ponds and determine best processes for managing those, as well as new ponds. Dale Ryden will survey existing ponds to determine current density and potential capacity.

Research integration has been delayed due to delays in funding. The integration subcommittees are trying to get back on track as best they can. The Biology subgroup has had two meetings to review and integrate work. The Physical subgroup contractors have recently been funded and are shooting for a mid-May meeting in Logan, Utah. A joint meeting can then be held in mid-July in the Basin. It is hoped that a draft report would be available for the Biology Committee and peer review panel in October; available to the Coordination Committee in November; and that the final report would be complete in January 2004.

The peer review panel said they would like to review the integration. Bill Miller and Associates may put in for additional funding to complete the integration, especially if the individual and subgroups are not able to do their own integration. The Biology Committee would also like to add in the 2002 data sets, through annual summaries (rather than detailed analysis) to look for significant data that might indicate a need for changes in research and/or monitoring for 2003/2004.

812 razorbacks suckers were captured that were spawned in the San Juan Basin in 2002; this is a significant increase. More of the larger fish have been stocked and are now becoming

reproductively mature. They are being found in backwater and low velocity areas.

Six pikeminnow were captured in the lower river; two in April and four in June. They were probably from the 1996 stocking. Those fish were pit tagged and returned to the river.

Augmentation:

200,000 pikeminnow were put in river in October 2002 and 100 pikeminnow were captured in November 2002. 125 razorback suckers were stocked in November 2002. Some harvesting problems were encountered in 2002 due to cold weather and vegetation in the ponds. The goal is to stock 300 mm razorback sucker as this is the size that seems to have the best survival.

The Biology Committee is in the process of developing pond criteria so that private parties could offer up their lands for possible pond construction. Jim Brooks met with one landowner and provided him with pond criteria. Paul Holden added that keeping ponds closer together, by building ponds, makes it more conducive for pond management and productivity. The Biology Committee is trying to move to a more active, less passive, pond management to increase the productivity of the ponds. Tom Pitts suggested that the public relations benefits may outweigh the costs of not having the ponds closer together. Brent Uilenberg added that the \$400,000 needs to be used. If the Navajo Nation is willing to manage the ponds for 2003, due to time constraints, Brent would prefer that option. There is not a lot of time to solicit other options.

John Whipple will talk with Mr. Dunlap about pond construction. The Biology Committee needs to meet with Manual Ulibarri and Mike Baker to evaluate the current ponds and determine what improvements or changes are needed. In May 2003, the Biology Committee will discuss what pond needs exist, and what can be done this year with the \$400,000.

Summary of February 24-25 Meeting

Bill Miller stated that the Biology Committee is currently seeking nominations, from the Biology Committee, for another peer reviewer. Dave Galat has resigned as one of the Biology Committee Peer Review Panel Members. The Committee will try to get a replacement to maintain continuity and to give the new peer reviewer time to get up to speed on what is going on. Dave Galat said that he looks at this Program as one of the more successful programs in terms of looking at issues and making considerable progress. He also expressed interest in staying in touch with the Program. He cannot make the commitment to attend meetings, but he would be available to review specific documents.

The Committee discussed developing a pool of peer reviewers for special reports, such as the integration report, per suggestions from current peer reviewers. These peer reviewers could review some documents and reports without having to attend meetings.

Bill Miller explained that the peer review panel gives feedback to the Biology Committee on statistical analysis and ensures that all disciplinary needs are covered for the areas of research. They also provide focus for the projects. Early on, the peer reviewers made sure that the researchers knew where they were going and stayed on track. Peer reviewers are paid for their time and for their travel. This currently costs about \$30,000 a year. The Biology Committee believes that the peer reviewers have had a good influence on the committee's activities over the last couple of years.

On February 25th, the Biology Committee looked at what types of activities would be coming up that we do not currently have projects for. These activities included stocking techniques or habitat improvements designed to keep fish higher in the system and methods for acclimating fish. Scopes of work are also needed for pond management - to establish a formal program for pond management, possibly in combination with the management of the PNM fish passage. BIA will handle it in 2003.

Action Items:

Shirley Mondy and Bill Miller will write up the new starts that were identified by the Biology Committee on February 25th. The Committee still needs to determine how to handle contracting. **These will be sent out to the Combined listserve. Program participants are encouraged to send them out to as many people as they know. Tom Pitts asked that they be added to the Upper Basin listserve.** The Biology Committee, with the peer review panel, will evaluate proposals that are received for this year. There has not been a chance to change this system yet. Tom Pitts suggested that the peer reviewers do the ranking for technical merit if there are competing proposals, especially for the proposals that have Biology Committee members competing against others. Bill Miller stated that all new starts should be ranked/reviewed for technical merit by peer reviewers.

One committee member asked if there was a process in place with Reclamation if an outside proposal were awarded. We don't want to advertise and be unable to award. **Brent Uilenberg agreed to talk with Tom Chart to determine what Reclamation needs to do to get a contract in place for a new contractor. Bill Miller and Shirley Mondy will send out procedures so that competitive bid requirements can be met from individuals who do not already have a contract. The goal will be to get the process cleared up by March 15th so there will be 30 days available for people to bid.**

Scopes of work will be due by April 15, 2003. There will be a meeting in Durango, Colorado on May 6th to discuss the scopes of work. There will be an integration meeting in mid-May for the Physical subgroup. There may be another Biology subgroup meeting in May. Both subgroups are hoping to meet in early July.

Hydrology Committee Update

Pat Page shared with the Coordination Committee that the Hydrology Committee has three tasks funded for FY 03:

- Development and completion of the 3rd generation model
- Operation and maintenance of the model
- Agreement with USGS for additional trips to maintain accuracy of the gages

The last Hydrology Committee meeting was a conference call on February 11, 2003. The modelers are working on the model and sub-models, and developing the new operating criteria for the model. Reclamation has hired a new modeler in the Grand Junction office and he is getting trained to run the model and be part of overall operation and maintenance of the model in the future. The modelers will meet with Ron Bliesner to ensure that they are on track to complete the model this fiscal year. It may still contain some provisional data, but it will be operational. The provisional data includes 1929 - 2000 depletion data from Colorado and New Mexico. The modeling effort may result in changes to the quantification of the baseline depletions and may result in a need for reconsultations. The Committee will use New Mexico's

depletion figures once they submit them. New Mexico does not know if their differences in data and assumptions would make any difference in the sensitivity of the modeling and the results, but that is why the disclaimer is in the model.

The next Hydrology Committee meeting will be on April 1, 2003 in Durango. The model will be demonstrated at the Reclamation office. Pat Page will submit a letter for the Coordination Committee within the next month or two. Since the first of the year, much energy has been put into dealing with the drought.

Regarding an action item from the last Coordination Committee meeting to develop recommendations for a trigger of extreme conditions, the Hydrology Committee could adopt language that would identify an extreme condition at this April meeting. The Navajo Contractors group that has been meeting since September 2002 has developed a possible trigger for determining if a shortage condition in the Navajo Reservoir Supply available to water users will exist in 2003. This involves using the Minimum Probable Inflow Forecast in the Annual Operating Plant to see if, under normal water demands, the reservoir elevation would drop below 5,990. If this is anticipated, then a shortage would occur. The Minimum Probable Inflow has a 90% chance, based on historical data, of being exceeded. The possible trigger for 2003 is part of an overall cooperative water management strategy being discussed by major water users on the San Juan River and has not yet been accepted by the water users.

Stanley Pollack commented that a more conservative trigger is more in line with Reclamation's responsibility. He expressed appreciation to the Biology Committee because when he goes to public meetings, everyone comments that the fish are a problem. The Biology Committee has been the most flexible in accommodating the needs of the water users. John Whipple echoed that appreciation and commended the Biology Committee for enabling the process to move forward.

Hogback/Cudei Fish Passage Reimbursement

Bob Krakow stated that he would like to come to some kind of agreement with the Coordination Committee regarding fish passage reimbursement. The BIA Farmington Construction Office figures for total Hogback costs were: \$4,501,634.

There was discussion about what the cost would be for providing fish passage around both of those structures, assuming that they were permanent structures, and what portion of these remaining costs are reimbursable costs from the Program. Reclamation designed and constructed the Hogback facility.

Cudei is the lowest diversion. BIA constructed the Cudei Project and stayed within budget. Fish passage costs are approximately \$1,618,000. BIA also constructed the siphon to connect the Cudei Project to the Hogback Project and removed the Cudei diversion. Removal of the Cudei diversion effectively dealt with both fish passage and fish entrainment issues.

The total expenditure by BIA was \$5.6 million; BIA is asking for a total reimbursement of \$3.35 million - \$1.35 million more than what has already been paid. Two million has been reimbursed by the Program to date.

The Coordination Committee voted to approve an additional reimbursement of \$1.35 million to BIA for the Cudei and Hogback structures. This money will be disbursed over time between now and 2006. BIA is agreeable to that. Reclamation and BIA will work out the reimbursement schedule and inform the Coordination Committee.

PNM Fish Passage Update

Brent Uilenberg stated that construction is going very well. The completion date is expected to be no later than March 31st. It will be completed on schedule and within budget. They need to get an operations agreement in place for 2004, and for BIA to operate it in 2003. Reclamation needs to get an agreement with PNM for long term maintenance of that facility. The total cost of the fish passage is \$1,618,000.

The Arizona Public Service Fish Passage is not a total obstruction to fish passage. It may just be an operational issue. We need to create the ability for the fish to pass. The budget includes funds in FY 2005 - 2006 if major construction is needed. Further research is needed to determine how much of a problem this weir causes.

Navajo Dam EIS Update

Brent Uilenberg stated that the draft EIS comment period ended December 4, 2002; and that 350 comment letters were received. Reclamation is in the process of responding to all comments. They want to get a final version out to cooperators in late May, and have a review period from June 1 - July 1, 2003. A cooperating agencies meeting will be held after July 1, 2003. A record of decision is anticipated October - November, 2003. This schedule was current as of Feb 4, 2003.

Data Accessibility for GIS Database

Steve Platania had stated at the last Coordination Committee, when reviewing scopes of work, that access issues for the GIS database would need to be discussed. His handout indicates the potential levels of access that might be considered. He will continue to update the Coordination Committee as to the progress on the GIS database. Until the database is a functional product, there will not be a partial database out there. Once the database is functional, further accessibility discussions will be needed. Steve Platania said that he will be able to come back to the Coordination Committee with a final product next year.

Everyone would get access to the home page and documentation, but access may be limited to the data. Right now, the data from 1997 and earlier can be released. After reviewing and cleaning the data, it can be released. For example, the data that is in the integration report has not been analyzed, it is really just reported.

The Program may need to develop a process where the data is analyzed sooner than 5 years so that the data isn't just sitting there unavailable. Platania stated that he has not received the funding yet due to problems at UNM regarding how to distribute the money. It is a two year project, so they do not have to come to an agreement anytime soon. They will develop a list of potential issues on how, who, and when access is granted. **Talk with Steve Platania if you have questions or comments about access to the data so that they can consider that in their planning and design.**

PNM Fish Passage Operation Scope of Work

Brent Uilenberg and Bob Krakow explained that Navajo Nation was going to operate the fish passage, but they are not ready to take it on yet. BIA is willing to operate the fish passage for 2003. The **Coordination Committee voted to approve modification of the SOW, approved in FY 2002, for BIA to operate the fish passage for 2003.** Reclamation will coordinate with BIA staff to make this happen.

Details on Congressional Briefings

Tom Pitts and Shirley Mondy will attend the annual congressional briefing in Washington, D.C. from March 12 - 18, 2003. They will visit delegates to discuss appropriations for Reclamation and the Service, and to support the appropriations proposed by the administration. They will point to the Upper Basin and the San Juan Programs as being good programs for the people and the fish. Shirley Mondy stated that the briefing book photos were appreciated, and photos would still be useful for the San Juan website and future briefing books. The briefing books will be available soon, and will be shared with the Committees when they are available.

Operational Plans for Navajo Dam for 2003

Pat Page explained that based upon the February most probable inflow forecast, the April - July inflow is projected to be 56%, or 381,000 af. With this inflow, and based on the Decision tree, no spring release will be made. This also indicates that no shortages would occur to the users. This would leave us where we were last September in storage in the reservoir: 6016 feet.

However, with the less than average snowpack and the low reservoir level, the outlook for 2003 is concerning. These conditions, in addition to a letter from Navajo Nation, spurred Reclamation to work with the State to look at possible ways to share in water shortages. Ten parties are on the list for endorsing the agreement to make recommendations to Reclamation and the State on how to deal with shortages. They are hoping to get responses back next week. March 1 is a key date - that is when the March forecast will be received. Reclamation will look at the minimum probable inflow forecast. If, under this forecast, the reservoir elevation is anticipated to drop below 5990 af, then shortages would occur to contractors, direct flow diverters, and the endangered fish. The current (February) minimum probable inflow forecast indicates that shortage would occur. A March forecast is still likely to show that the minimum probable inflow would result in a shortage.

Pat Page thanked the Biology Committee for their quick response. He also thanked John Whipple for all of his work. Pat Page stated that we wouldn't be as far along, if it were not for John Whipple. The parties have been working together cooperatively.

John Whipple explained that the small water users were not asked to participate. The recommendation of how to operate the river in 2003 came out of differences of legal opinion and was designed in the hopes of avoiding legal chaos until we get through 2003 and can hopefully get back to more stable or normal conditions. It is hoped that all parties will sign the agreement, then it will be up to the Secretary of the Interior and the State Engineer to distribute and administer shortages on the river. It is hoped that the parties will endorse the agreement within the next week. The deadline is March 10th. Once endorsed, there would be work to implement the agreement.

Achievement of Recovery Goals in the Lower Colorado River Basin

Shirley Mondy explained that she had requested information from Sam Spiller from the Service in the Lower Basin and has not heard anything back. ***When she receives information from the Lower Basin, Shirley will send it out on the listserve.***

Tom Pitts stated that certain activities have to take place in the Lower Basin in order to meet the recovery goals. Not much is happening in an organized fashion in the Lower Basin; i.e., there is no organized recovery program. Tom Pitts wrote to the Secretary of the Interior to propose the initiation of a recovery program in the Lower Basin. Copies of the letter were sent to the Service Regional Directors of Regions 2 and 6. ***Tom Pitts will send his letter out to the listserve.***

Long Range Capital Projects Budget

Brent Uilenberg presented the status of capital funds expenditures. \$18,000,000 is authorized by the authorizing legislation. \$4.5 million has been expended through 2002. There is \$900,000 budgeted for grow out ponds in 2003 and 2004. The Arizona Public Service Weir has \$1.2 million projected for 2004 - 2006. There is \$2.3 million budgeted for future projects in 2007.

On the Budget Leveling Discussion handout, the costs shown for 1999 - 2002 are actual costs. Projected expenditures are based on approved scopes of work and place holders are shown for FY03. A long range plan is needed for FY04 and out. FY06 is the earliest opportunity that we will have to make changes or to have new input. The FY07 budget will be formulated in FY04; the FY08 budget will be formulated in FY05.

Colorado has been invoiced for FY02 expenditures. New Mexico still needs to be invoiced. The first opportunity to reimburse BIA will be in 2004, if \$500,000 is not needed for grow out ponds that year. In 2005, there may also be some flexibility to make the BIA reimbursement.

Brent explained that it is very important that we get on with the LRP and identify capital projects. Being able to point to the LRP, and the needs that are identified to achieve recovery goals, gives us leverage for requesting funds.

Review New Action Items

- ◆ Tom Pitts agreed to compare the LRP to the specific recovery goals and to the specific items in the budget to see how well they correlate. The subcommittee will then convene to discuss the LRP. Tom Pitts will get the revised document out to the subcommittee.
- ◆ The Committee should forward any Program Document changes to Shirley Mondy by March 15th so that she can send them out to the Committee for approval.
- ◆ There needs to be a 1991 ALP baseline table discussion added to the next Coordination Committee meeting agenda. Shirley Mondy will send out the current baseline, with strikeouts, from the last Biological Opinion and the Coordination Committee can vote on it via email.

- ◆ Shirley Mondy will check with Tom Chart on the status of FY03 funds and send the status out to the listserv.
- ◆ John Whipple will talk with Mr. Dunlap about ponds construction.
- ◆ Shirley Mondy and Bill Miller will write up the new starts that were identified by the Biology Committee on February 25th. These will be sent out to the Combined listserv. Program participants are encouraged to send them out to as many people as they know. Tom Pitts asked that they be added to the Upper Basin listserv.
- ◆ Brent Uilenberg agreed to talk with Tom Chart to determine what Reclamation needs to do to get a contract in place for a new contractor. Bill Miller and Shirley Mondy will send out procedures so that competitive bid requirements can be met from individuals who do not already have a contract. The goal will be to get the process cleared up by March 15th so there will be 30 days available for people to bid.
- ◆ Reclamation and BIA will work out the \$1.35 million BIA reimbursement schedule for the Hogback and Cudei structures and inform the Coordination Committee.
- ◆ When Shirley Mondy receives information regarding recovery goals from the Lower Basin, she will send it out on the listserv. Tom Pitts wrote to the Secretary of the Interior to propose the initiation of a recovery program in the Lower Basin. He will send his letter out to the listserv.

Set Next Meeting Date

A specific expenditure decision needs to be made regarding grow out ponds. This can be done via a conference call in mid-May. The committee agreed to have a conference call on Thursday, May 15th, at 9 am.

The Coordination Committee requested three weeks to review the SOW's. ***Shirley Mondy stated that she can get them all out by the end of June.***

Attachment A

Others Present:

Rob Ashman
Mike Buntjer
Steve Platania
Dale Ryden
Ernie Teller
Chuck Wanner
Bob Oxford

Public Service Company of NM
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
University of New Mexico
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
U.S Bureau of Indian Affairs
San Juan Citizens Alliance