



**SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN RECOVERY
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM (SJRIP)
COORDINATION COMMITTEE**

Tuesday, July 30, 2019

Final Meeting Summary

COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CC) MEMBERS:

Jason Davis, Chair
Catherine Condon
Dale Ryden
Tom Pitts
Stanley Pollack
Michelle Garrison
Ryan Christianson
Patrick McCarthy
Absent
Absent
Absent
Absent

REPRESENTING:

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Service), Region 2
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 6
Water Development Interests
Navajo Nation
State of Colorado
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)
The Nature Conservancy
Jicarilla Apache Nation
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)
State of New Mexico

PROGRAM OFFICE (PO):

Melissa Mata, Program Coordinator
Eliza Gilbert, Program Biologist

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

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

Susan Millsap, CC Alternate
Jojo La, CC Alternate
Kathleen Callister, CC Alternate
Christina Nofsker, CC Alternate
Crystal Tulley-Cordova, CC Alternate
Jacob Mazzone, BC Chair
Nathan Franssen
David Campbell
Colleen Cunningham
Commission
Lee Traynham
Susan Behery
Paul Badame

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2
State of Colorado
Bureau of Reclamation
State of New Mexico
Navajo Nation
Jicarilla Apache Nation
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2
New Mexico Interstate Stream

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
State of Utah

1. Introductions/changes to agenda – Davis

Changes or additions: New Mexico would like to talk about Peer Reviewers retiring and whether or not they should be replaced.

2. Review of action items identified during 16 May 2019 meeting – Davis

Action Item 1: The PO will develop a quick reference of BC and CC responsibilities/processes with specific examples.

Ongoing.

Action Item 2: CC comments on the draft Annual Work Plan (AWP) - due date 14 June 2019. Completed. PO received comments from Condon. Additional comments came in today prior to meeting.

Action Item 3: The PO in coordination with Region 6 will summarize the contribution of Lake Powell to recovery

Ongoing. The PO communicated with Tom Chart, Program Director, Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program (UCREFRP) about writing a document to summarize the contribution of Lake Powell and recovery. Julie Stahli will assist. The highest priority is to get through post-2023 planning process and have a written product for Lake Powell by the winter of 2019/2020.

Action Item 4: The PO and Reclamation will work to provide the \$25,000 to fix the Hogback Variable Frequency Drive (VFD) pumps.

Completed. McKinstry has been working with Bliesner to get it fixed and has requested a proposal and trying to figure out how to fund fix. Note that fixing the VFD was included in the action of the Fruitland-Cambridge Irrigation section 7 consultation that rendered a biological opinion. Fixing the VFD was part of the proposed action.

Action Item 5: Reclamation will split SOW 32 into separate operation and maintenance and capital fund projects.

Completed. McKinstry provided updated SOWs, which are now included in the AWP as SOW 32 and 32a.

Action Item 6: Any proposed future stocking will be proposed as amendments to SJRIP augmentation plans and will be subject to Program approval. Ongoing. There was disagreement on this action item on whether approval of the augmentation plan was needed and was added to today's agenda.

Action Item 7. The PO will develop a schedule for completion of post-2023 activities in conjunction with the UCREFRP.

Completed: PO emailed a flow chart that provided a schedule of post-2023 activities.

Action Item 8: The PO will call relevant program participants to discuss the 8 February 2019 draft summary.

Completed. 8 February 2019 notes have been updated accordingly.

3. Approve February 8, 2019 meeting summary – Mata

Mata spoke to each commenter individually to ensure the revisions were acceptable. After conversation with Condon a few sentences were revised and shown in track changes. Condon had concern about the difference between minutes versus summary and the need identify individuals for declarative statements. Mata stated that, yes, there are some strong statements made during our meetings and sometimes those statements are not always discussed further. So, upon reading the meeting summary CC members react to these statement during the review of the summary. The solution for this reactive response to meeting summary is to identify the person making the strong statements versus summarizing as an accepted statement by the entire CC.

Condon moved to accept summary with the track changes. Noftsker seconded. No opposition.

4. Approve May 16, 2019 meeting summary – Mata (potentially)

Comments were received from Christianson, Condon, and Pitts. A table and header was included to reference scopes of work (SOW) to make it easier to understand the SOW summary. There were a number of strong statements and comments in the meeting summary. Each of the statements in question was discussed with the commenter to edit, but not to compromise the summary intent. There is still unresolved concerns regarding summaries with the augmentation plan and what was discussed during the meeting. This topic has been added to today's agenda. The concept that has not been resolved was the approval for the augmentation plan. Mata mentioned the augmentation plan is a guidance document and the SOWs should reference the augmentation plan. Pitts wanted an addendum and approval of the augmentation plan when there was a new stocking location. Mata said that would happen through the approval of an augmentation SOW, which is how the augmentation plan is implemented. The concern is still what happens when there is a plan to stock that does not require a SOW. Davis tabled the approval of the meeting summary since this topic needs more discussion and it is important to get through the AWP discussion today.

5. BC Update – Mazzone

A new BC alternate for Service-Region 2, the new New Mexico Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office (NMFWCO) project leader, Nathan Caswell was introduced. Three topics were added to the BC agenda: 1) a trap and transport feasibility analysis below waterfall, 2) New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF) is still working to get the Cooperative Nonnative Fish Stocking Agreement in place and comments were due 15 July, 3) Utah may be getting a signature from their Governor in the near future to participate in the SJRIP. The AWP discussion pertained to deciding between two competing SOWs (the Razorback Sucker Spring Study and the Colorado Pikeminnow Habitat Study). Both were well supported but after feedback from the BC and input from the Peer Reviewers, the Colorado Pikeminnow Habitat Study was withdrawn to be revamped for the next year's AWP process. Thus, the Razorback Sucker Spring Study was supported by the BC for recommendation to the CC. The BC went through an exercise of providing their recommendation on increasing, decreasing, or maintaining effort for tasks from the Long Range Plan and that was to be synthesized by the PO and will be the basis of BC discussion during their August 8th post-2023 conference call/webinar. The habitat workshop was briefly discussed and is bookmarked to occur during the BC's December meeting. Reclamation awarded all the contracts for FY 20 and they are working on budgeting for out years. Reclamation provided a presentation on the Navajo maintenance release and available water for this year. Three of four flow targets were obtained and the 8,000 cfs flow goal was nearly met. For the available water, the BC recommended elevated base flows through November. There will be habitat monitoring for these elevated base flows to take advantage of this

opportunity to determine how many secondary channels and backwaters would be inundated. NMDGF will be editing the draft adaptive Colorado Pikeminnow stocking plan to reflect options for high Animas River flows. The Razorback Sucker augmentation plan was reviewed by the BC, their comments will be incorporated by Weston Furr, and will be finalized at the end of August.

La asked if the CC could listen into the post-2023 conversations and Mata said they would extend an invitation, but to keep in mind the conversation is meant for the BC members. Condon asked for more consistency in sharing agendas and meeting summaries from each respective committee to keep informed of hot topics. Pitts asked how much specificity was in the Razorback Sucker stocking plan? Mazzone said there were specifics on numbers, not that much on locations, on hard versus soft releases (meaning no acclimation versus acclimation of fish prior to stocking), facilities, production numbers, or what stocking numbers would support various population levels.

6. Approve FY2020 Draft Annual Work Plan and Budget – Program Office (see Table 1 for reference to specific SOWs)

Pitts and Noftsker submitted substantial comments in the morning prior to this scheduled meeting. It will be difficult to approve the AWP today based on those comments.

a. 10,000 ft Summary

The 10,000 ft FY20 AWP summary was updated to reflect information gained from 2018 and Spring 2019 sampling efforts for Razorback Sucker captures and recent documentation of wild larval and young-of-year Colorado Pikeminnow. The purpose of the 10,000 ft is the help put the FY20 AWP into context. Davis thought the summary was very helpful. Pitts identified that SOW 41 and SOW 40 need to be consistently titled. Mata said there is no SOW 40, only 41 and this will be updated accordingly. La also mentioned there is a left over footnote that needs to be removed from SOW 41. Mata will update accordingly.

b. PO/BC Recommendation

All comments from BC members were addressed in the updated versions of SOW for all that received comments for submission in the AWP. Comments and responses are included in the AWP. No updates were required by other SOWs (which did not receive comments) and remained unchanged. The comments from Condon were addressed by PIs and some of those had to do with indirect costs and clarification of associated work. For example, SOW 13 needed clarification on what hydrology model runs would be included. That SOW was updated to include the possibility of running models runs for maintenance releases and how to incorporate that into the decision tree.

In Element 1 nothing changed from the May meeting, except for SOW 12 which now includes the number of PIT tags, previously omitted. Condon asked for more details about SOW 13 reference to doing modeling runs in collaboration with Sandia National Laboratory (Sandia). Behery stated that Sandia is doing climate change modeling and this is based on a request from the PO that Reclamation should include climate change modeling. This modeling was supported by use of the San Juan State Mod as well as SJRIP Riverware models. The main objective of this study was to explore how two water resource models of differing purpose and complexity perform under climate change scenarios and the importance of the differing simulation factors. While this study is not focused on impacts to the SJRIP, this study demonstrates the type of analysis that can be performed with this new framework. The support provided by Reclamation to Sandia in their study resulted in a modeling framework that can now be used by the SJRIP for runs and analysis that utilize alternative hydrology inputs, including climate change hydrology. The SJRIP does not pay

anything to Sandia.

Element 2. Comments on Phase III were received just prior to this meeting and will be addressed individually at a later date. The Four Corners Power Plant National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (FCPP NFWF) account has been paying for a large portion of habitat monitoring for the last several years. Per the Four Corner Power Plant Biological Opinion there is approximately \$100,000 per year that can be applied to habitat monitoring. The habitat monitoring SOW is in excess of the \$100,000, and this portion of the FCPP NFWF funds is nearly exhausted and the SJRIP is now paying for some of that cost. No other major changes were made to SOWs except for splitting out SOW 32 for base funds and capital projects (now SOW 32 and 32a). La asked if SOW 32a included the Variable Frequency Device (VFD) in need of replacement. Mata said this was briefly mentioned in the review of action items and that it is not part of that SOW 32a. Reclamation and Service are investigating how it would be funded, since it was a proposed action in a section 7 consultation.

Element 4, Condon stated SOW 37 has the Assistant Coordinator position identified and wanted a status update on filling that position. Mata reported that the Service is still working on getting hiring authority; there is \$88K from Service for this and if the position does not get filled then the Service would not be fulfilling its \$200K obligation to the SJRIP.

Davis reminded the CC that the intent of this meeting was to approve the AWP, but given the late comments from Pitts and Noftsker it will be challenging to go through an approval process at this meeting. It is frustrating to get substantial comments the day of the meeting. The process is to have comments submitted 10 days prior to a meeting when there is a decision needed.

Pitts was concerned about SOW 1 on how the contractor was chosen and reason for the sole source. Gilbert described that this proposal was a product from the recruitment bottleneck workshop and the PIs have expertise in fisheries in the southwest. Pitts does not understand why this is sole sourced. Mata expressed that it is very difficult to go through an entire request for proposal (RFP) process and working through academic institutions is quite reasonable. Pitts thinks a RFP process could produce a valid contractor. La said that SJRIP is paying for their fringe benefits and the overhead rate is high compared to other universities. Pitts also questioned why the SJRIP is paying for a full-time student when the student is not spending full time on the project. Mata also expressed that some of these comments could have been provided last year as well. This is the second year this project is requesting funds.

Pitts was concerned about SOW 30 given that this project is in its 4th year and adjustments may be needed or clarified. The staffing levels appear to be excessive and it appears that there will be no field work to account for that time and expense. Franssen said that this is an unfortunate typo, because fieldwork will be occurring this year. Pitts stated that providing funds to pay the student stipend and tuition is a misuse of recovery funds. Davis had asked if there was any language that prohibits such expenses when working with universities. Mata said that in other venues, government dollars are used to support academia in this way. Noftsker stated that in her experience this is the cost of doing business with academia and they are not being paid much to do it. Garrison stated that CO has certain policies they follow depending on the funding source when appropriate to include tuition or not. If it is not included it will usually be captured in their salary as appropriate. Tully-Cordova asked if reports are submitted to the SJRIP based on time expended on projects. The SJRIP does not ask for reports on time expended, but does request annual or final reports on project results, where applicable. However, Reclamation is the fund manager and they must have a mechanism to

evaluate and validate costs through their contracting process on budget justifications. Davis asked if a deadline is needed by the Reclamation for approving the annual workplan to ensure contracts are in place for FY20. Traynum said August 30th would be enough time for Reclamation to get contracts in place for FY20.

Noftsker provided comments prior to the meeting on C-3 Phase III’s measures of success and those comments will be addressed later. The update on Phase III is that Reclamation and Navajo Nation have decided on a contractor, Aquatic Consultants Inc. They reviewed the conceptual plan and revised the budget upwards by \$40K to include revegetation and updating the road to get heavy equipment to the other side of the wetland. Planning for construction should continue while the BC works on responding to NMISC comments on measures of success. The additional funding level for Phase III will need approval of the Coordination Committee.

Pitts motioned to approve all but three Scopes of Work (SOW) with identified deliverables in each SOW. The POs will work with the PIs on the three remaining SOWs (SOW 1, SOW 30 and SOW 41) to address comments received during the Coordination Committee meeting. In addition, SOW C-3 (Phase III) will address comments received on measures of success and updated to request an additional \$40,000 in capital funds. All remaining SOWs for the FY20 AWP in need of approval will occur during the August 30, 2019 Post-2023 Discussion Coordination Committee meeting, which is now starting at 8:30 am. McCarthy seconded the motion and no one opposed, therefore the motion was approved.

c. Condon’s Comments on 1st Draft FY20 AWP

Condon’s comments were addressed by the PO and PIs and above in the notes.

Table 1. Draft annual work plan by statement of work number, program element and project title.

SOW	Program Element and Project Title
	Element 1 - Management and Augmentation of Populations and Protection of Genetic Integrity
7	Horsethief Canyon Ponds O&M at Ouray NFH
8	Stocking & Acclimation of Age-0 CPM & Age-1+ RBS
9	Colorado Pikeminnow Fingerling Production (combined with 10)
10	Rearing Razorback Suckers (combined with 9)
11	RBS Augmentation/NAPI Pond Management
12	SJRIP PIT Tags (purchase)
	Element 2 - Protection, Management, and Augmentation of Habitat
13	Maintenance and Operation of SJR Hydrology Model
14	Stream Gaging and Flow Measurements
15	Operation of PNM Fish Passage Structure
16	San Juan and Animas Rivers Temp Gauges
C-1	Capital Projects Management
C-2	Repair of Capital Projects (e.g., fish passage, fish weir)
C-3	SJR Habitat Restoration Phase III

SOW	Program Element and Project Title
	Element 3 - Management of Non-Native Aquatic Species
17	SJR Nonnative Species Monitoring and Control
	Element 4 - Monitoring and Evaluation of Fish and Habitat in Support of Recovery Actions
18	UCR and SJR Centralized PIT tag database
19a	Demographic Monitoring for CPM and RBS
19b	Spring Age-1 Razorback Sucker Study
20	YOY/Small-Bodied Fish Monitoring
21	RBS/CPM Larval Surveys (Combined SOW)
21a	RBS/CPM Larval Surveys - Upstream Expansion of Study Area
22	Specimen Curation/Identification
25	Habitat Assessment
30	Razorback suckers in SJR-Lake Powell complex (4 of 4-yr project)
1	Backwater productivity assessment (2 of 3-yr project)
2	Nb and genetic diversity
32	PIT Tag Antennas O&M & Evaluation of Data
32a	Hogback PIT Tag Antenna Install
41	Facilitated fish passage in San Juan River (1 of 2-yr project)
42	Enhancing channel complexity and low-velocity habitat
43	San Juan fish passage investigation
44	Integrated bottleneck recruitment (1 of 3-yr project)
	Element 5 - Program Coordination and Assessment of Progress Toward Recovery
35	Base Funds and Contract Management Reclamation
36	Peer Review
37	Program Management FWS
38	Remote Biologist
FCPP	SJRRIP Biologist (FCPP/NMEP)
	Element 6 - Information and Education
39	Education and Outreach (funds transfer to UCRRIP)

7. Update on Recovery Programs post-2023 – Program Office

a. Post-2023 Schedule

The BC participated in an exercise to determine whether each action would achieve recovery. This was used as the starting point for the BC's next exercise, which was designed differently from the Upper Colorado Recovery Program's process. To do this exercise the PO asked for each BC member to provide a recommendation for each action on whether or not to maintain, increase, or decrease effort and also provide any additional recovery actions they thought should occur. The PO provided a recommendation as an example as well. The PO received the responses from the BC, synthesized the responses, and identified the actions that needed the most discussion to come to agreement. At the BC meeting, the BC will develop a recommendation for each action. Costs will

be added to this recommendation and sent to the CC for consideration at the 30 August meeting. Pitts reminded the CC of the post-2023 September 30 – October 1 meeting of the CC and the Upper Colorado Recovery Program Management Committee that will begin discussions on post-2023 program funding, institutional issues, and duration of the programs. This will be a critical meeting for CC participation.

8. Augmentation Plan and Process of Approval

Deferred to another meeting.

9. Process for Voting of BC Alternates

Deferred to another meeting

10. Peer Reviewer Updates

Deferred to another meeting

11. Recap Habitat Workshop planning effort from Annual Meeting – Mata

CC members should have received an email on July 25, 2019 with an attached document summarizing the Habitat Workshop Exercise from the annual meeting. The habitat workshop is still in development and will be held in conjunction with the Fall BC meeting in December.

12. Recap of Reclamation's 2019 maintenance release – Behery

Behery reported that Reclamation implemented a 12 day maintenance release from June 3 to June 15 which had a peak of 6 days at 4,000 cfs and 1 day at 5,000 cfs. Reclamation conducted sediment surveys pre and post maintenance release and results indicated that scouring did occur. There is extra water over 6063 pool elevation in the reservoir and this will be released as an elevated base flow. There will be a low base flow in early November to get the habitat monitoring flight.

13. Funding updates for FY20 – Callister

There is a draft energy and waters appropriations bill on the House side. There will be a short amount of time when congress gets back from summer recess to pass the bill and for the president to sign it before the end of the fiscal year. The bill states that hydropower revenues will be the source of funding. If there is no final bill passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President, there will be a continuing resolution and funding will likely be set as the same amount of funding as last year. Pitts said he the House bill was passed and sent to the Senate in late June.

14. Schedule next CC meeting(s)

The Post-2023 CC meeting is scheduled for August 30, 2019 from 9:00am to 12:00pm. However, given the need to address several SOW comments and their outstanding approval needs, this meeting will begin 30 minutes earlier. The next CC meeting is now set for August 30, 2019 from 8:30am to 12:00pm.

**ACTIONS ITEMS FROM 30 July 2019
COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

1. The PO will develop a quick reference of BC and CC responsibilities/processes with specific examples.
2. The PO in coordination with Region 6 will summarize the contribution of Lake Powell to recovery
3. Any proposed future stocking will be proposed as amendments to SJRIP augmentation plans and will be subject to Program approval.
4. The Program Coordinator will email the CC with the AWP motion by Pittts from this meeting to ensure it is documented.
5. The PO will make minor revision to the 10,000 ft FY20 Annual Work Plan Summary.
6. PO will update all SOWs accordingly to ensure there are deliverables documented.
7. The POs will work with the PIs on the three remaining SOWs (SOW 1, SOW 30 and SOW 41) to address comments received during the Coordination Committee meeting.