

Approved February 22, 2008



**SAN JUAN RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM**  
**Coordination Committee Conference Call**  
**October 29, 2007**

**Coordination Committee Members:**

Jim Brooks, Acting Committee Chair  
Steve Lynch  
Randy Seaholm  
Noelle Graney for Susan Jordan  
Catherine Condon  
Brent Uilenberg  
Al Pfister  
Tom Pitts  
John Whipple  
John Leeper for Stanley Pollack  
Dan Israel  
Absent  
Absent

**Representing:**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2  
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Colorado Water Conservation Board  
Jicarilla Apache Nation  
Southern Ute Indian Tribe  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6  
Water Development Interests  
State of New Mexico  
Navajo Nation  
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe  
Conservation Interests  
Bureau of Land Management

**Hydrology & Biology Committee Members:**

Pat Page, HC Chair  
Paul Holden, BC Chair  
John Simons, HC member

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Jicarilla Apache Nation  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

**Program Management:**

David Campbell, Program Coordinator  
Sharon Whitmore, Asst. Program Coordinator

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2

**Interested Parties:**

Bruce Whitehead  
Earl Dixon

**Representing:**

SWCD  
Navajo Nation

**1. Review and approve September 7, 2007, Meeting Summary** – Whitmore explained all comments received had been incorporated into the draft Meeting Summary and a final draft sent out to the Coordinating Committee (CC) on October 19. The final draft Meeting Summary was approved with a few minor changes.

**2. Review modifications to 2008 Annual Workplan** – A summary of changes made to the approved 2008 Annual Workplan, identified by the CC at the last meeting, was sent out on October 19. The CC members acknowledged the changes. No further action was identified.

**3. Review and discuss hydrology model issues/questions** – Brooks briefly summarized that the Water Development Steering Committee’s report of July 10, 2007, had prompted CC members to identify all of their hydrology model-related issues. To date, comments had been received from BIA/Bliesner, Southern Ute/Condon, Jicarilla Apache/Graney, and Water Development/Pitts. He said he had also had an email exchange with Whipple on the CC’s process to deal with the issues. Brooks asked if there had been any additional comments submitted. Uilenburg and Page indicated they would be submitting some comments this week. A discussion ensued on how best to proceed. Campbell recommended a workgroup be formed as the most productive way to deal with the model issues. Graney indicated the workgroup may be a practical method but she believes the whole CC needs to be involved. Seaholm explained the workgroup approach had worked well for dealing with the section 7 principles. Graney is concerned that because of the diversity and complexity of some of the issues and positions, they may fall outside the Program’s purview. Pitts disagreed that using a workgroup to frame the issues would be outside the Program process. He said the workgroup would not be a decision- making group; the full CC would make any final decisions. And, the whole CC can be involved in the workgroup if they so choose. Whipple said the issues are clear to him; however, after reviewing the comments to date, there seems to be a lot of misunderstanding and that a smaller workgroup would probably be better for attempting to frame the issues than the full CC. Uilenberg and Pfister expressed support for a subgroup. Israel said a subgroup maybe appropriate but, at some point, he would like a big-picture understanding of the issues and what is at stake so CC members can clearly describe the issue(s) to third party stakeholders. Condon said she supports the subgroup concept even if the whole CC chooses to participate. Leeper indicated support for forming a workgroup. It was recognized that this task will take more than one meeting.

Brooks asked if Hydrology Committee (HC) members should be involved in the workgroup because of the technical aspects of some of the issues. Pitts believes it is a CC process but that CC members could choose to involve their HC members. Seaholm agreed and believes the CC workgroup should take the first step at framing the issues. Uilenberg suggested that HC members would be helpful in framing the issues, at least initially, and then later when the policy-related issues were framed, the CC could address those. Graney asked for clarification of the workgroup’s purpose. There was general agreement that the primary task would be to identify and frame the issues as a first step toward resolving outstanding issues. Brooks explained that, ultimately, these issues will need to be resolved before the flow recommendations can be re-evaluated. He indicated that all written comments had not yet been received. Whipple reiterated that he thinks the issues are already clear but thought the original assignment was for CC members to simply identify their issues. Instead, most people commented on the Pitts report. He indicated he was writing up some comments on the Pitts report himself but that they were lengthy and would not be done until prior to the December 4 HC meeting. Whitmore said that after reviewing the comments received, she believes the issues fall primarily into two main categories, *Policy* and *Technical*. Subcategories under *Policy* include Program, Federal, and State, and Hydrology Committee and Biology Committee under *Technical*. Pitts suggested that Whitmore make an initial attempt to categorize the issues for use by the workgroup so they do not have to start with a blank state.

Brooks asked for a show of hands as to who wants to participate on the workgroup. Pfister and Israel said, “no.” Condon, Lynch, Pitts, Leeper, Seaholm, Uilenberg, and Whipple said, “yes.” Graney said she would need to consult with her client. BLM and TNC were not present to vote. The goals for the meeting were identified as: 1) identify all issues, 2) categorize issues as *Policy* or *Technical*, 3) identify who should resolve (CC or HC), and 4) develop recommendations (CC for *Policy*, HC for *Technical*).

Page expressed interest in the CC providing some guidance to the HC prior to their meeting on December 4. The following schedule was decided on:

- Whitmore will send a list of issues to the CC workgroup for review by November 16
- CC workgroup will meet via conference call November 30 from 9 to 11 a.m.

Pitts inquired as to the status of hydrology model updates. Page explained that the modelers were doing non-controversial data updates. Pitts stated \$90,000 had been approved in the budget for this activity but questioned if spending money on this should be delayed until after the outstanding issues are resolved. Page said they are also involved in important information transfer between knowledgeable Reclamation modelers to Reclamation modelers who will be responsible for the model in the future. Brooks said routine model updates should be done. Uilenberg agreed and said many non-controversial updates can be done while the issues are being resolved. Pitts requested a short write-up on what model updates are being done and what cannot go forward until issues are resolved. Page will provide this to the whole CC by November 16.

**4. Review Program's section 7 principles** – Brooks mentioned Section 8.0 of the Program document that addresses modification of the Program's section 7 principles. Pitts suggested the section 7 principles be addressed as part of the hydrology model issues effort. Seaholm agreed and said that after reviewing the principles again, he recognizes they are about much more than just the flow recommendations. Brooks emphasized that at the last CC meeting the Service reaffirmed their commitment to follow the principles. He also emphasized importance of an updated Long Range Plan to assist with use of the section 7 principles. No further discussion or action was taken on the section 7 principles.

**5. Long Range Plan (LRP) Update** – Campbell reported that another revision of the LRP was received from the consultant just last week. He said there has not been much progress since the last version the CC saw and believes SWCA has taken it about as far as they can. His plans are to close out the contract with SWCA and do any additional work in-house with Program staff that is now onboard. He mentioned stocking and non-native fish removal as two areas of emphasis targeted for further work. He anticipates a new draft of the LRP will be ready for CC review prior to their February meeting. Pitts emphasized the need to get the LRP and the budget into the same format. Condon asked if SWCA was paid in full for their services, as it does not seem that they have done much. Campbell expects they will receive their full contracted amount and emphasized that they have provided a product.

The need to schedule a CC meeting for February was discussed. Holden said the Biology Committee had set aside February 20 and 21, for a Biology Committee meeting. He also pointed out that the timeframe for the annual meeting was pushed to May so, in February, they will be discussing draft reports instead of final reports. A decision was made to have a CC meeting on February 19, 11 a.m. to 5 p.m., in conjunction with the BC meeting, probably in Farmington. The LRP and the hydrology model issues were identified as agenda items.

**6. SJRRIP Reauthorization Update** – Pitts reported there has been no change since his last update. It will either go through on the energy and water appropriations bill or, if not, a bill will be introduced next January and it will go through the normal reauthorization process. There is a lot of uncertainty about the energy and water appropriations bill. For example, the most recent version cut \$500 million in funds including those for Sandia and Los Alamos Laboratories. He does not believe that version will go through which may result in a continuing resolution. If it has to go through the normal reauthorization process, it needs to be completed in 2008 before Allard and Domenici retire. Condon asked if letters of

support are needed. Pitts said they are not at this point but if the legislation goes through the normal process, letters of support will be needed in January.

**7. Review draft Report to Congress** – Campbell said this is the second draft the CC has seen and changes from the last review are in red. He said he thinks it reads very well and does a good job of addressing the needs of both Programs. It has had a lot of oversight and should be close. Pitts explained that the recommendations included in Section 6.1 were to address power-user concerns. He emphasized the critical nature of getting this done and to Congress by March 1<sup>st</sup>. To accomplish this, they need to get the report to the Service and Reclamation regions for their review by November 1<sup>st</sup> so will need any feedback prior to that. Uilenberg said endorsement from the CC is important. Condon indicated she had some comments primarily regarding how the tribes are recognized. Graney indicated she may also have comments. Whipple said he sent in comments on the previous draft. Campbell said he forwarded all comments received onto Bob Muth. Brooks said that any comments on the draft report would need to be into the Program Office by COB tomorrow, October 30, to meet the November 1<sup>st</sup> time frame. The group recognized the importance of the report to the Program and to getting it done within the stated time frames. Pitts indicated letters of support will be needed but not for a couple months. Whipple said it did not look like his comments had been incorporated. He said he would forward them to Muth. The decision was made to have comments sent to the Program Office by COB October 30 to be forwarded to Muth before November 1.

Israel reiterated that he would like an overview of the hydrology model issue(s). Brooks suggested they wait until after the list of compiled issues is received from Whitmore on November 16.

**8. Schedule Next Meeting Date** – Important dates set or recognized include:

Oct. 30; COB	Comments on Report to Congress to Program Office
Nov. 16	Compiled list of hydrology model issues to CC (Whitmore)
Nov. 16	Brief report on hydrology model update work to CC (Page)
Nov. 30; 9 to 11 a.m.	CC conference call to discuss hydrology model issues
Dec. 4	HC meeting in Farmington
Feb. 19; 11 a.m. to 5 p.m.	CC meeting in Farmington
Feb. 20 and 21	BC meeting in Farmington