

August 17, 2001

**San Juan River Basin
Recovery Implementation Program
Biology Committee
July 20, 2001
Conference Call Summary**



Members Present:

Jim Brooks, Chairman
Matt Andersen
Ron Bliesner
Larry Crist
Paul Holden
Vince LaMarra
Bill Miller
Steve Platania
Dave Propst
Dale Ryden
Tom Wesche
Marilyn Greenberg, Program Assistant

Representing:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
State of Utah
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Jicarilla Apache Nation
Navajo Nation
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
University of New Mexico
State of New Mexico
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Water Development Interests
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Summary of Agenda/Action Items

Bill Miller's scope of work for the data integration

After some discussion of the time and energy required to integrate data from the three- and five-year scopes of work, the Biology Committee agreed (with Bill Miller concurring) that Bill and his group were qualified to integrate the data effectively and efficiently. This will not detract from Bill's population modeling work.

Bill agreed to be the lead for the scope of work for the data integration. He will combine the report editing and other researchers' involvement into one data integration effort, and describe it in the introduction as one unified scope of work. The \$200,000 budget will be clarified by adding details outlining man hours/days for tasks, equipment, etc.

Resulting products will be clarified and details about who will do what (subgroups providing chapters, integrating other available data and research, technical editing, final editing, etc.) will also be included. A flow chart will be added to show how pieces are passed and linked. It needs to be clarified that Peer Reviewers will provide additional expertise to ensure appropriateness and accuracy of the reports.

Utah's non-native removal scope of work.

The Biology Committee agreed that the same amount of trips (10) could be spread out over a longer period of time (approx. March - Nov.), to determine when fish are moving up river, with the same amount of money as currently budgeted. They could also review and fill in with other available data, from previous years, for clarification of other impacts of fish movement upstream (such as water clarity and flows). Trips could be done biweekly starting in May. There may be additional Fall sampling data available from non-native fish removal trips by other groups.

Matt Andersen agreed to clarify in the revised scope of work that this first year is an exploratory, intensive effort to design a long-term control/removal program. He will also take advantage of existing literature to incorporate previous years' data.

PNM fish passage operation scope of work.

The Biology Committee discussed concerns about the cost of operation of the fish passage. It is high compared to Redlands. They would like to see the costs reduced by approximately \$8,000. There are also questions about who will operate the fish passage. If it is not someone local, there are concerns about response time (i.e., the ability to respond to problems that arise due to weather or other unforeseen circumstances).

Larry Crist agreed to take these comments back to Bob Norman. Vince LaMarra will touch base with Jeff Cole and ask that the work plan budget be revised accordingly.

Hybridization Scope of Work

The Biology Committee recommended that the justification be expanded by linking it to future recoverability and habitat work. Some Committee members feel that a Hybridization study is a lower priority, if funding is limited.

Peer Review

Dave Galat cannot be as involved as needed, but can assist part of the time. An additional Fishery Ecologist and a Hydrologist/Geomorphologist are needed for 20 - 25 days in 2002. Their pay would be in the \$65 - \$75/hour range.

Please get nominations, resumes, AND availability to the list serve within the next 30 days. The committee will discuss nominations at the early September Biology

Committee meeting.

Water Development Comments

a) More details in the \$200,000 budget/integration (already addressed above).

b) Roundtail Chub

The Biology Committee supports the community approach: the chub is tied to the recovery of the pikeminnow. The committee agrees to forward this item to the Coordination Committee. (Wesche opposed) Program funding is a separate issue.

c) Budget process details

The Biology Committee agreed to modify scopes of work budgets by providing fiscal details broken down by task. Jim Brooks agreed to send out a format proposal so that budget scopes can be uniform (break out man hours/days and total costs; and specify big ticket - \$5,000 or more - equipment items). Out year costs should be included. Monitoring costs will be the same, with increases for inflation, in following years. They agreed to include how long costs are expected/projected.

There were questions about water temperature and quality and how data are being put to use. A statement will be added re: "this information is included in the monitoring plan" so that the same information does not have to be repeated and the same questions answered repeatedly.

d) Identify 2002 deliverables in each scope of work.

The Biology Committee agreed to note end product(s) and date(s) of delivery in scopes of work.

All revisions should be to the Program Coordinator by July 24th. If received after that date, the turnaround will be delayed until the week of Aug. 8th.

Other:

Jim Brooks asked for volunteers to assist with the Congressional Tour (August 21 - 22). Please talk to Jim ASAP!

Larry Crist is leaving the Bureau of Reclamation. Reclamation will nominate Tom Chart to replace him on the Biology Committee. Larry requested that Tom be added to the list serve in the interim to facilitate the transition.