

Approved July 17, 2009



## SAN JUAN RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

**Coordination Committee Meeting**  
USFS Public Lands Center, Durango, Colorado

**Friday, May 15, 2009**  
**8 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.**

### Meeting Summary

#### **Coordination Committee Members:**

Jim Brooks, Acting Committee Chair  
Catherine Condon  
Joel Farrell  
Herb Becker  
Al Pfister  
Tom Pitts  
Randy Seaholm  
Brent Uilenberg  
John Whipple  
Stanley Pollack  
Adrian Oglesby  
Steve Lynch  
Peter Ortega, Alternate

#### **Representing:**

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

#### **Hydrology & Biology Committee Members and Committee Alternates:**

Andrea LeFevre, CC Alternate  
Bill Miller, BC Chair  
Mark McKinstry, BC Member  
Paul Holden, BC Member  
Tom Nesler, BC Member  
Katrina Grantz, HC Chair  
Ryan Christianson, HC Alternate  
Bruce Whitehead, HC Alternate  
Aaron Chavez, HC Alternate  
Paul Harms, HC Alternate

Jicarilla Apache Nation  
Southern Ute Indian Tribe  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Jicarilla Apache Nation  
State of Colorado  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Southwestern Water Conservation District  
San Juan Water Conservation District  
NM Interstate Stream Commission

#### **Program Management:**

David Campbell, Program Coordinator

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2

Approved July 17, 2009

Sharon Whitmore, Asst. Program Coordinator  
Scott Durst, Program Biologist

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

**Interested Parties:**

Warren Vigil  
Nancy Gloman  
Wally Murphy  
Paul Montoia  
Amy Kraft  
Michelle Morgan  
Maria O'Brien  
Marian Wimsatt  
Melynda Roberts  
Pat Page  
Doug Fruge  
Kristen McKinnon

Jicarilla Apache Nation  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2  
City of Farmington  
Southwestern Water Conservation District  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6  
BHP Billiton  
BHP Billiton  
Bureau of Reclamation  
Bureau of Reclamation  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6  
Wild Rivers Expeditions

Jim Brooks opened the meeting.

**Feb. 26, 2009 Meeting Summary** was approved with some minor changes.

**2010 Annual Work Plan (AWP) and Budget** – Campbell said the draft AWP is based on priorities discussed at the BC and CC meetings in February. It follows last year's work plan with a few changes. He suggested the group go through the plan by Recovery Element.

**AWP Element 1 - Integration and Evaluation of Information** – Database management was originally handled by Keller-Bliesner Engineering and then UNM. In 2007, the Service took over the activity. Last year's budget included carry-over funds from FY2008 for the Program Office to do database management. For FY2010, a separate SOW is included for all costs associated with Program Office management of all data, reports, and other information; the costs for this work was removed from the Program Office SOW. A Peer Review SOW is included that covers peer reviewer's time and travel. A line item for conducting workshops to address specific questions is again included. The amount is a placeholder with no specific SOW. In 2009, the BC will host three workshops to critically review and revise the monitoring plan. In 2010, a workshop to assess the non-native fish removal effort is planned.

Condon asked about the extent of peer reviewer involvement and the costs. Campbell said the peer reviewers were asked to review additional items in FY2009 such as the LRP and monitoring plan/protocols and to participate in the BC workshops. He said the BC has also asked them to attend more meetings recently. He said the amount in the SOW is an estimate but their level of involvement should probably be reviewed. Seaholm agreed; if they get too involved in the overall process, they become part of the process instead of providing independent review. Pitts also agreed; the peer reviewers need to be independent reviewers and not regular attendees at the BC meetings.

**AWP Element 2 – Stocking and Augmentation** – This element includes all of the Program's stocking and augmentation work. Pitts asked if enough fish are being stocked. Campbell said the Service is in the process of reviewing and revising the stocking plans and Kevin Bestgen is doing an assessment of the pit tag recapture data. Any changes will come out of those processes. Brooks said Weston Furr of

his office has revised two stocking plans and they are currently being reviewed by the BC. The overall number of fish stocked may not change but stocking targets such as size, number per size, type of release, and stocking locations may change. Pitts said if total fish numbers need to increase, the Program needs to start thinking about sources. Campbell said for now, the Program's need are being met between Dexter, Uvalde, and NAPI ponds. Pitts asked about the NAPI ponds. Campbell said that because of the quarantine problem at Uvalde, the only razorback suckers stocked in 2008 came from NAPI's Hidden Pond. The pond had high survival and the fish were of high quality. In 2009, three NAPI ponds, all with improvements, will be used. NAPI ponds provide redundancy for the stocking program. Recapture information has shown better survival of the NAPI fish than some of the hatchery fish. Brooks mentioned the BC is looking at ways to stock the large razorback suckers held over at Uvalde and to use them in assessing survival success of larger hatchery fish. Campbell said the current budget covers all stocking activities and minor changes. Any cost adjustments due to major changes would not occur until the next budget cycle.

**AWP Element 3 – Habitat Management** – Uilenberg said Hogback Fish Weir will be constructed by Navajo Engineering and Construction Authority (NECA) and should be done in March of 2010. He said the costs for O&M for the project will probably not be known until after one full year of operation but he estimates it will be around \$20,000 to \$45,000. Capital funds can be used for the first year of operation so O&M will not need to be included in the annual Program budget until 2011. It will be covered similar to PNM's O&M as a line item in the annual budget. Uilenberg said contracting will be handled by a four-party contract between Navajo Nation, Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, and PNM. San Juan Dine Water Users will do the day-to-day operations for the Navajo Nation.

Campbell said the Service is working with Reclamation to have remote pit tag readers permanently installed on the structure. This will address entrainment by providing long-term monitoring that is cost effective because it will not require people physically on-site to do the work. It will be constructed as part of the capital project and in the long-term contract. Brooks asked when a SOW for the project will be available for technical review by the committees. Campbell said no SOW has been prepared because it is only in the planning phase as part of the consultation for the capital construction project. Miller asked if the pit tag readers are considered to be inside or outside the Program. Campbell said it will initially be in the biological opinion for the project but could become a Program monitoring activity. Miller asked when the BC can review the method to insure it fits with the Program's monitoring program. Campbell said the BC can review it but the Service, working with Reclamation, first needs to insure long-term monitoring for entrainment is adequately covered and that it is part of the capital project for funding purposes.

**AWP Element #4 - Non-native Fish Removal** - Campbell reported the non-native fish removal effort is now up to full implementation. A technical workshop will be held next year to review the activity. All aspects of the effort will be reviewed and assessed including level of effort to determine if, and when, "equilibrium" is achieved.

**AWP Element #5 – Fish and Habitat Monitoring** – This element includes a long-term fish monitoring activity for each of three life stages for both species, larval, YOY/small-bodied, and sub-adult/adult large-bodied. Seaholm emphasized the need for the Program to be collecting the most cost effective, useful data to identify what is needed for recovery and not information that is just nice to know. He asked if Program money would be better spent elsewhere until enough fish are in the system to get useful information and mentioned the small number of fish caught each year through larval fish monitoring as an example. Miller said the larval monitoring dataset is probably the most valuable as it documents that adult razorback sucker and Colorado pikeminnow and other native species are maturing

*Approved July 17, 2009*

and reproducing whereas the other two life stage data may not be as important. He emphasized the monitoring program is currently undergoing extensive review via the workshops and the BC is not ruling out any changes at this point. Pitts questioned why YOY sampling continues when only 10 Colorado pikeminnow were collected in 11 years and it primarily collects fish community information. Campbell said the YOY monitoring will document when recruitment occurs for the listed species and the data collected on the other native fish species gives us an indication of what should be occurring. It is an important component of the monitoring program and is needed, in combination with the other life stage data, to track cohorts of the listed species and other species through the system. Pfister said a lack of data does not necessarily mean it is bad data and we should be cautious in eliminating something just because it is not currently getting data. Pitts asked if we should be seeing recruitment based on survival curves. Miller said the numbers of the listed species are still relatively low in the SJR so it is not unexpected that juveniles are not being collected; they would be hard to find. The BC is reviewing the protocol and may change sampling frequency or other parameters such as timing to improve capture probability.

Curation - Seaholm asked why curation is done every year. Brooks said to verify data. McKinstry said a certain amount of the funds go toward a base level of maintenance for curation files which is required for museum property. Campbell pointed out that larval fish are not identified in field so the UNM lab is needed for that process.

Temperature - Temperature monitoring is done every year as a reasonable and prudent measure for NIIP and is part of a long-term data set. It was used to determine if spawning could occur further upstream to extend fish stocking and it showed temperatures were not adequate. Pfister said sampling frequency should be evaluated for its applicability to recovery. Changes could be made with a modification to the RPM.

Habitat Monitoring - Some budget items for habitat monitoring were modified at the BC meeting. \$46,000 was added to cover completion of the final report for the two-year detailed reach study. Campbell explained he was not aware that the full allocation for the project was not made in 2009 and, contractually, needs to be done in 2010. Videography frame capture and photo interpretation were identified at the workshops to replace river cross sections. Pitts asked what is done with the yearly videography. Campbell said it is part of the standardized long-term monitoring plan and provides a long-term data set that is used for river-wide habitat mapping. This includes the 5-year river cross section survey that has not been done for six years and the detailed reach survey, which will probably be changed. Pitts said a lot of money has been spent on the fish-habitat study for very little information and mostly for information we have known for years, (i.e., small fish like low velocity habitat and bigger fish like faster water.) He pointed out that the Upper Colorado River Program abandoned trying to figure out these relationships years ago. He questioned the validity of continuing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on this type of work with few fish in the system and to tell us what we already know. He emphasized the importance of habitat monitoring that specifically addresses the effectiveness of the flow recommendations on habitat.

Campbell said there is no proposal on the table yet for long-term habitat monitoring. In reviewing and modifying the Program's habitat monitoring program, the BC needs to critically address and prioritize what is most important to meet recovery needs. Miller emphasized that the habitat items in the budget are just preliminary. He said the BC did not have the linkages to the LRP tasks in February but will after the workshops. After the last workshop, the BC will discuss this further and will complete prioritization at a meeting in July.

**AWP Element 6 – Education and Outreach.** A separate SOW is included for all costs associated with Program Office I&E. Those costs were removed from the Program Office SOW. The majority of funds go to the Upper Colorado River Program, which handles the majority of that activity for the SJR Program. It is a very cost effective arrangement for the SJR Program. Pitts said more SJR press releases are needed. He had seen a press release on the Upper Colorado Program published in the Durango Herald today, but had never seen any press release on the San Juan Program, published or unpublished. He suggested that Debbie Felker, I&E Coordinator for the Upper Colorado Program, do them for the SJR Program. Before she can, the Service needs to revisit its internal policy that makes putting out press releases across Regions difficult. Pfister says the problem is that everything has to go through each Region’s External Affairs Office. Nancy Gloman said Region 2 has not had a dedicated External Affairs person for Ecological Services for a while but will be bringing someone on shortly, which should help. The Service representatives will work together on this issue.

**AWP Element #7 – Program Coordination** - This element includes Reclamation base funds management and Service Program management. Several modifications were made to the Program Office budget including separating the database management and I&E activities into separate SOWs, mentioned earlier. No carry-over is included (\$30,000 of carry-over was included in the 2009 budget) but there may be some associated with the \$100,000 for data integration. A major change in the SOW, is a proposal to create a Recovery Science Biologist position in the Program Office to do annual data integration, assess progress toward recovery, and do sufficient progress assessments. The Service believes data integration is tied to assessing progress toward recovery and is inherently a Service responsibility. There is agreement among the committees to move from a 5-year data integration process to a yearly process. Funding a biologist in the Program Office would provide a more timely and cost effective way to accomplish this important task. Campbell said the BC expressed concern that this strategy would be in conflict with Program guidelines. Miller said this was first presented at the BC meeting two days ago so the BC has not had the opportunity to fully consider and discuss the proposal. He said 5-year data integration is in the standardized monitoring plan and specifically states that it is a BC responsibility. Campbell said the Service needs timely data integration to assess Program progress and the Program Document does not specify that the BC is responsible for data integration. Miller said he is not opposed to doing annual integrations but, initially, the task may be too much for a senior biologist to tackle because it will involve integrating a large dataset from 2004-2008. He also pointed out that the Program process requires any new SOW by any Program participant including the Service to be circulated and reviewed.

A discussion ensued about the AWP development process. Campbell said the process described in the Program Document is: 1) Program Office, with the technical committees, puts together a priority list of projects based on the Long Range Plan approved by the Coordination Committee; 2) Program Office solicits SOWs back from participants based on those priorities; 3) Program Office develops a draft AWP and budget for presentation, in its entirety, to the committees for review; and, 4) CC provides final approval. Miller pointed out the Program Document says the BC reviews and approves the AWP and reviews new SOWs. Campbell said the BC reviews BC/biology-related SOWs but not Program Office/management SOWs. He said the intent of those revising the Program Document was to remove the BC from approving AWPs and budgets so there would be no direct conflicts of interest. Brooks said he reviewed the Program Document and it is not specific and there are ambiguities. Condon questioned if data integration was assigned to the BC and the Program Office takes that task over, then it becomes strictly an administrative issue. Campbell reiterated that the Program Office proposes to take on the task because the Service needs the information in a timely manner for assessing progress toward recovery and this was not being accomplished by the BC through the 5-year process. Miller said the roles and responsibilities of the BC and the Program Office need to be clearly defined. Brooks

Approved July 17, 2009

pointed out that the Program Office doing data integration is a proposal at this point and needs further discussion by the CC. Program process, roles, and responsibilities also need clarification.

Pollack said there are two issues. One is Program Document ambiguity, which is fairly easy to fix. It is clear that the HC should not be reviewing and modifying BC products or the BC telling the Service how to administer the Program. Second is who is ultimately responsible for data integration, is it a Program Office function or a BC function? This is a more fundamental issue that requires careful thought. Brooks agreed and said the discussion needs to happen after the BC workshops are done at the end of June and after the draft 2010 AWP is in order. Pitts added that how integration is done is described in the Program Document in Section 6.0 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Responsibilities, *“annually preparing, in consultation with the Coordination Committee and the Program’s technical committees, a report that assesses the preceding year’s fish monitoring data, progress toward recovery, and adaptive management recommendations, including recommendations for changes in direction, termination of projects, new projects or other pertinent recommendations.”* He said the last 5-year Integration Report developed by Biology Committee members was 3 years late. Campbell said the crux of the issue is who does data integration and how those funds are expended; is it accomplished by the Program Office or by RFP. If it goes out via RFP to BC members, it will be a 2 or 3-year process. Miller said BC involvement is integral to the data integration process. Campbell said it is not about the technical side, it is about how to achieve the task. Becker asked about the RFP that was supposed to be done in February. Campbell said completion of the RFP was delayed pending the outcome of the BC workshops. Pitts said how the data integration task is accomplished is not a BC decision. It is the CC’s responsibility to decide how the Program should be administered. Pollack commented that regardless, the BC should retain some level of oversight.

Condon said she does not think the CC can make an informed decision on this issue today and suggested the group have a conference call later to discuss it further. Brooks proposed that the Program Office provide a description of the AWP process as described in the Program Document and the intent if it is different. Pitts said the Program Office also needs to describe how the data integration process would work under this proposal.

Campbell said there is money set aside in the FY2009 budget for data integration that will be lost if not used by the end of the year and that deadline is fast approaching. McKinstry said the amount is less than the \$100,000 estimate because of additional expenses associated with the BC workshops. He estimates there is about \$60,000-\$65,000 left in the FY2009 budget for data integration. Melynda Roberts, Reclamation, said they could obligate the funds to the Service to do data integration. Campbell said he is concerned this will just reduce the Program Office budget in FY2010 because it will not be tied to a specific task. Pitts made a motion that the funds be obligated to the Program Office budget. Seaholm seconded. Pollack asked for clarification on how this will affect the Program Office’s budget. Campbell said it would become part of the Program Office budget and he would need to decrease his FY2010 budget request by that amount. If the money is put into the Program Office’s FY2010 budget, the data integration task cannot go out for RFP or be done by the Program Office if it is not in its approved SOW. Pitts amended the motion by adding, *“expenditures subject to CC approval of AWP.”* Becker seconded. Roberts said the money could be carried over in Reclamation’s budget. After further discussion, the motion was tabled and a conference call scheduled for May 28 @ 8 a.m. to discuss: 1) clarification of the Program Document, and 2) the data integration process and roles and responsibilities of the Program Office and BC. Brooks reminded the group that if a vote will be taken, any information should go out one week prior, by May 21.

*Approved July 17, 2009*

**AWP Budget Estimate** - With all the activities included, the current estimated budget shows a ~\$88,000 deficit. Whitmore said no increase for inflation is expected in FY2010 so last year's funding total was used. Pitts asked when the CC would see a new version of the AWP. Campbell said it cannot be redone until after the data integration issue is resolved and the BC has had another opportunity to prioritize projects. He said July would be the normal timeframe. Miller said the BC will have the June 29 and 30 monitoring workshop and then will meet in July to prioritize. A CC meeting was scheduled for September 1, 8 a.m. in Farmington with the primary purpose to approve the AWP.

**Long Range Plan (LRP)** – Campbell reported the majority of comments received to date have been incorporated into the LRP and the most recent version is on the website. Whitmore said some of the comments received are more difficult to deal with such as reducing redundancy. These will take more time and probably require major changes like combining two Elements. She said any major modifications under consideration would be presented to the Coordination Committee for approval.

**BC Flow Recommendations/Shortage Sharing Review and Memo** – Brooks summarized that the CC, at the February 26 meeting, directed the BC to review their 2003 memo on shortage sharing. They were directed to give their response to the Service after which the Service would make a determination and provide a draft to the CC for review. The BC sent the Service a response on April 16 and the Service sent a draft memo from the Service to the shortage-sharing participants to the CC on May 8. It states the Service concurs with the BC's determination and is in full support of the shortage-sharing concept. Whipple said he thinks there was some misunderstanding about what he had asked for. He requested that the BC determine if the conclusions in their 2003 determination (i.e., if flows could dip below 400 cfs) were still valid. The assumption is that a lot of recovery work has been done since the last shortage sharing agreement so species status and habitat should be better now. He doubts there is any new information to show otherwise until after the flow recommendations revision process is done. Miller explained the flow recommendations in the 2003 memo were based on specific conditions at that time. If a shortage occurs now, the BC would have to review current conditions before making recommendations. He said if a shortage occurs, the BC is very willing to work with the shortage-sharing participants. Whipple said he does not believe maintenance flows of 400 cfs would be a problem now but the important point is the willingness to participate when a shortage occurs. He has concerns about process and response time, as it is easier to have specific agreements now instead of waiting until a shortage occurs and going into an emergency situation. Miller pointed out the BC was able to respond promptly in 2003.

The group discussed a comment period for the draft Service memo. Pitts said it is not a Program committee activity at this point but between the Service, Reclamation, and the shortage-sharing participants although a communication process may be needed. Campbell said the Service will work with Reclamation in the event of a shortage. Comments on the draft memo are due to the Program Office by May 22.

**BC Workshops** – Miller said he gave a detailed report the previous day at the annual meeting. He recapped that the BC held two fish and habitat monitoring workshops and will have a third on June 29 and 30. The Program Office is compiling all the input from the first two workshops for use during the third. He is hopeful that by the end of the third workshop the BC will be well on the way to completing a revised comprehensive monitoring plan. The BC will have a workshop next year to evaluate the non-native fish removal effort.

*Approved July 17, 2009*

**Desert Rock** – Campbell said the Service is still in consultation with BIA on Desert Rock. Nothing has changed since his last report. He expects the timeline will be extended another 90 days. The Service has not received official word from the BIA on release of the draft BO to the CC for review. Lynch said he will check on it and report back at the May 28 conference call.

**Congressional Activities Update** – Pitts said the annual funding legislation was passed and signed into law in March. It gave \$12 million to the San Juan Program for capital project funds and \$15 million for the Upper Colorado Program. The money is to maintain in-place capital projects and to fix the slide area at Farmers Mutual Ditch. Authority for expending capital funds was also extended to 2023. Two items are pending, extending the annual funding legislation through 2023 and Reclamation and Service FY2010 annual appropriations. Funding of some Program activities will end in 2011 if the annual funding legislation is not passed. A decision was made not to send the Report to Congress referenced in authorizing legislation because of a myriad of problems. If there is a Report to Congress, it may only be a one-page letter from the Secretary. Rep. John Salazar introduced the annual funding legislation that extends full annual funding through 2023 last week. There is good bipartisan support for the bill with nine co-sponsors. Senator Bingaman has agreed to introduce the same bill in the Senate. If it goes through, which it looks like it will this year, both Programs will be well set until 2023. Pitts will be asking for support letters for Reclamation and Service appropriations. He appreciates everyone's past support and emphasized the importance of grassroots support in keeping the recovery programs going.

**Capital Projects** – Uilenberg handed out a memo from Larry Walkoviak, Reclamation Regional Director, to the Office of the Solicitor regarding cost ceilings for the Upper Colorado Program and San Juan Program under Public Law 106-392. Reclamation indexed the original authorizing ceiling plus subsequent amendments and at the end of fiscal year 2008. The Upper Colorado Program has \$28.3 million remaining under its ceiling authority and the San Juan Program has \$15.4 million. With the authorization of an additional \$12 million (\$7 million is earmarked for fixing Farmers Mutual Ditch) authorized under the Public Lands Bill, PL 111-11, the San Juan Program currently has a \$27 million ceiling authority. This means the Program is well situated financially to address capital project facilities and maintenance. The 2009 approved budget in March for the endangered species line item for Upper Colorado Region was \$6,976,000, which covers the Upper Colorado Program, San Juan Program, and activities to avoid jeopardy (\$400,000). By the end of April, \$5.6 million was spent on capital projects for both Programs with most (over \$5 million) going for repayment to the Colorado River Water Conservation District for enlargement of Elkhead Reservoir on the Yampa River. The remainder covered upgrades at 24 Road Hatchery (\$1.4 million), Hogback Fish Weir (\$132,000), and other capital projects management such as producing the annual report (\$42,000). Uilenberg said Reclamation is well positioned to award a contract for the Hogback fish weir this year. The budget request for 2010 for both programs is \$3,569,000 plus \$400,000 line item for activities to avoid jeopardy. The current NFWF account is \$1,792,347 and CO is working on an additional transfer. Seaholm said CO's transfer has been made and they are working with Liz Epstein to fix the accounting sheet to reflect the \$625,000 contribution. With construction beginning this year at Hogback, the cost-share accounting should get in balance. Campbell said the only SJR expenditures this year has been ~\$58,000 for improvements at Uvalde.

**Program Funds Management Update** - McKinstry said he gave his budget talk the day before and wanted to give an update on the problems he has encountered with the \$400,000 River Ecosystem Restoration Initiative (RERI) grant funds from New Mexico Environment Department. DOI solicitors determined that Reclamation and the Service cannot be the contractor for reimbursable dollars. He has tried several different avenues for handling the money including NMDGF (cannot administer the grant

*Approved July 17, 2009*

because of staffing and contracting issues), TNC (already has RERI funds from another project), and for-profit Program contractor (a possibility but has never been done before). He said they are looking into the possibility of NFWF but this also has potential problems. The NFWF fund has an authorized ceiling that cannot be exceeded and the capital funds can be used for many things whereas the RERI money can only be used for habitat restoration. To use NFWF, the Program would have to spend money from the NFWF funds on habitat work then NFWF would invoice NMED to replace the capital funds used. Whipple said he would need to check the terms of the agreement to see if it allows the RERI funds to go through NFWF instead of directly to the project. Campbell said NM ISC has paid the Service directly for FWCA processes in the past. McKinstry said NMED will not advance the money even on a quarterly basis. Campbell said a mechanism for handling the money needs to be found. Oglesby said their RERI funds are for a land transaction that may fall through. He said not to rule out TNC being in a position to handle the funds.

Another issue is if the \$400,000 should count toward NM's contribution. Whipple questioned how much of the habitat restoration work would be towards recovery. Pitts said that if the funds are going to be used for recovery, then it should be credited to NM's contribution and if it is not going to recovery, then the Program should not be involved. He asked if the Program would eventually do this kind of work. Campbell answered yes and said habitat restoration would provide flexibility in using less water to manipulate habitat. Pitts asked what the problem is with NM counting it. Campbell said using one grant source (in place to do habitat improvement) to offset another obligation under a different mitigation requirement (i.e., the recovery program), is typically not allowed for obvious reasons. Whipple said that if the RERI funds went toward NM's contribution to the recovery program, an equal amount of the authorized money may be removed. If the RERI habitat restoration work is handled outside the Program, the Program would not lose \$400,000 in the capital fund.

**Program Office Report** – Campbell said the Program Office is moving forward on priority items and working on getting documents out promptly. He said if time allowed he wanted to show a presentation on all the work that has been done on the database and document management system. He will put it on a future meeting agenda. Whitmore said she and Katrina Grantz would be scheduling another hydrology baseline workgroup meeting soon.

Approved July 17, 2009



## SAN JUAN RIVER RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM

**Coordination Committee**  
Conference Call  
**May 28, 2009**

### Meeting Summary

#### Participants

##### CC Members:

Jim Brooks, Chair  
Pat Turney  
Randy Seaholm  
Tom Pitts  
Herb Becker  
Stanley Pollack  
Dan Israel  
Cathy Condon  
Brent Uilenberg  
Michelle Morgan  
Absent  
Absent  
Absent

##### Representing:

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

##### Program Management:

David Campbell, Program Coordinator  
Scott Durst, Program Biologist

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

Two documents were distributed prior to the meeting, a proposed Program Office data integration SOW and suggested revisions/clarifications to Chapter 6 of the Program Document regarding procedures. The group discussed and decided on a schedule for making revisions/clarifications to the Program Document and for completing the 2010 Workplan.

**June 30** - Comments on the two documents due to the Program Office

*Approved July 17, 2009*

**July 16-17 (1 p.m. to 5 p.m. and 8 a.m. to 3 p.m.) – CC meeting in Durango** to address comments on the draft SOW and the proposed changes to the Program Document and to decide on final content for both. The results of this meeting will be used to provide alternate or additional direction as needed to the BC relative to their final input into the 2010 Workplan

**July 20 – BC Meeting**

**September 1 – CC Meeting in Farmington** to approve the 2010 Workplan review (*Note: The meeting was subsequently rescheduled to September 10-11, 2009*)