



## COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Ft. Lewis College, Durango, CO

May 18, 2017

### Meeting Summary

#### COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Tom Sinclair, Chair  
Catherine Condon (via phone)  
Brian Westfall (For Pearl Chamberlain)  
Dale Ryden  
Tom Pitts  
Stanley Pollack  
Michelle Garrison  
Brent Uilenberg  
Patrick McCarthy  
Leland Begay  
Katerina Diemer  
Warren Vigil (for Darryl Vigil)

#### PROGRAM MANAGEMENT:

Sharon Whitmore, Program Coordinator  
Melissa Mata, Asst. Program Coordinator  
Scott Durst, Science Coordinator  
Nathan Franssen, FCPP Biologist  
Eliza Gilbert, Program Biologist

#### OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

Kathleen Callister, CC Alternate  
Paul Harms, CC Alternate (via phone)  
Bill Miller – BC Chair  
Matt Zeigler – BC Member Alternate  
Mark McKinstry – BC Member  
Tom Wesche – BC Member  
Harry Crockett – BC Member  
Craig Townsend – BC Member  
Jacob Mazzone – BC Member  
Mike Ruhl – BC Member  
Jason E. Davis – BC Member  
Benjamin Schleicher – BC Member  
Susan Behery  
Carrie Lile  
Steven Platania  
D. Weston Furr  
Bobby Duran – BC Alternate  
Brian Hines

#### REPRESENTING:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), Reg. 2  
Southern Ute Indian Tribe (SUIT) (On the phone)  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 6  
Water Development Interests  
Navajo Nation (NN)  
State of Colorado  
Bureau of Reclamation  
The Nature Conservancy  
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe  
Bureau of Land Management  
Jicarilla Apache Nation

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

Bureau of Reclamation  
State of New Mexico  
SUIT  
NM Department of Game and Fish  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Water Development Interests  
Colorado State Parks and Wildlife  
Bureau of Land Management  
Jicarilla Apache Nation  
NM Department of Game and Fish  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 6  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Southwestern Water Conservation District  
American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2  
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

Roland Becenti

Bureau of Indian Affairs, Navajo Region

**Introductions/changes to agenda** – Sinclair started the meeting with introductions and asked if there were any changes or additions to the agenda. Brian Hines, UDWR, said that the State of Utah (UT) would like to become a partner to the San Juan River Recovery Program (SJRIP) and be active members of the Coordination Committee (CC) and the Biology Committee (BC). Whitmore stated that she did not know the history of UT not signing the Cooperative Agreement (CA) to begin with. Pitts said UT had been actively involved in negotiations of the SJRIP in the early 1990s. There was a potential depletion of 12,000 acre feet/year from the San Juan River in Utah. According to Pitts, UT requested a guarantee that the Service would issue a non-jeopardy biological opinion. The Service could not legally pre-judge the opinion. UT decided not to participate in the SJRIP at that time. Whitmore said the Program Document states, “If Utah decides to participate in the Program by signing the Cooperative Agreement, a vote of the CC will not be required.” Hines asked if there would be any monetary requirements from UT to participate in the SJRIP. Pitts stated that UT paid-in-full its agreed upon contribution to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program.

**Approval of Dec. 12, 2016 conference call notes** – Mata stated that she received several comments and incorporated them into the conference call notes. Sinclair asked for a motion to approve the conference call notes. The notes were approved.

**2018 Draft Annual Work Plan (AWP) and Budget** – Whitmore said the AWP development process is much further along than in past years because the schedule was pushed up to allow more time for the BC to technically review the Scopes of Work (SOWs). Whitmore said all BC members were asked to review all technical SOWs in the draft FY2018 AWP. For the review, they were asked to answer two questions, 1) how can the technical aspects of the SOW be improved, and 2) what is the SOWs contribution toward recovery. Peer Reviewers were asked to review and answer the same questions for SOWs in their expertise area. One new project was not reviewed by the BC yet. Durst explained that after the February meeting, there was a lot of discussion about the larger number of Young-of-Year (YOY) Colorado Pikeminnow caught by New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF) in 2016. A small group was formed to identify outstanding questions about hatchery fish and wild-spawned fish. During this small group meeting, an idea and project was developed and a SOW submitted but after the BC review period. The BC will now review that new scope and comments are due back to the Program Office (PO) by May 31.

Miller mentioned that the habitat monitoring SOW was also still in progress and Lamarra/ERI will be working with the PO to develop the methods further to address questions about flow-habitat-fish relationships. Lamarra will submit a final SOW that is expected to be budget neutral.

Whitmore said the AWP is in draft and the budget estimate currently shows that expenses exceed available funding. Uilenberg asked if there has been any discussion about Operation and Maintenance (O&M) costs for capital projects in the budget. Whitmore said that discussion is needed but because it is a budget issue, the BC will not be discussing it. Westfall said continued vegetation control at habitat restorations sites should also be included in O&M costs.

Whitmore said in the past, a placeholder for O&M-related expenses was included in the budget under base funds but the funds went unused in most years so we stopped including it. This may not be the best way to do it because if those funds are not used in a given year, they go away, but could have been used elsewhere. McKinstry stated that having alternative options such as the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) accounts to cover unexpected expenses is useful (e.g., repairs at NAPI ponds, purchasing PIT tags, PIT tag readers, and PIT tag equipment). He suggested it might be possible to give the Service additional base funds that they could administer and allocate for

unexpected expenses, when needed. Whitmore said such a scenario would probably not work or be possible, because the Service typically does not have mechanisms in place to administer funds for those purposes.

Ryden said this discussion about dealing with unforeseen O&M costs needs to occur but can be worked on outside this meeting. He pointed out the more projects we build that require O&M, the more O&M funds will be needed from here on out. Pitts asked if we could move base funds into a NFWF account to pay for O&M when it is needed. McKinstry stated that the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) had this conversation with their solicitors and they said Reclamation cannot use power revenue funds in this way. McKinstry said he has a memo that reflects that message. Uilenberg suggested that McKinstry work with Whitmore to see if his idea of providing base funds to the Service for administrating and allocating O&M expenses, when needed, is feasible. Whitmore added she also wants to get a better understanding of how the power revenue funds, capital funds, and NFWF funds can be used to fund projects and O&M and what the limitations are. This also involves coordination between the PO, OSM, and PNM about how the Four Corners Power Plant funds can be used to contribute to SJRIP recovery projects and activities.

Whitmore said the PO will be working with Principal Investigators (PIs) and researchers to reduce SOW costs, where possible. The PO is considering future cost-cutting measures such as reducing the amount of annual reporting requirements and having PO staff conduct some of the data analyses. The PO also plans to give SOWs with budget increases of more than 3% from last year a further look to determine why there is an increase. Condon said she noticed in the Budget Comparison that Whitmore sent out that the hydrology model SOW budget had a large increase, which is a concern, and Condon stated that unless there is a good reason for the increase, it should not be allowed. Her second concern is the idea of having placeholders in the AWP because she fears that something will go forward that is not approved by the CC. Sinclair asked Whitmore to go over the schedule for when the final AWP needs to be approved. A final AWP should be approved before the end of September if not sooner so McKinstry can get the contracting done before the end of the fiscal year. Miller said that BC comments on the new SOW are due to the PO by mid-June and they will schedule a conference call in July to finalize any response to comments. Ryden added that there might be funds available from the PIT tag SOW because the Upper Colorado and San Juan Programs should both have enough PIT tags for FY18.

**BC Update** –Miller described the BC’s technical review of the 2018 SOWs and the PO’s proposed schedule for getting the review done before the draft AWP prior to the CC’s May meeting. SOWs without budgets went out to the BC and peer reviewers for technical review on March 9. Comments from the BC and peer reviewers were due back to the PO by March 31. The PO sent a request to PI’s for revised SOWs and response to comments on April 7. Revised SOWs and response to comments were due back to the PO on May 1. The PO then sent out the Draft 2018 AWP to both BC and CC with compiled BC comments and PO recommendations on May 10. Miller added that SOWs that were reviewed by the BC did not include any budgets to ensure that the BC could strictly focus on the technical aspects. The BC also did not review any SOWs that were considered non-technical (e.g., Funds Management, Program Management). Miller said that the BC still needs to review the response to comments, due back to the PO by mid-June, and to review the new SOW that has not yet been reviewed. This will close the final loop on the technical review process on all SOWs. Whitmore added the technical review seemed to be greatly improved by having the budgets removed from the SOWs. It removes the conflict of interest issue the BC members had questions about. Miller reiterated that the review process was a good and allowed the BC to focus strictly on the technical merits of each SOW.

Miller said that the BC meeting focused primarily on the new SOW review process and the SJRIP's new environmental flows release process. The BC discussed last year's environmental flows regime and how to ensure good communications between the BC, the PO, and Reclamation so everyone is in the loop regarding releases to the San Juan River. Franssen said he was still waiting for model runs from Reclamation before the final environmental flows process document could be completed. Miller said 2016 releases were great for the habitat and fish and 2017 looks like it will be a better year. Habitat analyses have indicated that secondary channels are being inundated at lower base flows.

McCarthy asked if the BC talked about the effects of the high flows on the nonnative fish removal experiment. Miller said it was discussed and that crews on the river from all projects have to decide whether to cancel trips due to high flows decreasing fishing efficiency or making conditions unsafe to be on the river. It is not ideal if nonnative removal trips have to be cancelled because of high flows, but the total level of effort will not be compromised because the cancelled trips will be rescheduled and completed after high flows.

**Long Range Plan Update** – Mata provided an update that the Long Range Plan (LRP) will be going through a complete revision. The plan is to make the LRP a standalone document that would be updated annually. For this year, the main body of the LRP will be in draft form but the Appendix A tables will be a separate document that is updated to reflect current status of the projects. Condon asked for clarification for why this is needed. Mata stated that the PO would like to see an overarching umbrella plan for recovery of the two endangered species that is not updated annually. The plan would include goals and actions the Program needs to undertake to achieve recovery in a specified time frame. Mata suggested a potential timeline of 10 years. Pitts stated some concerns about setting up a timeline that goes past the Program's current end date in 2023. Mata said given that 2023 is around the corner that could be the timeframe which would make the revised LRP a 5-year plan. Pitts had some concerns about monitoring if the species are delisted. Mata stated that if the two species become delisted there would be a post-delisting monitoring requirement based on regulations under the Endangered Species Act. This is something that could be included and prepared for in the LRP. Mata said she will look into what language could be included in the LRP that reflects post-delisting monitoring.

**Remote Biologist Proposal** – Sinclair described the intent behind the proposal to hire a remote biologist. He envisions this individual taking a leadership role in assisting with several projects and activities as well as being available to quickly assist with issues that arise in the basin. McKinstry supports this proposal because having someone who is local who can assist with projects when needed will be invaluable. Whitmore said that SOW is quite broad. Pitts would like the SOW to include more details of what this individual would do with a specified budget for each activity. Condon referenced an email Pitts sent to the PO about the remote biologist proposal and PO staff workloads and asked if the PO had addressed his questions. Pitts said Whitmore will compile a list of PO staff roles but could not get it done by this meeting. Pitts stated that he supports getting someone on the ground locally to help with recovery projects.

**Changes to Program Document** – Condon reported that a workgroup of herself, Uilenberg, Sinclair, McCarthy, and Whitmore met to make changes to the Program Document regarding conflict of interest when the BC reviews SOWs for the AWP and the BC chairperson selection process. She said there might not be a conflict of interest issue anymore with the budgets being removed from the SOWs for the BC's technical review.

Condon discussed the addition of verbiage to the "Program Peer Review Process" section requiring the peer reviewer SOW to include the requirement that the peer reviewers provide recommendations to the Program Coordinator with respect to the LRP, project prioritization, SOWs, AWPS and budgets. Pitts

asked if the CC was okay if the peer reviewers provided recommendations. Whitmore added that the peer reviewers have never provided recommendations because the PO has only asked for comments, never to rank projects or make recommendations. Franssen said that in his opinion he does not think that the peer reviewers would be comfortable with prioritizing projects. Ryden added that it is not the role of the peer reviewers to provide recommendations or prioritize projects for the Program. Peer reviewers are here for their technical expertise. The technical review document that the PO provided to both the BC and peer reviewers is the best way to review SOWs. Ryden added that he does not think that the conflict of interest issue will ever be completely removed because there are a limited number of people who can review Program SOWs. Pitts added that the peer reviewers should provide recommendations, if asked. Again, Ryden stated that the peer reviewers should not provide recommendations to the PO; however, the peer reviewer's input should be considered when the PO makes their recommendations.

Whitmore said that the Program Document does not currently reflect the new process for technically reviewing the SOWs earlier in the AWP development process. The new technical review process was started because of conflict of interest concerns and it needs to be reflected in the Program Document. Miller commented that during this year's review process, the BC and peer reviewers provided excellent technical comments but no recommendations. If the benefits of each SOW need to be weighed to determine priority projects because funding is tight, it is the PO's responsibility to make the final decision on what SOWs will be recommended to the CC in the AWP. Miller said relying solely on the BC for technical comments, resolves the conflict of interest issue for the BC. He suggested that simply removing the word recommendations from the BC section of the Program Document may be enough. Pitts and Ryden agreed with Miller. Ryden reiterated that peer reviewers should not be asked to provide recommendations.

Pitts suggested that before the review process for the AWP is started each year, the PO provide the CC with a summary of last year's projects and describe how the PO-recommended projects fit into the Program's recovery strategy and budget priorities. This type of early information will help the CC determine if the Program's AWP budget priorities are consistent with the LRP and recovery goals. McCarthy suggested that the PO identify strategic priorities for the next 3 to 5 years in the revised LRP. This would help identify those priorities. Miller stated that identifying what has been completed and what is needed for recovery in the future could help put the budget into perspective. This may take a lot of work at first. Pitts stated that some SOWs are standard but new projects the PO recommends for funding should be brought to the CC's attention. Whitmore stated the draft AWP has been used to provide the CC with that information. Pitts said he wants to see something from the 30,000 foot level and how the SOWs will help to achieve recovery for the two endangered species. Whitmore said the recovery plans for each species provides the overall requirements for recovery. McCarthy added that it would be helpful if the PO put together a brief paper annually that summarizes all priority projects needed for recovery and why. Whitmore said the PO will develop an annual summary for the CC as described during this discussion. Ryden stated that the Recovery Elements will not change over time, but how the Program spends the money will.

Uilenberg asked if the issue of conflict of interest was resolved. Condon asked if there is still a conflict of interest if "recommendations" are removed from the Program Document. Westfall asked if the conflict of interest exists for everyone, including federal agencies. McKinstry added that Reclamation has a memo from their solicitor that states no legal issue exists for federal or state entities to receive funds. Whitmore reminded the group that the issue of conflict of interest is being discussed because the BC asked for clarification from the CC on conflict of interest verbiage in the Program Document. Condon said the workgroup will revisit the relevant sections of the Program Document again with consideration that the BC will no longer see budgets during the AWP review process.

Whitmore said the BC also asked for guidance on procedures for appointing a BC Chair. The workgroup added language to the Program Document that would put a two-year term on the chair position starting in 2018. This would result in three different BC chairs by 2023. Pitts said he is concerned about the use of a secret ballot when voting for a new BC chair. Pollack asked what the logic is behind the term limit. Whitmore said the workgroup thinks it would be beneficial to have different perspectives in the BC chair position. Ryden provided an example of how the Upper Colorado Recovery Program uses a 1-year term limit and all BC members must serve a term as the BC chair. It essentially forces other members of the committee to become more engaged in the Program and see another side of the Program. He does not think it is a bad thing. Pollack said that institutional knowledge is also invaluable and a consistent representative as the BC chair is not bad either. Mata stated that by giving other BC members the opportunity to be the BC chair, a new person could establish that institutional knowledge. As Ryden mentioned, this forces other BC members to be more engaged in the Program. Pollack added that there are arguments on both sides of the table, but he believes that institutional knowledge is valuable. Condon asked if the workgroup should make changes to the draft language on the BC chair. Miller said when the BC started in 1992, the BC chair rotated every two years and they shared the workload with the PO. It worked well because the chairperson would become more knowledgeable about the Program. He said the Program has shifted with the PO taking on more of the administrative responsibilities and the workload of the BC chairperson decreasing from the early years of the Program. Now, no one seems to want to step up and take the role of the BC chair. Miller thinks a two-year term is good but it should be voluntary for BC members to serve.

**Annual Meeting Needs** - Ryden brought up for discussion the issue of the February BC meeting and the annual May meeting being redundant. He posed to the group if it is worthwhile having both of the meetings or just one meeting to reduce redundancy. He asked if the engagement by the CC is enough and if they are getting the information they need to make decisions. Condon said that the annual May meeting has been beneficial in the past. Pollack voiced his agreement. McKinstry asked if it would be worthwhile for the CC to also attend the February BC meeting where the biologists summarize the previous years' work. Miller added that he and Ruhl had a discussion that the annual meeting should include topics or presentations on what has been accomplished toward achieving recovery. Miller suggested maybe having a half-day annual meeting held in the morning and a CC meeting in the afternoon. Whitmore emphasized that the February BC meeting is for the biologists to provide their first report-out of data and results to the BC for technical discussion. The annual May meeting is for the BC to provide a summary of data and results to the CC and interested parties. She said the two meetings have very different purposes and are both important. Whitmore asked Diemer for her perspective as a new member of the CC and having attended her first annual meeting. Diemer responded she attended the February BC meeting but the annual meeting gave her a lot of background information about the Program that she did not know previously. McCarthy made a recommendation to try a one year experiment in which the BC, PI's, and PO staff prepare a series of presentations that summarize program activities, synthesize monitoring results, and assess progress toward recovery. Garrison commented that the annual meeting did not synthesize the recovery activities and link them to recovery. It would be beneficial to synthesize each recovery activity, show how they are all connected, and talk about where we are in terms of recovering both endangered species. Sinclair agrees that there needs to be more synthesis and discussion of where we are in terms of recovery. The annual meeting is supposed to include group discussion about progress toward recovery. Diemer agreed and thought she would hear more of that type of discussion during the annual meeting.

**2017 SJR Environmental Flows/Navajo Dam Release Update** - Behery gave an update concerning the problems that occurred with the peak release from last year. She stated that Reclamation believes many of the problem areas causing the issues in 2016 have been cleaned out of debris. In 2017, they

plan to do a longer ramp up to 5,000 cubic feet per second compared to last year to help insure the same problems don't arise. Reclamation mailed out flyers to alert people about the planned water operations out of Navajo Reservoir. In addition, they had public meetings in the area to inform, answer questions, and send the message that they are sympathetic to those living along the river. Gilbert added that she attended the after-peak meeting as a representative of the Program and stated that Reclamation did an excellent job at the public meeting.

McCarthy asked what the problem areas were last year. Behery stated that there were several problem areas, but the main one involved an island that was diverting flows and causing loss of property. Franssen stated that the PO recommends a three-day ramp up and asked if that will be possible in the future. Behery said we will have to wait and see how the channel handles the flow this year.

McCarthy gave Reclamation kudos on their efforts to communicate with the public on their water operations. Behery stated that the problem areas from last year do not appear to be an issue this year. Ryden asked if Reclamation would continue to do outreach through mailers in the future. Behery said they will continue outreach efforts with mailers, television, radio, and business cards with relevant information.

**FY17 appropriations/DC trip update** – Pitts reported that non-federal participants went to DC in March with participation from the Tribes, Utah, Wyoming, water developers, and two biologists, Bill Miller and Pete Cavalli, Wyoming. He emphasized biologist participation is very important. The Programs are in the business of recovering the species and those experts are needed to help us address questions that are always asked regarding status of the species. The main purpose of the trip is to request funding support for the two recovery programs that is included in the President's budget. There were no details on the President's 2018 budget by the trip but when they get the budget details, they will circle back with Congress. The second mission of the trip was to lay the groundwork for extension of the funding authorization for use of power revenue funds from 2019 to 2023. Participants were advised by DOI to get started now on the funding authorization extension as it will require a lot of time and work. Pitts does not anticipate an issue with extending funds to 2023 because the Program's cooperative agreements go through that timeframe and there is broad support from all of the non-federal participants in the programs. The status of the species will be under scrutiny. The Programs have been at this for 30 years and the species are still officially on the verge of extinction. He is hopeful the SSAs and PVA being done will lead to downlisting. Region 6 may make downlisting proposals for two of the species starting in 2018. The species may not be delisted by 2023, so the programs' participants need to start thinking strategically about post-2023 programs will look like and what we can tell our constituents and Congress. Pitts thinks it will require re-negotiation for the programs' goals and funding arrangements and we should initiate those discussions now; we need to go to Congress with solutions. Pollack said that downlisting species would go a long way in establishing the credibility of the programs. Franssen asked Pitts how he sees downlisting happening since based on the current recovery plans, at least for the San Juan River, those metrics have not been met. Pitts said he does not know but the Service needs to consider if the species are still on the verge of extinction and if they are not, can they be downlisted?

**2017/2018 annual base funding update** – McKinstry stated that Reclamation is going forward with 2017 contracting, but still has not awarded some contracts. Reclamation does not get all of the money at once and the three Colorado River programs share the same pot of money, so it has to be distributed (albeit unequal proportions). In addition, Reclamation had hiring freezes and is lacking contracting staff. About a month ago, Reclamation was informed that any contracts with non-federal entities obtaining funds over 5 years and \$100,000 must undergo DC review. This is new and they do not know how it will work but it is affecting their ability to get funds to some of the PIs. All contracts

were submitted to DC this week for the SJRIP and they are awaiting approval. Ruhl added that anything that has a DOI nexus is being affected. Garrison said this is due to the new administration and they are trying to determine how these changes will impact the Colorado River programs. McKinstry said he would not be surprised if some of the contracts are not awarded in FY2017 especially when there is a deadline when funds need to be obligated.

**Capital funding/capital projects update** – Uilenberg reported on the Fruitland/Hogback Diversion Rehabilitation Project. In the design, Navajo Nation included a fish barrier wall in the channel to prevent fish entrainment with an estimated cost of \$972,000 to the Program. BOR will need to see the final design and a contract will be needed to cover O&M for the fish barrier. Navajo Nation has not said who the contract entity will be, but was informed it would not be Keller-Bliesner Engineering who did the fish barrier design. He hopes to approve the contracts for Fruitland in FY17 and Tusher Wash on the Green River in 2018. Bliesner mentioned that he was surprised their consulting firm did not get the contract to build the fish weir and urged Reclamation to pay close attention to that project design as it develops.

Westfall asked if it is possible for him to serve as Pearl Chamberlin's alternate on the CC for BIA even though he is on the BC. BIA tends to have a difficulty getting a representative to attend CC meetings. Ryden said he does not see it as a problem for an alternate, but if it becomes a reoccurring issue then that would violate the Program Document. Condon said that she would need to think about it before she made a decision because there were reasons why the Program Document states that individuals could not serve on multiple committees. Pitts said there is a need for a larger discussion with BIA to resolve the issue. Vigil said he does not have a problem Westfall being an alternate. McCarthy added it is more an issue of getting participation from BIA than having no representation. This is something that the Program needs to address. Westfall mentioned that BIA is trying to get Roland Becenti on the CC, but that may take some time.

**Next meeting(s)** – After the BC's July conference call gets scheduled, the PO will send out a Doodle poll to schedule a CC conference call for some time shortly after.

### **Action items developed during meeting**

Whitmore will work with Hines to prepare documents for the Governor of Utah's signature to the CA to become a partner of the SJRIP.

McKinstry and Whitmore will investigate potential mechanisms for funding O&M needs at SJRIP facilities and habitat restoration sites in the basin. Whitmore will work with CO, NM, and Reclamation to clarify appropriate uses of the state in-kind NFWF account.

Sinclair will revise the proposed remote biologist SOW to include more detail about the position's responsibilities and realized cost savings from other SJRIP projects they will be assisting.

For future AWP development, the PO will provide the CC with a 10,000-foot-level, two-page briefing document to accompany the initial May draft AWP. This document will put the draft AWP and budget estimate in the context of the LRP, Program goals, project priorities, and progress toward recovery.

The CC Workgroup will further revise the document in light of recent changes to the AWP process that have eliminated most potential conflicts of interest, remove the secret ballot requirement from BC chair voting process, and the suggestion that the chairmanship not be required to rotate every two years between different entities, if necessary.

At future May annual meetings, the PO will coordinate with the various PI's and researchers to provide a synthesis of results from the previous year's work across Program Elements, progress toward recovery with respect to species status, and recommended next steps.

The PO will coordinate with BIA's CC representative to discuss their availability in participating in meetings and to identify a CC alternative.