

Meeting Notes (prepared by Ann Oliver, 4/21/10)  
DRD Science Committee  
April 15, 2010

## Agenda

*1. Review/Discussion/Recommendations: Given new information from CDOW, Biology Committee and Chester Anderson, what does Science Committee recommend as next steps with respect to science and/or action around native fish?*

- CWCB proposal will most likely not be funded.
- Discussion of Technical Memo from Chester Anderson:
  - Mike Preston presented the memo publicly at a Wild and Scenic meeting in GJ
  - David Graf related that Dan Kowalski disagrees with concept that trout, non-native predator issues or channel structure/habitat issues outweigh inadequate base flows as a stressor for the native fish.
  - Memo illustrates the reason that an agreed upon review process is very important. (Note: David Graf and Ann Oliver did review and edit the memo, but it did not go through review by Science Committee nor by Steering Committee).
  - Memo developed partly to try to enhance/broaden the discussion with CDOW regarding native fish issues on the Dolores.
- Steering committee discussed a symposium around native fish as one way to address questions/disagreement around native fish.
- Point was made that it is important to discuss operations at the same time as native fish.
- Suggestion: focus on the question: What can, should we do to improve conditions for native fish given the current operational constraints? Is there anything? Is it worth doing?
- Suggestion: should be a regional discussion.
- Question was posed: Should we identify priorities for flow management? Discussion:
  - Priority is native fish for the environmental entities.
  - What are CDOW's current priorities? Response: Native fish, but there are always pressures regarding game fisheries from angler roundtables, etc.
- Question was posed: How did natives survive the 1890-1990 period, when base flows were very low (sometimes intermittent). Discussion: One point is that even in that period, flows remained high into late June and July, so the period of time when flows were very low was limited to late summer/early fall.
- Suggested next steps:
  - Native fish meeting. Discussion in steering committee around a Delphi approach type workshop and need for education around proposals. Need to understand both the biology and the hydrologic and operational dynamics.
  - Gather more info on native fish from other systems (although recognize that data and knowledge about these native fish is in really just now being developed)
  - Gather more info on methods for controlling Small Mouthed bass.
  - Then try some things: take some actions and see what happens.
  - Develop monitoring protocols.

*2. Review/Discussion/Recommendations: Review draft review process for Big Gyp Final Report; recommend process to Steering Committee.*

Suggestions:

- increase number of academic reviewers needed to "at least 2". Emphasis on academic.

- Specify in the process that the 1st and 2<sup>nd</sup> DRD Reviews (1=Biology Committee/Hydrology Committees, 2= Steering Committee) will each be discussed in the form of a 2 hour meeting with guidelines (e.g. substantial comments only, no wordsmithing, acceptance means you can live with it, etc.), with intention being to have robust discussion among all partners at once.
- In order to secure the needed outside reviews, contacts should be made now. Ann will draft a cover letter to set context and make the request. Rob, Chester, Adam responsible for identifying reviewers and securing the reviews.

### 3) Update: Chester Anderson

- recently purchased Sonde instrument which collects: Dissolved Oxygen, Temperature, pH, turbidity and conductivity. Purchased out of Big Gyp funds.

### 4) Update: Rob Anderson (Rob could not be present, but Ann provided brief update).

Fort Lewis College classes of Drs. Gary Gianinny and Cynthia Dott recently installed 3 piezometers and data loggers for tracking groundwater levels on a transect across the river and an old meander bend in the Big Gypsum Valley. Well locations selected by Rob, David, and Chris Massengil during a previous site visit. Rob has also secured 6? Sensors and gypsum blocks to monitor soil moisture levels along the transect. Rob was able to borrow most of this equipment from Larry, with NRCS office in Cortez. Many thanks to Jim Fisher for connecting Rob to Larry and facilitating this opportunity.

### 5) Discussion: Science Sub-Committee Role with respect to Steering Committee and Framework Process

- Chester pointed out that his remaining funds are not sufficient to cover development of proposals or participation in "framework" workshops.
- Need to define DRD science role (Ann offered to take a shot at a draft.) Discussion:
  - One model proposed: "Steering Committee asks the questions, and Science Committee answers them." Point added that in some cases, questions and ideas will come from the Science Committee (e.g. SLOWS).
- Meghan will send an outline of how a similar committee works in another organization (example provided by Chris Massengil)
- Could propose that a management priority on the Dolores be defined.