Approved Summary
San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program
Biology Committee Meeting
San Juan Public Lands Center
Durango, CO
7-8 November 2012

Attendees:

Biology Committee Members:
Bill Miller, Chair – Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Kevin Terry – Jicarilla Apache Nation
Brian Westfall – Bureau of Indian Affairs
Jason Davis – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2
Mark McKinstry – U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Dale Ryden – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6
Vincent Lamarra – Navajo Nation
Jim White – State of Colorado
Eliza Gilbert – State of New Mexico
Gregory Gustina – U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Tom Wesche – Water Development Interests
David Gori – Conservation Interests

Program Office – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2:
David Campbell
Sharon Whitmore
Scott Durst

Interested Parties:
Carrie Lile – Southwestern Water Conservation District
Steven Platania – American Southwest Icthyological Researchers
Nathan Franssen – SJRIP post-doc
Bruce Jaquez – Bureau of Indian Affairs NIIP
Kyle Tator – Jicarilla Apache Nation
Grant Webber – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Uvalde NFH
Ben Zimmerman – Southern Ute Tribe

Wednesday 7 November 2012

Changes to agenda:

- Miller suggested moving discussion of Gori's nomination to the first item of the agenda.

Discuss Dave Gori's nomination as TNC's representative on the Biology Committee:

- Campbell provided background on Patrick McCarthy's new role at TNC and move to the Coordination Committee and TNC's nomination of Dave Gori.
- Gori provided background on his research and work experience; a Ph.D. from the University of Arizona and ecologist and scientist at TNC in Arizona and New Mexico. Areas of expertise include behavioral ecology, fire management, riparian ecology, and in-stream flow needs.
- McKinstry asked if Gori will be involved in future restoration work on the San Juan River. Gori explained that this effort will be led by Robert Findling. This work is being funded by the BHP Billiton settlement and the next steps will involve site selection for future habitat restoration.
- Gilbert asked about Gori's plant restoration experience. Gori does not have direct experience in plant restoration but he has closely followed the work on the San Juan River.
- Wesche asked about Gori's future plans. Gori indicated that he expected to be serving on the Biology Committee for the next several years.
- Gustina motioned to accept Gori's nomination to the Biology Committee, Gilbert seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Approve draft summary from 13 August 2012 conference call; review Action Item list:

- Durst incorporated all comments he received and distributed the revised summary prior to this meeting. Wesche motioned to approve the summary as distributed, Ryden seconded, and the summary was unanimously approved.

Update from Uvalde – Grant Webber:

- Webber is the project leader at Uvalde. This facility captively rears razorback sucker for the SJRIP. Webber provided a description and background of the facility. The facility has both lined and unlined ponds; there are advantages and disadvantages of both. Razorback sucker are susceptible to bird predation and netting is placed over the ponds to protect the fish.
- Razorback sucker growth rates at Uvalde are very high. Efforts are made to curb their size. The 2009 year class has carried the facility through the quarantine from Dexter and these fish will be very large when they are stocked in 2013. Could these fish be used to test some of the hypotheses presented by Bestgen et al. 2009 such as season of stocking? Stocking goals in 2013 will be met by a combination of Dexter and Uvalde fish.
- Webber described the changes in management undertaken to improve razorback sucker returns. These include PIT tagging in the spring prior to fall stocking, returning fish to ponds for summer grow-out, using salt as a de-stressor when fish are in raceways, getting fish back on feed post-handling, and decreased density during hauling to the San Juan River. Hauling time from Uvalde to the San Juan River is 15-17 hours and tanks are kept at 15ºC. Although all 2012 recaptures have not been analyzed, it appears that these management changes have resulted in more Uvalde razorback suckers being recaptured in the San Juan River.
- Tagging in spring allowed for an evaluation of tag retention. Between the spring tagging and fall harvesting tag loss was approximately 2.5%.
- In FY2013 a cortisol study will be conducted by experts from Dexter to examine razorback sucker stress at Uvalde. This study plan will be distributed to the BC once it is finalized.
- Hauling time from the new Horsethief Canyon Native Fish Facility in Grand Junction, CO is 4-5 hours.

- The group discussed stocking locations. PNM is an ideal stocking site but the Program has made efforts to stock at different locations further upstream. A non-selective fish passage may be constructed at APS as part of the Navajo-Gallup project so this site could be suitable for stocking in the future. Once the Hogback Fish Weir is constructed it could also be used as a stocking site. Those sites that are further upstream from PNM are only periodically available because of low flows. These sites could be modified through the use of capital funds to make them available under lower flow conditions.
- Davis reported that returns from NAPI Hidden Pond were 76% and East Avocet were 66%. A total of 4000-4500 razorback suckers were stocked from NAPI. Davis will report on the results of the NAPI tagging study in more detail once all the data are analyzed but it appears that initial short term tag loss is about 3%.
- Webber asked if there is an "ideal" stocking size for razorback suckers. The Upper Basin uses a minimum average size of 350 mm. Larger fish spend more time in the hatchery so there may be diminishing return on fish once they reach some size threshold. Durst can explore the effects of size on returns of stocked razorback suckers.

Update Long Range Plan:

- Whitmore summarized Tom Pitt's comments. Pitt's made a recommendation that those items brought up in the sufficient progress report be included in the LRP with specific timelines. The LRP should be used as a tool to evaluate the Program's progress toward recovery. The document should be tied to the Sufficient Progress Report in order to make this link between them more transparent.
- The group discussed structural changes to the LRP. Previously the LRP was updated every 5 years and the transition to updating every year is not complete. The column headings could be changed to include a progress, start and end years, and status type headings. Important to maintain headings that identify who is doing the work and a column that includes a description of the work. Any tasks included in the LRP need to consider the Program's 2023 end date. Completed tasks in the LRP should move to a different table that includes a heading indicating the conclusion or end result of that task.
- Ryden cautioned moving the LRP toward the Upper Program's RIPRAP. How the SJRIP operates is more flexible compared to the Upper Program in part because of the differences in their long-range planning and funding documents.
- PIs should provide results for on-going tasks by the February meeting. Whitmore will be sure description in table is consistent with the narrative portion. The monitoring and evaluating tasks that are in different places throughout the document need to be cross-linked to close those loops.
- How should priorities be addressed? Some tasks are needed for ESA compliance. How are these tasks different than "critical" tasks? A revised category to cover compliance could be "required." The PO will update priorities for tasks included as part of BOs and the BC will review and update remaining tasks.
- Campbell provided details on the mercury bioaccumulation study in association with the Four Corners Power Plant consultation. This study will include a PVA for Colorado pikeminnow. The BC has an important role to advise the PVA process.
- The group discussed Element 3 – Manage non-native fish species. Should the mark pass continue to be used for channel catfish to estimate exploitation and abundance during subsequent removal passes? There was consensus that this effort was useful to evaluate the effects of removal on non-native species and also provided valuable movement data. Can non-native removal trips be moved to be more effective? In 2012 the 10 day trip typically in July was moved to June. How can the effect of non-native removal on native species be evaluated? Population estimates. Are there removal methods that can focus on all life stages of channel catfish? Focus removal efforts on spawning or use flow as a means to disrupt spawning. There should be some effort to evaluate

across datasets to inform non-native removal efforts and address the recommendations that were made during the non-native fish workshop. Davis will review the non-native fish workshop summary and address how those recommendations are being implemented.

- How can the Program promote a recreational channel catfish fishery in the San Juan River? What about a bounty program? Are there ways to promote a fertilizer business based on channel catfish?
- Should the frequency of some monitoring activities be changed? Less frequent monitoring would allow the Program to do other high priority work in off-years. How can all three fish monitoring program be examined to provide a broader picture of fish populations in the San Juan River?
- Should the efforts of adult monitoring shift to native fish population estimates? Because Recovery Goals are based on specific targets there is rationale to move in that direction. Can existing data be used to reliably estimate populations of Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker?
- Are the recommendations made during the habitat workshop included in the most recent Monitoring Plan and Protocol document? Durst will look into this.
- Whitmore will take a first cut to incorporate the BC's, Wesche's, and Pitt's comments along with suggestions received during this BC meeting. PIs and BC members should provide relevant information that needs to be included in an updated LRP. Wesche offered to review the next draft of the LRP before it goes out to the entire BC.

Update from Program Office – FWS meeting in Denver on 27-28 November to discuss the role of Lake Powell in razorback sucker recovery:

- How does Lake Powell fit into long-range planning? A total of 8 razorback suckers that were initially captured in Lake Powell have been documented in the river indicating that they moved upstream of the waterfall while it was temporarily inundated in 2011. Given the degree of movement in Lake Mead, there is no reason that razorback suckers in the San Juan arm of Lake Powell do not move to the Colorado arm of the lake.
- Campbell discussed the Lake Powell special session that will be held at the Researcher's Meeting in January and solicited opinions from the BC regarding the upcoming FWS meeting in Denver on the role of Lake Powell in terms of razorback sucker recovery. The results of the natal origin study will inform what action is taken in Lake Powell. The group discussed how effort would be balanced between the river and the lake and if the river would be "sacrificed" in favor of the lake. The FWS will try to develop a comprehensive approach to the role of Lake Powell in terms of endangered fish recovery during the meeting in Denver and discussions will continue on what to do in Lake Powell in FY2014.

Data integration:

- The group discussed integration options for Franssen. These included evaluating the effectiveness of non-native fish removal, revising survival estimates for hatchery-reared fish, using the PIT tag database to retrospectively estimate population sizes, examining movement patterns and use of tributaries, integrating Lake Powell data, and using spatial and temporal power analysis to determine the appropriate scale of monitoring activities. There is some integration happening in the course of all existing annuals reports. The summary from the monitoring workshop includes a list of integration activities although it is not clear if the workshop summaries have been posted to the website. Durst will look into this.
- Lamarra will provide the summary of habitat by river mile and reach for use in integration. With habitat monitoring data being collected again, integration efforts should include habitat data as well.
- The group discussed temperature monitoring. In moving forward with this monitoring there was consensus that it would be best to consolidate temperature monitoring sites to USGS gage stations. Temperature monitoring can be incorporated into existing USGS gage stations at a cost of $2500/gage/year. This should be part of the FY2014 budget.

Thursday 8 November 2012

Discuss Program priorities in 2014:

- 2013 priority list: (1) O&M on existing facilities for ESA compliance; (2) augmentation; (3) efforts to document recruitment; (4) non-native fish removal; (5) data integration for Lake Powell and revising flow recommendations; (6) fish monitoring; (7) habitat monitoring; (8) peer review.
- Non-native fish removal should remain high on the priority list and augmentation should remain high until there is substantial recruitment.
- Should there be any changes to the priority list for 2014? (1) ESA compliance activities (O&M of existing facilities and hydrology model); (2) augmentation including production, stocking, and evaluation; (3) efforts to document recruitment; (4) data integration in association with revision to flow recommendations; (5) general integration; (6) non-native fish monitoring and control; (7) fish monitoring (in order of priority: larval, small-bodied, adult); (8) habitat monitoring; (9) peer review.
- What studies could be funded through consultation process with power plants?
- Lamarra suggested developing a white paper that reviews existing data to identify limiting factors and guide future research investigations. Can this be assigned to Franssen?
- The group discussed the possibility of Colorado pikeminnow recruitment since the 1990s. How can recruitment be distinguished from the 400,000 age-0 Colorado pikeminnow that are stocked into the San Juan River without PIT tags? Should there be an effort to do a natal origin study for Colorado pikeminnow? Collecting and storing scales is easy, so it may be worth taking them. Where are the reproduction and recruitment bottlenecks for Colorado pikeminnow? The number of larval razorback suckers has increased as the number of adults in the system has grown. There were more Colorado pikeminnow in the San Juan in the late 1980s, where are they now? No larval Colorado pikeminnow were captured in 2012.
- If factors such as contaminants are limiting Colorado pikeminnow reproduction then identifying that issue and rectifying it should be the Program's highest priority. Campbell will distribute information on mercury effects to Colorado pikeminnow that was detailed in recent draft Biological Opinions.
- Platania will review older larval and small-bodied datasets and report to the BC in February.
- Hydrology has changed dramatically since the late 1980s and early 1990s. Could the higher flow conditions during that time period have mitigated the effects of contaminants like mercury?
- Lamarra suggested the need for a systematic write-up of the Program's data to track where we stand and where we should go. A small committee consisting of Lamarra, Ryden, Platania, and Miller could convene to guide Franssen in this effort. Campbell will work with Joel Lusk to bring the BC up-to-speed on the FWS contaminants knowledge.
- The FWS will continue to address the contaminants issues in the San Juan River Basin through the ESA consultation process. Funding to address contaminants concerns could come through the consultation process. The BC should develop ideas for studies that could be funded through this effort but FWS cannot share details from on-going consultations.
- Older datasets that predate the Program may not be in the Program Office. PIs will work with Durst to be sure this information is available so the compiled data can inform future efforts.
- The Program Office library needs to be available on the website. Durst will look into this.

Update on 2013 AWP:

- The 2013 AWP was approved by the CC. There have not been any changes since the last time it was reviewed by the BC. The 2013 AWP has been posted to the website with details on the 5-year budgets removed.

Update on FY2013 budget issues – McKinstry:

- All 5-year budget requirements have been submitted and the brief annual reports that were due at the end of the fiscal year were submitted apart from UDWR and Navajo Nation. This report requirement was not necessary for federal agencies.
- The Program continues to operate under a continuing resolution. All budgets except for Program Office will be funded in full and BR will use its authority to fund the Program until the authorizing legislation passes. There is a 2% CPI for FY2013 but the AWP reflects the actual costs so the CPI will not be included in those budgets to allow for overall budget flexibility.
- Funding issues with the Navajo Nation are being sorted out. There is an agreement in place for the PNM fish ladder but the one for NAPI ponds has not been signed although McKinstry is optimistic that this will happen soon since NAPI is due to receive fish in March. James Morel's position was advertised and has closed. It appears that there are some good candidates for this position. Because PNM fish passage did not operate for most of 2012 there will likely be sediment related maintenance issues to address in 2013.
- BR is moving to the Financial and Business Management System (FBMS) a new federal accounting system. Hopefully this will cause minimal disruption but it is not known if this will be an issue.

Update on O&M funding for Horsethief Ponds – Ryden:

- This facility has a new name: Horsethief Canyon native Fish Facility (HCNFF). There are a total of 22 ponds with 6-7 acres in total surface area. The SJRIP has a total of 1 acre of space over several ponds. All the ponds are currently full and excess 2012 year class razorback suckers have been put into ponds designated for SJRIP use. In late 2013 or 2014, depending on growth rate, approximately 2,000 razorback sucker should be ready to stock in the San Juan River.
- The State of Utah has concerns with whirling disease that is present at this facility and the Colorado River. These issues will have to be sorted out prior to stocking these fish.
- O&M cost for the SJRIP are 1/6 of the total costs based on the amount of pond space devoted to the SJRIP. Ryden's office will cover the cost of the first stocking to the San Juan from this facility so future budgets reflect the true cost of producing and stocking fish from this facility.
- The maximum yield of the SJRIP ponds is approximately 4,000 razorback sucker.

Update on installation of remote PIT tag readers:

- Remote PIT tag readers are scheduled to be installed at PNM Weir, Hogback Fish Weir, and Mexican Hat this winter. The reader at Hogback will be completed by spring 2013 and will be integrated into the construction of the fish weir.
- Because of electronic interference at PNM Weir, the readers will be mounted on frames above the concrete weir. This has increased the cost of installation. One reader will be placed in the stilling basin in order to determine downstream movement and a second reader will be placed on the downstream side of the stilling basin to identify fish that approach the barrier but do not subsequently use the fish passage.
- The installation site at Mexican Hat just upstream of the boat launch is on private land and McKinstry is working with the land owner regarding access issues.
- During installation at PNM and Mexican Hat flows will be reduced to 250 cfs to facilitate installation without any negative effects to the fish. BR is authorized to release flows from Navajo Dam as low as 250 cfs although FWS can send a letter indicating its approval of such low flow releases for the purpose of these installations. The Program Office has encouraged flows as low as 350 cfs throughout the winter in order to conserve water for spring release.
- Ryden cautioned against installations in March since UDWR starts non-native fish removal in the lower river during this time.
- How will the Program deal with the data produced from these systems? The system at McElmo Creek has detected many tagged fish. The Upper Basin is moving forward with having one or two

people devoted to data collected from remote PIT tag readers. The SJRIP needs to think about how this information demand will be addressed. Durst has communicated with PIT Tag Information System in the Columbia River Basin (PTAGIS) and the FWS Columbia River Fishery Program to get ideas how they deal with this kind of data. These groups have designed databases and queries in-house to automate the process. Because of life history of the fish in the San Juan River (long life-span and movement patterns) the data collected in the San Juan could be more complicated. There is expertise from KB and MEC to deal with issues that can be solved through programming. It will be important to account for all PIT tags being used in the system for this effort to be effective.

Capital projects update:

- The Navajo-Gallup project out-take could be combined with a non-selective fish passage at APS. The design would also prevent entrainment as well. Campbell has talked with project proponents, Pat Page, Brent Ulienberg to determine the feasibility of this option.
- The contract for the construction of Hogback Fish Weir has been completed and work will begin this winter. While the Hogback BO does not include a provision for post-construction sampling, Campbell will talk with BR about doing a one-shot study.

Hydrology model update:

- Katrina Grantz moved into a new position so Susan Behery will take the lead on the model with help from Ryan Christianson and Kristine Blickenstaff.
- Attempt to schedule a meeting of the Hydrology Baseline Work Group with the BC's February meeting.
- Efforts to model inflow to Navajo Reservoir are still under way. Model runs should be able to happen by the February meeting, followed by model validation so the Hydrology Model can be used to inform the flow recommendation revision in 2014. Model documentation should be complete by September 2014.

Researcher's Meeting update:

- The joint Upper Colorado River Recovery Program and SJRIP researcher's meeting will be held at the Moab Valley Inn in Moab, UT on 15-16 January 2013. Durst has distributed and posted to the website meeting information and a call for papers.
- The Program Office asked if SJRIP partners could participate as session chairs and also encouraged partners to attend and present at the meeting as well. The deadline for abstract submission is 1 December 2012. When the SJRIP hosts future Researcher's Meetings they will be held in Durango.

Review tasks assigned in Action Item list and schedule next meeting:

- Action items from this meeting: Whitmore will update the LRP (deadline 31 January 2013); Davis will develop non-native fish removal summary plan (31 December 2012); Campbell will provide a contaminants summary presentation at the February meeting (with the help of Joel Lusk); Durst will ensure that the documents from the monitoring workshop are posted to the website; Durst will ensure that the habitat workshop recommendations were incorporated in the monitoring protocol plan document; the PO will get the ball rolling to collect temperature data from select USGS stream gages; PIs will provide historic perspective on San Juan data; Durst will post relevant literature to San Juan website; Lamarra will send Durst summary of habitat type by river mile and reach; Campbell will follow up with folks at PNM about conducting a survey at the PNM lake; Campbell will work with BR to see if they need a letter to modify flows to install remote PIT tag readers.
- Next meeting 20-21 February 2013 in Durango, CO at Fort Lewis College. Attempts will be made to hold a hydrology meeting in conjunction with this meeting.
- The weeks of 6 and 13 May will be set aside for scheduling the Annual Meeting.

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG (Updated 20 November 2012)						
Item No.*	Action Item	Meeting/Origination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
1	Provide RBS/CPM stocking/capture/recapture data		P.I.'s to the Program Office	Annually before Jan. 1		
2	Provide Preliminary Draft Report Presentations		Project Leads (authors)	Annually at Feb. meeting		
3	Review LRP		BC	Annually at fall meeting		
4	Review Peer Review Comments from the February and May meetings		BC	Annually at fall meeting		
5	Provide Draft Reports		Project Leads (authors) to Program Office	Annually by end of March		
6	Scopes of Work		Project Leads to Program Office	Annually by end of March		
7	Provide Final Reports		Project Leads (authors) to Program Office	Annually by end of June		

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG (Updated 20 November 2012)						
Item No.*	Action Item	Meeting/Origination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
8	Annual Data Delivery		PIs to Program Office	Annually by June 30		
9	T&E Species Data		BC to Program Office	Annually by Dec. 31		
10	Annually compile T&E data and Program progress into summary to address overall Program recovery goals/objectives for presentation at annual meeting		Program Office/BC	By Annual Meeting in May		
11	Distribute Consolidated Data and list of annual data collected and available in the Program's database		Program Office to BC	Annually by Jan. 31		
12	Recapture analysis on PIT tagged fish		Durst	Annually by March		
13	Coordinate CPM stocking closely with Reclamation to avoid negative impact due to high flows/releases		Project Leads	Annually		
14	Waterfall Inundation Whitepaper – review past meeting summaries, determine what is needed, and provide report at the next meeting.	05/18/07	Program Office	12/07/07	Not a current priority	

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG (Updated 20 November 2012)						
Item No.*	Action Item	Meeting/Origination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
15	Revise RBS Augmentation Goals (based on the outcome of experimental stocking)	5/10/10	FWS Fisheries/Program Office	5/2011 – provide update and extend as needed	ongoing	
16	Develop a detailed outline for San Juan River Recovery Program case history manuscript	11-5-08	Propst/Miller			On hold
17	Pursue Non-native fish stocking procedures	11/5/09	Crockett and Gilbert	12/1/09	5/14/12	
18	Pursue effects study on Hg/pikeminnow with other groups/programs	1/14/10	Program Office lead	ongoing		
19	Blank database structure for data integration	1/13/10	Durst	3/23/10	2/24/11	
20	Discussion of what is the appropriate number of fish to stock	3/23/10	BC	ongoing		
21	Southern Ute funding of Population Model	5/10/10	Miller	11/2010	ongoing	
22	Work with I&E Coordinator to determine feasibility of brochures and signs	11/10/10	PO	2/24/11	Ongoing	

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG (Updated 20 November 2012)						
Item No.*	Action Item	Meeting/Origination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
23	Revised positive population response criteria	11/15/11	PO and FWS to BC	2/13/12	5/7/13	
24	Prepare memo to CC conveying BC recommendation to conduct a feasibility study on removing fish barriers in the lower Animas River	7/9/12	PO	8/20/12		
25	Prepare Lake Powell summary analysis SOW	7/9/12	PO	7/20/12		
26	Revise Lake Powell 2013 SOW	8/13/12	FWS-GJ	8/31/12		
27	Update LRP	11/8/12	Whitmore	1/31/13		
28	Non-native fish removal summary plan	11/8/12	Davis	12/13/12		1/30/13
29	Contaminants summary presentation	11/8/12	Campbell and Lusk	2/20/13		2/20/13
30	Post monitoring workshop documents and summaries to website	11/8/12	Durst – this was posted on 5/11/12 at http://www.fws.gov/southwest/sjrip/DR_PGD.cfm	12/31/12		11/29/12

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG (Updated 20 November 2012)						
Item No.*	Action Item	Meeting/Origination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
31	Incorporate recommendations from habitat monitoring workshop in monitoring protocol and plan document	11/8/12	Durst – there were no "recommendations" in the summary from the habitat workshop but the workshop summary was not posted to the website	12/31/12		11/29/12
32	Work with USGS to incorporate temperature monitoring into select existing stream gages	11/8/2012	PO	2/20/13		
33	Provide historic perspective on historic San Juan data	11/8/2012	PIs	2/20/13		
34	Post San Juan literature to website	11/8/2012	Durst	2/20/13		
35	Send PO summary of habitat type by RM and Reach	11/8/2012	Lamarra	12/31/12		12/31/12
36	Work with PNM to investigate potential for entrained fish at PNM lake	11/8/2012	Campbell	2/20/13		
37	Letter to BR regarding modifying flows for installation of PIT tag readers	11/8/2012	Campbell	12/31/2012		

* Items were re-numbered after changes were made

Yellow highlight indicates annual action items

Green highlight indicates new action items

Red highlight indicates completed action items that will be removed from the next iteration of the Action Item Log

Annual SJRRIP Cycle (Oct. 1 –Sept. 30) ***January 2011 version***

Date	Annual Tasks	PO	CC	BC	P.I.
Oct.	Reclamation administers contracts	X			
Nov.	BC Meeting • Identify questions for annual data integration • Review data integration results from previous year • Discuss Program priorities • LRP review and provide recommendations (pros and cons) to Program Office	X		X	
Dec. 31	RBS/CPM stocking/capture/recapture data to Program Office				X
January	Notification/update of Program rosters/mailing lists	X			
January	Executive meeting (Program Office; Reclamation Fund Manager; CC and BC Chairs) to do preliminary planning for upcoming year	X	X	X	
January	Updated LRP to BC and CC for review	X	X		
Jan. 31	Distribute consolidated PIT tag data and post other data	X			
February	BC Meeting • Prepare for Annual Meeting • Provide preliminary results; draft report presentations • Review updated LRP • Review annual data integration priorities	X		X	X
February	Final updated LRP to CC (with explanation of input included/not included)	X			
Feb/Mar	Approval of yearly LRP		X		
March	Annual guidance/solicitation for SOWs based on LRP/list of prioritized projects	X			
March 31	Draft reports due/SOWs to Program Office			X	X
April	Preliminary draft Annual Workplan and Budget	X			
May	Annual Meeting • Program overview • P.I. presentations • Review preliminary draft AWP • Committee reports	X	X	X	X
June/July	Draft Annual Workplan and Budget	X			
June 30	Provide final reports and data sets				X
August	Tech review of draft AWP; recommendations with pros and cons to Program Office			X	
August	Revise AWP based on input and transmit final draft to CC with documentation of all input	X			
Sept.	Review and approve final AWP		X		
Sept.	Post final AWP to website	X			