



Final Summary
San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program
Biology Committee Conference Call
8 September 2009

Attendees

Biology Committee Members:

Bill Miller, Chair – Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Paul Holden – Jicarilla Apache Nation
Ron Bliesner – 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
David Propst – State of New Mexico
Gregory Gustina – U.S. Bureau of Land Management
Tom Wesche – Water Development Interests
Navajo Nation – absent
State of Colorado – absent

Program Office – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2:

David Campbell
Sharon Whitmore
Scott Durst

Interested Parties:

W. Howard Brandenburg – American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers

Introductions; Changes to agenda:

- There were no changes to today's agenda

Approve 20 August 2009 meeting summary:

- The outcome of writing task #2 was clarified that the project PI's would develop an integrated monitoring plan and protocol from the workshop notes. This revision included possibly changing protocols in order to save funding that could be used for targeted studies in the future.

- The use of 95% ethanol for specimen preservation in larval sampling make genetic analysis possible but genetic analysis is not part of this scope. Also shifting the September sampling trip to July/August has only been a discussion topic and remains that at this point.
- The peer review discussion was clarified to indicate that this SOW is still under revision and different options are still being considered that will satisfy recommendation that have been made by the Coordination Committee.
- The summary from the 20 August meeting was unanimously approved with these edits.

Technical review of revised SOWs:

- Minor edits still need to be made to some of the scopes. These are not yet available for review but these edits do not change the technical merits of the scopes.
- The funding is sufficient for all scopes as detailed in the SOWs. Campbell coordinated with PIs to ensure the carryover was accounted for in the budgets. There are two proposals that will be submitted to the Coordination Committee:
 1. Proposal A – In this proposal all scopes are funded in full with a \$16,000 surplus. The budgets in this proposal have increases/decreases in funding from FY2009 levels that were directed by the projects PIs. Scopes in this proposal had an average increase of 5-6% over FY2009.
 2. Proposal B – This proposal holds FY2010 funding at FY2009 levels. Any CPI will be uniformly applied to projects in the future based on what the Program receives from the Bureau of Reclamation. This proposal has a \$114,000 surplus that can be directed toward changes in workload scopes that will be determined on a case-by-case basis. These funds could also be used to cover work outside of exiting scopes or to cover equipment needs. Increases or decreases in funding from FY2009 levels will be based on the effort or workload in the scope.
- Since CPI is not known at the time that scopes are developed, if scopes do not change effort, the budgets should be at FY2009 levels and any CPI increase that the Program receives will be uniformly applied to all projects.
- The anticipated CPI should be added to meeting agendas as a running item. McKinstry would provide a CPI update so PIs know what to expect each year.
- Surpluses like the \$114,000 detailed in Proposal B can be easily carried over from year-to-year so the monies are not lost.
- The Program Office will have a full-time coordinator position that will be filled by Campbell. This position will be funded by 75% contribution from FWS and 25% contribution from the Program. The group agreed that this will be a benefit to the Program.
- BIA is willing to funnel funds to Keller-Bliesner Engineering to complete habitat monitoring work. An inter-agency agreement between BIA and BR will be required to have this project funded through 2010. The Keller-Bliesner contract expires at the end of 2010. A new contract is required for work after 2010, but is required for other work Keller-Bliesner is doing for BIA. Future work for the Program could be added to this contract. For work beyond 2010 the inter-agency agreement between BIA and BR will require extension or a new agreement.

- The status and role of the current peer review panel is still under consideration. The Biology Committee felt that the peer reviewers should continue to review draft reports and attend the February meeting. The peer reviewers and BC should be separate entities with the BC in a “developing” role and the peer reviewers in a strictly review role. The peer reviewers do not need to be present at the meetings that develop scopes but they should review the scopes once they are developed. The upcoming meetings in November and January will include discussion from workshop recommendations. The peer reviewers do not need to be at these meetings but they should review products that are developed from this meeting.
- There was some discussion of an additional group of peer reviewers that would focus on broader recovery issues. This group would be used on a case-by-case basis to address specific issue(s). This panel should be separate from the current peer reviewers. There should be a group of specialists that serve as peer review for next year’s non-native fish removal workshop.
- Ryden distributed the non-native fish stocking document. This document needs to be pushed by the Coordination Committee to the relevant state, federal, and tribal agencies with non-native fish stocking authority within the San Juan River Basin. This document strictly refers to the San Juan River Basin and signatories to this document may also be signatories to the Upper Program’s nonnative fish stocking policy.

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG						
(Updated May 18, 2009)						
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 Final 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		
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		

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG						
(Updated May 18, 2009)						
Item No.*	Action Item	Meeting/Origination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
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	Coordinate CPM stocking closely with Reclamation to avoid negative impact due to high flows/releases		Project Leads	Annually		
13	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	
14	Revise CPM and RBS Augmentation Goals	5/7/08	FWS Fisheries/Program Office	11/30/08	Nov 2009	
15	Provide specifics of selenium sampling procedures and analysis	1/26/09	Bliesner/Osmundson	2/18/2009		On hold
16	Develop a detailed outline for San Juan River Recovery Program case history manuscript	11-5-08	Propst/Miller			On hold

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG						
(Updated May 18, 2009)						
Item No.*	Action Item	Meeting/Origination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
17	Remote PIT tag reader white-paper	BC 13 may 2009	McKinstry			
18	Incorporate peer review comments and workshop notes to come up with SOWs to address these outstanding questions	8/20/2009	Brandenburg, Durst, McKinstry, and Ryden	10/23/09		
19	Develop integrated monitoring plan and monitoring protocols from workshop notes	8/20/2009	Bliesner, Propst, Ryden, and Whitmore	10/23/09		
20	Review integration analysis from workshops to develop a list of questions and proposed approach to address these	8/20/2009	Campbell and Miller	10/23/09		

* Items were re-numbered after changes were made