

2 July 2013



**Approved Summary  
San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program  
Biology Committee Conference Call  
4 June 2013**

**Attendees:**

**Biology Committee Members:**

Bill Miller, Chair – Southern Ute Indian Tribe  
Jake Mazzone – 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  
Benjamin Schleicher – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 6  
Vincent Lamarra – Navajo Nation  
State of Colorado – absent  
Eliza Gilbert – State of New Mexico  
U.S. Bureau of Land Management – absent  
Tom Wesche – Water Development Interests  
Conservation Interests – absent

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

David Campbell  
Sharon Whitmore  
Scott Durst

**Interested Parties:**

Dale Ryden – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Bobby Duran – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Carrie Lile – Southwestern Water Conservation District  
Chris Cheek – Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife  
Howard Brandenburg – American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers  
Susan Behery – U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

**Tuesday 4 June 2013**

**Changes to agenda:**

- Add nomination of Jacob Mazzone as Jicarilla Apache Nation BC representative.
- Discuss change in larval fish monitoring schedule.

- Update on target base flow from Behery.
- Provide background on TNC SOW to evaluate and update the flow recommendations.
- Update on data management call with Upper Basin from Durst

**Nomination of Jacob Mazzone as Jicarilla Apache Nation BC representative:**

- Campbell distributed Mazzone's nomination and resume.
- Mazzone provided details on his experience with Colorado State University, Larval Fish Lab, and Jicarilla Apache Nation.
- Wesche asked about Mazzone's intentions to stay with the Jicarilla Apache Nation given their recent turnover and his hopes that someone would be there more permanently. Mazzone intends to stay in the position for some time. McKinstry suggested that Mazzone get on the river with Program PIs to learn what kind of work the SJRIP is doing. Mazzone intends to get into the field.
- Wesche moved to approve Mazzone's nomination, Lamarra second, and approved unanimously.

**Approve draft summary for 7 May 2013 meeting:**

- Durst incorporated earlier edits.
- Mazzone is still not on the BC email list and Lamarra will provide an updated email address. Durst will see that these are added to the list.
- Davis motion to approve the meeting summary as distributed, Gilbert seconded, and approved unanimously.

**Discussion of 2014 AWP:**

- Campbell indicated that there is still about an \$87,000 deficit after the budget was reduced by removing workshops, reducing overhead at SNARCC, and combining Program Office SOWs and lowering some costs. Options to make up the deficit include foregoing specific activities within projects, foregoing entire projects, or reducing projects to 2013 budget levels.
- Wesche expressed concern that once remote PIT tag readers are operational; there may be increased budget needs for database management. Campbell indicated that until these systems are online we will not know the degree to which the database management budget would change.
- Returning SOWs to 2013 levels will not eliminate the entire budget deficit. Also, certain projects cannot be reduced to 2013 levels because of additional activities scheduled in 2014. Miller suggested reviewing specific activities within projects that could be dropped without seriously compromising the project objectives. For example, the retrospective analysis in the temperature monitoring could be pushed off for another fiscal year saving about \$16,000. Could a trip or reach be dropped from other projects? Could elemental scale analysis be pushed off for another year? Davis suggested that if budgets were reduced to 2013 levels, PIs should develop a list of activities that would not be completed.
- Peer review was at the bottom of the listed priorities, but Campbell indicated that peer review is a Department of Interior mandate that cannot be dropped. The priority list should be revised to reflect this. Wesche asked if savings can be made by not having higher level biologists participate in fieldwork or if non-native fish removal projects from FWS and UDWR could be combined to save costs? What about pushing off habitat verification? Others noted that this has not occurred since 2007. In general, budgets in 2014 increased to reflect actual costs.
- Campbell asked for guidance on how to proceed. Ryden indicated there could be some savings in PIT tags but there is not a stockpile from past years. The monitoring upstream of the Animas River was conducted at no additional cost in 2013 and could be removed from the 2014 scopes. The block-seining method in small-bodied could be eliminated, allowing for some cost savings, since it has not been more productive than normal seining techniques. McKinstry indicated that the budgets

Reclamation receives should not be reduced so if additional funding becomes available that money can more easily be obligated.

- PIs should review their projects, prioritize activities, and propose activities that could be eliminated in 2014 budgets. PIs should provide justification and pros/cons for dropping any activity. This should be a brief one-two page document submitted to the Program Office for consolidation and distribution to the BC for their review.
- PIs should submit potential revisions to scopes-of-work with justification and costs savings to Program Office by 21 June. The Program Office will distribute this to the BC the following week. BC will discuss during a conference call on 2 July from 9-11am. Since UDWR is not on call Whitmore will coordinate with Brain Hines.

**Change to larval fish monitoring schedule – Brandenburg:**

- The scheduled 4-10 August larval monitoring trip has a scheduling conflict. Given the low flows and warm water temperatures, it would be beneficial to move this trip one week earlier resulting in only a one week break between the July monitoring trip. If the scheduled trip is delayed one week Colorado pikeminnow larvae might be missed. The BC supports the proposed shift of this trip one week earlier.

**Target base flow projections – Behery:**

- Behery will provide a new update with the latest forecast. It appears that the forecast has improved from earlier projections. Behery will continue to send these updates to keep everyone informed. Reduced target base flows are only estimated for the period following fieldwork.

**Background on flow recommendation evaluation and revision SOW – Campbell:**

- This SOW originated from the previous habitat workshop and the need to understand the habitat-flow relationships. This SOW is written as a series of workshops to review and possibly revise the existing flow recommendations. Budget issues will push this SOW off until 2015.
- BC should review this SOW for discussion during 2 July conference call.
- TNC will facilitate these workshops and any analysis will be a team effort among TNC, BC, PIs, outside experts, and Program Office. The Hydrology Model should be completed before proceeding with this SOW.

**Update on data management conference call – Durst:**

- A conference call organized by Dave Speas was held on 24 May 2013 to discuss developing an integrated database for both recovery programs. Call participants included Speas, Koreen Zelasko, Durst, Nate Franssen, and Tom Czaplá. The group was convened to provide the foundation for a scope-of-work to develop a cross-program database. The group discussed the feasibility and need to merge the recovery program databases, the need for a “master” database of PIT tags, the database needs to address remote PIT tag detections, how QA/QC would fit into this process, and how the Upper Colorado River Recovery Program’s GIS tag database would be integrated or used. Outside expertise from the Pacific Northwest or Paul Marsh’s group may be able to provide guidance in database development. The group plans to have a future call in late June or July. Several key database users/managers, including Travis Francis, were not on this first call.
- Ryden expressed the importance of PIT tag distribution lists to distinguish and identify fish detected via remote PIT tag readers. Some issues with data sharing that have been problematic in the Upper Basin are not present in the San Juan Basin.
- The SJRIP should continue this discussion during the fall meeting

**BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG**

(Updated 5 June 2013)

Item No. *	Action Item	Meeting/O rigination 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 5 June 2013)

Item No. *	Action Item	Meeting/O rigination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
8	Annual Data Delivery		Pls 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 5 June 2013)

Item No. *	Action Item	Meeting/O rigination 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	5/14/13	
18	Pursue effects study on Hg/pikeminnow with other groups/programs	1/14/10	Program Office lead	ongoing		
19	Discussion of what is the appropriate number of fish to stock	3/23/10	BC	ongoing		
20	Southern Ute funding of Population Model	5/10/10	Miller	11/2010	ongoing	
21	Work with I&E Coordinator to determine feasibility of brochures and signs	11/10/10	PO	2/24/11	Ongoing	
22	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	5/7/13	

**BIOLOGY COMMITTEE ACTION ITEM LOG**

(Updated 5 June 2013)

Item No. *	Action Item	Meeting/O rigination Date	Responsible Party(s)	Due Date	Revised Date	Date Completed
23	NNF workshop recommendations to Davis	2/21/13	BC	3/18/13		
24	Pros and cons of moving non-native removal trips from lower to middle sections of river	5/7/13	Davis	6/28/13		
25	Provide trips dates to Reclamation (via Whitmore) to determine if flows can be increased during sampling trips	5/7/13	PIs	5/31/13		5/31/13
26	Finalize memo on Ridges Basin recommendations, CC review, forward to FWS-R6	5/7/13	Miller, PO	5/31/13		
27	Revise SOWs based on recommendations from February and May meetings	5/7/13	PIs	5/31/13	6/21/13	
28	Review AWP	5/7/13	BC	5/31/13		6/4/2013
29	Finalize and post LRP to website	5/7/13	Whitmore	5/31/13		5/31/13
30	Complete Threats Assessment draft	5/7/13	TNC	6/28/13		
31	Prioritize within project activities and pros and cons of removing low priority actions	6/4/13	PIs	6/21/13		

\* 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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify questions for annual data integration</li> <li>• Review data integration results from previous year</li> <li>• Discuss Program priorities</li> <li>• LRP review and provide recommendations (pros and cons) to Program Office</li> </ul>	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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare for Annual Meeting</li> <li>• Provide preliminary results; draft report presentations</li> <li>• Review updated LRP</li> <li>• Review annual data integration priorities</li> </ul>	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 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program overview</li> <li>• P.I. presentations</li> <li>• Review preliminary draft AWP</li> <li>• Committee reports</li> </ul>	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			