

Executive Committee Meeting
June 17, 2010

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
June 17, 2010, 9:00 am to 12:30 pm
Bureau of Reclamation Rio Grande Conference Room
555 Broadway NE, Suite 100, Albuquerque, NM**

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| | 1. Introductions and Changes to the Proposed Agenda (Dave Sabo) | <i>(5 minutes)</i> |
| * | 2. Approval of May 20 EC Meeting Summary | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 3. Update on ISC Water Rights Acquisition on MRG (Estevan López) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 4. Update on USACE Overbanking Action (USACE) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 5. Update on Ecosystem Revitalization @ Route 66 (USACE) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| * | 6. Coordination Committee Report (Co-chairs) | <i>(30 minutes)</i> |
| | a. Recommendation: Habitat Restoration Workgroup (HRW) Charter | |
| | b. Decision: Approve/Revise Charter for HRW | |
| | c. Peer Review Criteria | |
| | d. Prioritized Peer Review Projects | |
| | e. LTP Development Update and Schedule | |
| * | 7. Program Manager Update (Yvette McKenna) | <i>(15 minutes)</i> |
| | a. Workgroup Updates | |
| | b. Staffing Update | |
| | c. Adaptive Management Plan Update | |
| | 8. PHVA/Hydrology Update (Reclamation) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 9. USFWS Update (Lori Robertson) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | a. Biology Update | |
| | 10. PVA Update (USFWS/MRGCD) | <i>(15 minutes)</i> |
| | 11. BA/BO ESA Consultation Update (Consultation Team) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 12. Public Comment | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 13. Announcements | <i>(5 minutes)</i> |
| | 14. Next meeting: July 15, 2010 – ISC will host | |

EC Closed Session

Revised LTP Development Contract

* *Denotes read ahead material provided for this item*

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
June 17, 2010, 9:00 am to 12:30 pm
Bureau of Reclamation Rio Grande Conference Room
555 Broadway NE, Suite 100, Albuquerque, NM**

- | | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| | 1. Introductions and Changes to the Proposed Agenda (Dave Sabo) | <i>(5 minutes)</i> |
| * | 2. Approval of May 20 EC Meeting Summary | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 3. Update on ISC Water Rights Acquisition on MRG (Estevan López) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 4. Update on USACE Overbanking Action (USACE) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 5. Update on Ecosystem Revitalization @ Route 66 (USACE) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| * | 6. Coordination Committee Report (Co-chairs) | <i>(30 minutes)</i> |
| | a. Recommendation: Habitat Restoration Workgroup (HRW) Charter | |
| | b. Decision: Approve/Revise Charter for HRW | |
| | c. Peer Review Criteria | |
| | d. Prioritized Peer Review Projects | |
| | e. LTP Development Update and Schedule | |
| * | 7. Program Manager Update (Yvette McKenna) | <i>(15 minutes)</i> |
| | a. Workgroup Updates | |
| | b. Staffing Update | |
| | c. Adaptive Management Plan Update | |
| | 8. PHVA/Hydrology Update (Reclamation) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 9. USFWS Update (Lori Robertson) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | a. Biology Update | |
| | 10. PVA Update (USFWS/MRGCD) | <i>(15 minutes)</i> |
| | 11. BA/BO ESA Consultation Update (Consultation Team) | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 12. Public Comment | <i>(10 minutes)</i> |
| | 13. Announcements | <i>(5 minutes)</i> |
| | 14. Next meeting: July 15, 2010 – ISC will host | |

EC Closed Session

Revised LTP Development Contract

* *Denotes read ahead material provided for this item*

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
June 17th, 2010 9:00 am to 1:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation Rio Grande Conference Room
555 Broadway NE, Suite 100, Albuquerque, NM**

Decisions

- The May 20th, 2010 EC meeting minutes were approved for finalization with 3 changes:
 - 1. The last bullet in the decision section will be removed from that section and rephrased to: “The EC *expressed interest* in pursuing a BA analysis period of 10 years for an indefinite consultation (BiOp) term and *provided guidance* to the PHVA/Hydrology work group to move forward with 10 year analysis periods.
 - 2. On page 3, under the USFWS update, Lori Robertson’s name will be removed and replaced with “the Service (to Wally Murphy)” as the point of contact for comments; and
 - 3. On page 4, in the 3rd sentence under the Consultation bullet, the phrase “not included in the *BA*” will be changed to “not included in the *proposed action*.”
- With quorum present, the EC approved the revised HR charter.
- With quorum present, the EC authorized the CC to make non-substantive changes to Program documents as needed without having to revisit each at the EC level. However, with this authorization came a caution that the CC carefully define what “minor” changes entail. CC members were instructed to continue to communicate with their EC representative on these changes as they occur.

Actions

- Yvette McKenna will send out the invitation to the Overbanking Action Follow-up and Discussion meeting.
- In advance of the Overbanking Action Follow-up and Discussion meeting, agencies are asked to send any information (data, photos, documentation, etc.) collected during the overbanking action to the Corps for compilation.
- On June 23rd after the CC meeting, Yvette McKenna will distribute the CC’s recommended list of peer review questions for the San Acacia Fish Passage project. EC members are asked to provide comments and feedback on the questions by June 30th.
- Yvette McKenna will schedule a conference room and have a conference call line set up at Reclamation for the special session EC meeting on July 1st from 1:00pm to 3:00pm to review the CC’s recommendations on San Acacia Fish Passage peer review questions.
- The EC requested the CC group the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review questions into main categories and organize the categories by chronological sequence to make it easier to determine/define the expertise needed on the review panel.

Special Session Meeting

- July 1st from 1:00pm to 3:00pm at Reclamation - to review the CC’s recommendations on the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review questions.

Next Meeting: July 15th, 2010 at ISC

- Tentative Agenda Items: (1) Mark Brennan's presentation to EC on yearly work plan

Meeting Summary

- Dave Sabo called the meeting to order and a quorum was confirmed. Introductions were made around the room.
- The agenda was reviewed and approved with (1) the removal of Item #3 (Update on Water Rights Acquisition on MRG) since no ISC representatives were present and (2) decreasing the allotted time of the PVA update from 15 minutes to 5 minutes.
- The May 20th, 2010 EC meeting minutes were approved for finalization with 3 changes: (1) the 4th bullet under Decisions regarding the *"EC support[ing] pursuing a BA analysis period of 10 years for an indefinite consultation (BiOp) term and authorize[ing] the PHVA/Hydrology work group to move forward with 10 year analysis periods"* will be removed from the Decisions section and reworded to read *"The EC expressed interest in pursuing a BA analysis period of 10 years for an indefinite consultation (BiOp) term and provided guidance to the PHVA/Hydrology work group to move forward with 10 year analysis periods."*; (2) on page 3, under the USFWS update, Lori Robertson's name will be removed and replaced with "the Service (to Wally Murphy)" as the point of contact for comments; and (3) on page 4, in the 3rd sentence under the Consultation bullet, the phrase "...not included in the BA" will be changed to "...not included in the *proposed action*."
- In an update on the Overbanking Action, the Corps' representative shared that overall the action went well. The Corps started storing water in mid-April through mid-May resulting in about 17 ft of lake rise. The actual release began May 18th. The peak through Albuquerque and Belen occurred on May 23rd and 24th. All water was evacuated by May 27th. The original intent was to add to the natural peak assumed to be near 5,000 cfs, however, this year's run off started strong but quickly trickled down. This resulted in the releases adding to 3,200 cfs instead. The action achieved about 5,300 at Albuquerque for 2 ½ days. The extent of inundation was even more than expected for those flows – mostly of bars and restoration projects. There was fairly extensive overbanking down through the Los Lunas Bridge; inundation was "spotty" below Los Lunas until the Refuge reach. The Corps captured the aerial extent down to the Bosque Bridge. There were many people from multiple agencies and entities out monitoring at individual restoration projects.
 - There will be an Overbanking Action Follow-up and Discussion meeting with interested agencies to discuss the event including procedure and process. The follow up meeting is expected to be scheduled for the end of June. A meeting notice with details will be sent. In advance of the meeting, agencies are asked to send any information (data, photos, documentation, etc.) collected during the overbanking action to the Corps for compilation.
 - It was commented that there was a big silt problem encountered within the District's system.
- The Corps' Ecosystem Revitalization event on May 28th was successful and exceeded expectations. The event was informative with guest speakers sharing critical NM conditions and issues and area "tours" highlighting some of the overbanking. This is an \$8 million dollar project outside the Program but supports the work of the Program; 128 out of 1,110 acres have been completed so far.
- The Coordination Committee (CC) has recommended the EC approve the revised [Habitat Restoration \(HR\) work group charter](#). The only revision the CC made to the charter was to

change the HR work group “leader” to “leaders.” The CC asked for clarification on what the EC has delegated to the CC for approval.

- The EC approved the HR charter and authorized the CC to make non-substantive changes to Program documents as needed without having to revisit each at the EC level. However, with this authorization came a caution that the CC carefully define what “minor” changes entail. CC members were instructed to continue to communicate with their EC representative on these changes as they occur.
- Provided in the read aheads was a CC document describing the [peer review recommendation and prioritization process](#) that the EC requested last month. The recommendations have come from both top down and bottom up as well as from the CC itself. The work groups are in process of developing peer review questions with assistance from their CC representatives. An official, formal process has not been developed or agreed upon yet. However, the CC will continue working on developing a more formal process for selecting and prioritizing projects for peer review that includes elevating recommendations to the EC for approval.
 - It was explained that there is an ID/IQ with 2 contractors; each individual project review will be issued as a task order under the standing ID/IQ. It is the responsibility of the selected contractor to locate specific, appropriate review panel experts. This was done intentionally to operate the reviews in a “double blind” manner that allows the company to manage the review process and avoids inadvertent influencing of the panel. However, the Program also has the option of issuing a solicitation for a wide range of responses. Concern was raised regarding the assurance of getting the appropriate level of expertise. The contractor(s) have a list of nearly 400 names of various subcontractors that can be accessed and used for any given project; most are from academia.
 - The Program can request a standing panel that will follow and provide review through the various phases of development. It was suggested that the review panel address the questions in a logical fashion starting with the design, then construction, etc.
 - The San Acacia fish passage project review has 27 review panel questions identified to date – including questions regarding design, construction, fish biology & science, location & hydrology, O&M, monitoring, etc. This review has the potential to be very big and there are a lot of questions (for comparison, there were only 11 questions for the San Acacia A&R review). The Science work group is concerned that the questions posed to the contractor are so specific that it will constrain the reviewers to that level. The questions are intended to focus the reviewers on what needs to be addressed or answered.
 - The CC is currently trying to focus the list of questions. Comments on the current question list are due tomorrow. The CC will then review those questions and the revised list at their next meeting on June 23rd. Recommended questions will be provided to the EC for final decision. However, the approved final questions list is needed before the next EC meeting since the acquisition deadline has already past. The review process won’t itself be rushed, but the funding needs to be obligated as soon as possible.

- The EC agreed to hold a special session meeting July 1st from 1:00pm to 3:00pm at Reclamation to review the CC's recommendations on the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review questions. It was requested that the CC group the San Acacia Fish Passage peer review questions into main categories and organize the categories by chronological sequence to make it easier to determine/define the expertise needed on the review panel.
- In the CC update on the Long-term Plan (LTP), it was shared that the CC continues to have working meetings and will be reviewing the future activity summaries. The CC is also revising the text of the LTP for clarification and thoroughness. Past activities are being developed by GenQuest. It is anticipated that a draft LTP will be available for Program review this summer.
- In the [Program Manager \(PM\) Update](#), it was shared that the HR work group is still in need of a co-chair. There continues to be very little participation and commitment in the Public Information and Outreach (PIO) work group which is in jeopardy of disbanding until there is more support and participation. Reclamation is interviewing for the PMT liaison position (to replace Kathy Dickinson). The term Program Administrative Assistant position closes on June 21st. The Adaptive Management Plan Development solicitation is out with responses due by July 1st. Experience and technical background will rank higher than cost.
- In the PHVA/Hydrology Update, it was shared that the 2003 BiOp model runs were discussed at the last meeting in May. The tech team has some minor changes to make to the model before any more runs are completed. A few months ago the PHVA work group provided a refresher on the work they have been doing; there will be another very condensed refresher provided soon for any new individuals. At the request of the PVA group, PHVA is working on an operations calendar for historical flows from the 1990s with key occurrences; the purpose is to provide information to the PVA group on some of the management actions going on during that time. The PHVA Summary document is expected by the end of July. The next meeting is August 10th.
- In the hydrology update, it was shared that the mainstem flows are dropping rapidly and managed recession is expected to begin soon. Drying could begin as early as next week below San Acacia. El Vado was filled this year and Heron probably won't get much more. Abiquiu is essentially full; ABCWUA moved a portion of their water down to Elephant Butte so they have just enough space for this year's allocation of about 50,000 ac-ft. They are still subject to evaporative losses. It is assumed that the "not causing harm to the native supply" rule applies so San Juan/Chama water would be on top in Elephant Butte. Lack of storage for San Juan/Chama water is the biggest issue right now. We are out of Article VII with the projection of being back in Article VII by mid-summer (July). The lease information is public but it is not posted anywhere specific and there isn't a directory or published report that is produced; Reclamation has summaries.
- In the USFWS Update, it was shared that about 1,000 eggs were collected between late April and early June and delivered to the BioPark. Larval and juvenile fish will be collected to add to propagation needs of up to 10,000 for future broodstock. The Service monitored 5 HR sites in the Belen reach during the overbank action peak. Some of the sites were not inundated but sites were sampled as close as possible and silvery minnow were found at all 5 sites. In the population monitoring, silvery minnow were present at 19 of the 20 sites sampled by ASIR on April 1st and 2nd. Overall, there was approximately 9.8 silvery minnow/100 m²; Angostura had approximately 11.2/100 m²; Isleta had approximately 5.3/100 m²; and San Acacia had the highest density with 11.5/100 m². A single large backwater

produced 81% of the 405 silvery minnow captured at the site below San Acacia Diversion Dam. Because of the good minnow production this year, it is expected that salvage will be important and that there will be a large salvage operation. And because of the large numbers of minnow, careful water management can help with keeping as much minnow survival as possible.

- Quarterly monitoring was conducted on May 19-21 in Big Bend. Silvery minnow were collected at 2 of the 5 monitoring sites, including 30 at Santa Elena Canyon. Egg monitoring was conducted during March and April: approximately 200 eggs were collected from Santa Elena Canyon and Rio Grande Village sites, preserved in alcohol, and taken to UNM for genetic analysis. The presence of silvery minnow eggs at those two sites can now be confirmed. This is the first evidence of spawning in Big Bend since the first fish were stocked in 2008..
- Mark Brennan, the reintroduction biologist with the Service, is working on the LTP activity summaries for the reintroduction projects (planning, implementation, and monitoring). He will present his work plan at the July EC meeting. In order to recover the minnow, there needs to be 3 self-sustaining populations (the Middle Rio Grande, Big Bend, and an additional population); right now, there are zero self-sustaining populations.
- The flycatcher is having a good year so far – while there are no exact numbers yet, this year is at least as good as last year. 10 nests have already been established at the Bosque del Apache sediment plug area. The Service is working on the reissue of flycatcher critical habitat as a result of a lawsuit. The proposed rule will be issued in little over a year and will include all habitats that meet the definition of critical habitat for the flycatcher including occupied and unoccupied areas and Elephant Butte. The 2005 critical habitat rule covers 120,000 acres across California, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and New Mexico and focused on providing riparian habitat for breeding, non breeding, territorial, dispersing, and migrating flycatchers. The Service will define critical habitat using the best available science; and all habitat that meets the definition will be in proposed rule but it is possible for some areas to be excluded between the proposed and final rules. Examples of possible excluded areas could be warehouses on included land parcels, landowners with their own management plan, etc. There is only one Safe Harbor agreement along the MRG and it is unknown how it will be addressed in the proposed rule. The Service will conduct government to government consultation with tribes and pueblos, and will do the NEPA process. The comment period on the proposed critical habitat rule is assumed to be 60 days.
- In the PVA Update, it was shared that work group has not met since report but has a meeting scheduled for June 29th and 30th. The modelers with the work group agreed to have a useful product of both models by September 30th. This won't be a finalized or perfect version of the models, but they are supposed to be useable.
- The consultation team met on June 3rd and continues to have broad participation. The team is focusing on the consultation strategy documents: outlines with details in order to guide the group assure the path we are on will lead to where we want to be, especially in terms of non-federal coverage. Questions that still need resolution include: (1) what are the non-federal actions?; (2) how to appropriately include those non-federal actions into the consultation; (3) how to confer the broad ESA coverage to those non-federal actions; (4) how the LTP and adaptive management plans will work with the BA/BO to help alleviate jeopardy; and (5) the period of analysis versus the “term” of the consultation and the details of each. A handout

with an excerpt from the Consultation Strategy Document regarding the terms and analysis periods was provided. Please provide comments or feedback on the draft strategy document to team members. There is a non-federal meeting scheduled for June 25th from 9:00am to 3:00pm at ISC– to review and provide input on the draft non-federal list of actions documents. The hope is to have a draft of the non-federal actions provided to the Program soon.

- There was no public comment.
- It was announced that (1) the Program is participating in Sandia Pueblo's Earth Day celebration on Friday and everyone is invited (please see [Earth Day read ahead](#)); and (2) everyone is also cordially invited to attend the [Army Corps' Change of Command ceremony](#).

Next Meeting: July 15th, hosted by ISC

**Executive Committee (EC) Meeting Attendees
June 17th, 2010 9:00 am to 1:00 pm**

Attendees:

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Seat</i>
Dave Sabo	Dept. of the Interior	Federal co-chair, non-voting
Lisa Croft	Bureau of Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
Kris Schafer	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Bob Jenks	NM Department of Game and Fish	NMDGF
Matt Schmader	City of Albuquerque	City of Albuquerque
Subhas Shah	MRGCD	MRGCD
Frank Chavez	Pueblo of Sandia	Pueblo of Sandia
Janet Jarratt	Assessment Payers Association Of the MRGCD	APA

Others

Yvette McKenna – PM	Bureau of Reclamation
Brent Rhees	Bureau of Reclamation
Jim Wilber	Bureau of Reclamation
Leann Towne	Bureau of Reclamation
Monika Mann	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
William DeRagon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Col. Colloton	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jason Williams	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Kelly Allan	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Stacey Kopitsch	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Lori Robertson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jennifer Bachus	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ann Moore	NM Attorney Generals Office
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD
Terina Perez	City of Albuquerque
Robert Hall	DOI/Solicitor's Office
Deborah Goss	Pueblo of Santa Ana
Rick Billings	ABCWUA

Cody Walker	Isleta Pueblo
Joe Jojola	BIA
Reese Fullerton	SPO
Ann Watson	Santo Domingo Pueblo
Stephanie Russo	U.S. Representative Martin Heinrich's Office
Jenae Maestas	GenQuest
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech

MEETING READ AHEADS

**Charter for
Habitat Restoration Work Group
of the
Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**

Overview

The Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Act Collaborative Program (Program) By-Laws, adopted by the Executive Committee (EC) on October 2, 2006, define the Program's organizational structure and discuss the various organizational units including the EC, Coordination Committee (CC), Program Manager (PM), Program Management Team (PMT), and work groups. The EC may establish work groups and designate members of work groups on its own initiative or on the recommendation of the CC when additional assistance or expertise is beneficial to accomplishing the goals of the Program. Upon approval of this charter, the Habitat Restoration Work Group (HRW) is established by the EC, and will serve at the pleasure of the governing body.

The HRW will operate with specific schedules, objectives, and scopes of work established by the EC. Methods for accomplishing the established activities will be identified by the HRW. The PM will assign a PMT liaison to support the HRW and ensure that objectives and work products are clearly identified, assigned work group tasks are completed, and schedules are met.

HRW Objectives

The purpose of the HRW is to help restore habitat in the Middle Rio Grande (MRG) in order to provide guidance and contribute to accomplishing Biological Opinion RPA elements R and S for the benefit of the listed species. The HRW will provide technical assistance, expertise and leadership to address specific Program tasks, primarily implementation of the Long Term Plan, to accomplish the goals of the Program. The HRW provides:

1. Coordination of long-term, MRG-wide, habitat restoration plans that actively integrate river function, riparian community and hydrology, resulting in improved habitats for endangered species that support the Biological Opinion RPA
2. Integration of HR activities with other Program-related activities, including other Program work groups and restoration efforts outside of the Program
3. A regular forum for meeting and discussing Program-related habitat restoration topics
4. Consistency in technical planning efforts over the duration of the Program
5. Technical assistance to others wanting to implement habitat restoration projects
6. A scientific framework for monitoring and assessing restoration projects
7. Support for conferences and publications that facilitate the exchange of information derived from HRW efforts

HRW Membership

Each EC member may appoint one voting member to the HRW. Each EC member may also appoint one or more alternate HRW members. As in the EC and the CC, the total membership of the standing HRW shall not exceed twenty (20).

Additional Participants

Participation in the HRW may vary depending on the subject matter and may include:

1. Additional personnel from agencies/entities that are signatories to the Program;
2. Professionals with expertise in the subject matter who do not represent Program signatories;
3. Contractors or other parties, including members of the public, with experience in the subject matter addressed by the HRW.

Ad Hoc Work Groups

If necessary to implement tasks in the long-term plan, and after providing notice to the EC, HRW may form and disband temporary ad-hoc groups of individuals with expertise and/or interest in the specialized subject. HRW will oversee ad-hoc work groups and be responsible for ensuring ad hoc work groups meet objectives and schedules, and will disband the work groups upon completion of the pre-determined objectives. The EC may appoint additional members to the ad-hoc groups including:

1. Professionals with expertise in the subject matter who may or may not be involved in the Program, and
2. Contractors or other parties, including members of the public, with experience in the subject matter addressed by the work group.

HRW Leader(s)

The HRW will elect two work group leader(s), each serving for a term of one year with no more than two consecutive one-year terms. Any appointed member of the HRW may serve as work group leader. To the extent practical, one leader should represent a federal agency and one leader a non-federal agency to ensure broadest representation. At least one HRW leader will participate in each monthly PMT communication meeting, held the 4th Wednesday of each month, and at CC and EC meetings upon request.

HRW Meetings

The HRW will hold regular meetings on the third Tuesday of each month. The HRW may meet more or less frequently, if determined appropriate by the HRW leader(s), according to work assignments. Additional special meetings may be called by the work group leader(s) if needed to accomplish specific tasks. The PMT will post HRW meeting schedules, locations, and agendas on the Program website at least one week in advance of the meeting date. All meetings will be open to the public. The work group leader(s) will ensure that meeting summaries are kept that accurately reflect actions of the HRW. The PMT will ensure that meeting summaries are posted on the website within one week after they are final.

If a member cannot attend a meeting, the alternate should attend, or the member may send a written request or statement regarding agenda items of interest.

HRW Responsibilities and Scope of Work

The HRW is responsible for carrying out specific scopes of work established by the EC. The PMT liaison will assist the leader(s) to develop a HRW Annual Scope of Work and Schedule for submittal to, and approval by, the EC each year. The HRW Annual Scope of Work will contain objectives, tasks, schedules, and deliverables to be completed for that year. To the extent possible, the Annual Scope of Work will also identify ad hoc group(s), if any, and ad hoc group members. Any additional activities that may arise during the course of the year will be submitted to the EC. The continuing responsibilities and scope of work of the HRW are as follows:

Implementation of Long Term Plan (LTP) Activities via the RFP Process:

- Review LTP budget estimates and activities and recommend changes if needed
- Recommend priorities for focused HR activities
- Coordinate with other work groups and PMT to develop scopes of work (SOWs) that effectively integrate objectives
- Participate in evaluating proposals (TPEC process) and recommend TPEC membership (i.e. outside experts)
- Interface reach-specific restoration plans into master approach for MRG

Technical Review and Coordination:

- Provide technical input and assistance for work groups, projects, and Program assessment process
- Review contract and work group deliverables and provide feedback
- Conduct site visits
- Review and update habitat restoration plans
- Coordinate with other efforts (Program and non-Program) in the MRG
- Participate in joint quarterly meetings with other work groups
- Oversee ad-hoc HRW work groups

Monitoring and Assessment:

- Provide technical input and implement Program Monitoring Plan
- Develop and implement Adaptive Management Plan (consistent with the Program Monitoring Plan)
- Provide prior year project updates to PMT (i.e. assist with Annual Report)
- Participate in and recommend topics for annual forums
- Review Long Term Plan budget estimates and activities and recommend changes if needed
- Recommend experts to obtain input on technical issues
- Recommend research and monitoring needs

Other Technical Contributions:

- Carry out other work established or approved by the EC

Relationship of HRW to Other Organizational Units of the Program

The EC makes Program decisions. The EC establishes work groups. HRW products and recommendations are provided to the EC through the PMT, after discussion and review by the CC and the PMT. The CC will discuss all work products with their respective EC member.

The PM is the leader of the PMT. The PMT will provide a liaison to support the HRW and to ensure that assigned work group tasks are completed. The PMT reports to the EC. The EC may delegate certain decisions to the PMT, CC, or work groups.

Coordination between work groups occurs through the PMT, during monthly communication meetings, and at joint work group meetings. Joint work group meetings will be held when needed, such as when preparing for fiscal year activities and working collaboratively on specific projects.

Support to HRW

The PM will assign Program staff to support HRW so that the objectives and work products are clearly identified, assigned tasks are completed, schedules are met, and necessary support is provided as further identified in the PMT Charter. HRW leader(s) will be designated to work with the assigned staff to establish the Annual Scope of Work and Schedule.

The PMT will provide support for meetings of the HRW, including distribution of agendas and meeting materials, and distribution of meeting summaries. Final meeting summaries will be made available to the public via an established Program distribution network. The PM will provide HRW products subject to EC approval to the CC for review and discussion, and will assist the CC in developing recommendations to the EC.

HRW Recommendations

The HRW will make technically sound recommendations based on the best available science and professional judgment of the members. If a consensus recommendation is not reached, the voting procedure described below may be used.

Voting Procedures and Minority Reporting

When voting is required to provide recommendations, each voting member (member appointed by an EC member) is allowed one vote. Participants that are not voting members do not have a vote. Recommendations will be of the simple majority present. The minority, if they choose, may submit a minority report with the majority recommendation to the PM and the EC. The majority recommendation will note that a minority report has been filed.

Reporting Results and Communicating Recommendations

The HRW leader(s) will provide work products and recommendations to the EC through the PMT, after discussion and review by the CC. HRW leader(s) will report on HRW activities at each monthly communication meeting, and at CC and EC meetings upon request.

HRW Work Products

All final HRW products are subject to approval by the EC and, upon approval, the PMT will make them available to the public.

Annual Review of HRW

The PM, with input from the PMT, will review the accomplishments of HRW annually with respect to its objectives, schedule, and participation by members, and make recommendations to the EC regarding continuation or termination of the HRW, as well as changes in objectives, schedule, or membership.

Amendment of HRW Charter

This charter may be amended as deemed appropriate within the bounds of the By-Laws, with input from the HRW, and approval by the EC. At a minimum, the charter will be reviewed annually.

EC approved the foregoing Habitat Restoration Work Group Charter on 23 August 2007.

Background

The Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program (Program) approved peer review of the San Acacia Reach A&R report to test the Department of Interior's IDIQ contract and process for peer review of scientific information. The Program paid approximately \$29K (FY09 funds) for the peer review report and a presentation which was very beneficial and exceeded expectations. Program participants were in agreement that additional Program projects should be identified for independent scientific peer review in order to ensure the quality and credibility of the scientific information we will be utilizing for decision making and disseminating to the public.

Funding Available for Peer Review

Program approved \$50K for peer review in FY10. Funds previously approved for completing environmental compliance on San Acacia Fish Passage (\$166K) have been added to Independent Peer Review. Currently, approximately \$216K is available for independent scientific peer review of Program projects in FY10.

Process Used to Select Projects for Peer Review in FY10

- Projects recommended for peer review are initially identified by the Executive Committee (EC), the Coordination Committee (CC), or the technical workgroups.
- During the April 14 meeting, the CC discussed and approved the Population Estimation study for peer review in FY10 as: 1) the draft final report for the first three years of this study is available and 2) the Program needs an agreed upon, scientifically sound methodology to better estimate how many Rio Grande silvery minnow are in each reach of the Middle Rio Grande. The CC also requested that the Science (ScW) and Habitat Restoration (HR) workgroups recommend projects for peer review.
- On May 12, the CC prioritized projects recommended for peer review by the ScW and HRW.

The questions used to determine the priority included:

- Is the timing right for the results of the peer review to inform the next phase of the project?
- Will the project or project results have great influence on or importance to the Program?
- Is there a draft project report available to be reviewed?
- Is there sufficient time and money in the contract or agreement, or opportunity to extend either, for the principal investigators to incorporate feedback from the peer review into the final project report?
- Are the results of the study controversial?

This resulted in the following projects being recommended for peer review by the CC:

- 1) Population estimation
 - 2) River Mile (RM) 83 Feasibility Study
 - 3) Population monitoring
 - 4) Genetics
 - 5) Suggested review of PVA models when available
- At the May 20 meeting, the EC directed the Program to peer review the San Acacia Fish Passage project.
 - During the May 26 meeting, the CC was briefed on the results of the RM 83 feasibility study and it was determined that, at this time, the project would be enhanced by expanding the geographic scope of analysis rather than a peer review. Funds previously planned to be used for peer review may be used to expand the scope of analysis if deemed reasonable by the HRW and the CC.
 - The CC then reevaluated and reprioritized projects recommended for peer review based on the new information about the RM 83 project and direction from the EC.

Current Priorities and Status of Peer Review

- 1) San Acacia Fish Passage (reviewing draft peer review questions)
- 2) Population estimation (draft peer review questions prepared)
- 3) Population monitoring (may be tabled until FY11)
- 4) Genetics (revising draft peer review questions)
- 5) PVA models when available (tabled until FY11)

The CC and technical workgroup members will review and comment on the peer review task order for the San Acacia Fish Passage project. Appropriate technical representatives can be scheduled to provide informal presentations to the CC for further information on other projects selected for peer review.

Workgroup Update
Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
June 17, 2010

Project Management Team

The Program Management Team (PMT) continues to meet frequently to follow up on action items from the Coordinating Committee (CC) and the Executive Committee (EC), and to discuss and implement improvements to the Program.

Revised LTP Development

The CC held working meetings on May 26 and June 4 to continue reviewing the future activity summaries drafted by the Science workgroup (ScW) to further the development of the revised Long Term Plan (LTP). The CC held a regular meeting on June 9 to discuss the peer review process, workgroup charters, and guiding principles for projects to include in the LTP. It is anticipated that the LTP will cover approved Program activities from FY2011 to FY2020 and a draft plan will be out for Program review this summer. GenQuest is compiling the past activities summaries from 2000-2010 with the assistance of Kathy Dickinson. The workgroups have submitted draft summaries for their identified priority 1-3 activities. The revised LTP development is a priority for the CC, the PMT, the workgroups, Water Consult and GenQuest for the next few months. The Program has contracted additional administrative and technical support, and Jenae Maestas, Jean Burt and Edward McCorkindale, GenQuest, and Rachelle Schluep, Christine Sanchez and Marta Wood, Tetra Tech, continue to assist the Program in the revised LTP development, meeting summaries, and other critical areas.

Adaptive Management

The Adaptive Management Plan (AMP) Development solicitation was posted on June 8 with a response date of July 1, 2010. Activities for this requirement include: review of Program documents; coordinating and facilitating strategy meetings and planning sessions with Program participants; developing a preliminary outline of the AMP; and producing the draft and final AMP. Evaluation criteria for award consideration include technical capability to satisfy the government need, qualifications of proposed staff, past performance on similar or comparable projects, and price. This will be a long-term effort requiring a multi-disciplinary team of Program members and technical consultants.

Jericho Lewis has been coordinating contractual activities related to the AMP Development, Isleta Phase II habitat restoration, and peer review; and a grant opportunity for Restoration of Habitat Benefitting the Rio Grande silvery minnow and the Southwestern willow flycatcher. Diana Herrera has been working on: financial information for the 2008 and 2009 annual reports being prepared by GenQuest; updates on FY10 funding obligations; water leasing obligations; and FY2012 and FY2013 Program budgets. Monika Mann is the PMT liaison to the Database Management System (DBMS) ad hoc workgroup, and for the Habitat Restoration (HR) workgroup where she assists the co-chair with many LTP related tasks as they have a vacant co-chair position. Amy Louise serves as the PMT liaison to the Population Hydrology Viability Assessment (PHVA) and San Acacia Reach (SAR) ad hoc workgroups, and the Species Water Management (SWM) workgroup. Stacey Kopitsch serves as the PMT liaison for the Science and Population Viability Analysis (PVA) workgroups, and Monitoring Plan Team (MPT) ad hoc workgroup. Susan Bittick has arranged for "Strengths Finder" training for the PMT and the CC using U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) collaborative funds. Reclamation is conducting

interviews for a general biologist/PMT liaison, and the announcement for a term Program administrative assistant went out on June 11 and closes on June 21.

Habitat Restoration Workgroup

The HR workgroup met on May 18 and approved the HRW Charter. The DBMS request and spreadsheet were provided to workgroup members for review. The workgroup discussed using a spreadsheet listing volunteers to read and summarize HR reports for presentation at HRW meetings. An update on the draft River Mile 83 (RM 83) Feasibility Study Report was provided. The workgroup discussed what next steps should be taken after a peer review. There was general agreement that output from peer reviews should be discussed and used to benefit future projects. The workgroup viewed the presentation “*Understanding Channel/Floodplain Relationships, A Ratio to Recovery*” by Anders Lundahl. The presentation showed a comparison of channel and flood plain widths on the Middle Rio Grande using aerial imagery from 1935 and 2006. A discussion on the need for variability in channel/floodplain ratio followed, with one opinion that any plan for recovery should recognize the dynamics in each river reach.

The HRW also met on June 15 and heard a presentation on E-flows from Susan Kelly, a habitat restoration update from Sandia Pueblo, and an update on the City of Albuquerque wetland project by Martin Martinez. The Program Contracting Officer (CO) has requested that members be identified to participate in a team to evaluate HR construction proposals which are due at the end of June. Rick Billings also gave updates on the “Annual Report for the City of Albuquerque’s Rio Bravo North and Rio Bravo South Habitat Restoration Projects: 2007-2008” and the LTP. The next meeting is scheduled for July 20.

Monitoring Plan Team ad hoc Workgroup

The Monitoring Plan Team (MPT) has continued to implement the low intensity monitoring portion of the Effectiveness Monitoring Plan (EMP). The workgroup held a regular meeting on June 15, and members of the EMP Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee (TPEC) will meet again on June 25 for follow up on the EMP contract status.

Science Workgroup

The ScW held a regular meeting on May 18 at the Interstate Stream Commission (ISC). Further discussion of the projects recommended for peer review took place. The workgroup is reviewing and revising the peer review questions developed for the Genetics Assessment and Monitoring project. Members of the workgroup were assigned to complete 41 priority 2 and 3 activity summaries for inclusion in the LTP and to date, these have all been completed. The DBMS request for information was passed along to the workgroup, and members will submit any available data that they have access to. The workgroup also discussed the use of a DIDSON camera for the Fish Community/Gear Evaluation and future projects.

The ScW also met on June 15 at the ISC. Comments on the San Acacia Fish Passage draft peer review questions will be sent to Stacey Kopitsch for compilation and will then be provided to Kathy Dickinson and Jericho Lewis. The next meeting is scheduled for July 20.

Species Water Management Workgroup

The SWM workgroup met on June 2 to discuss the DBMS workgroup needs, LTP, and climate change models. SWM provided point of contact (POC) information and made several

suggestions for data that should be added to the Program database that was not included in the spreadsheet. SWM continues to provide information for the LTP future activities and is currently producing future activity summaries for priorities 2 and 3. The SWM workgroup was shown a presentation “Downscaling Climate Projections: Motives, Methods, and Resources” by Levi Brekke from Bureau of Reclamation Technical Service Center. The presentation showed how planning interests motivate climate projection downscaling and bias-correction, the strengths and weakness of methods for downscaling, and several data resources available to support planning studies. The next meeting is scheduled for July 7 at the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) from 10 am – 12 pm.

San Acacia Reach ad hoc Workgroup

The SAR workgroup met on May 27 to discuss the DBMS workgroup needs, Objectives, Agency Response to Themes, and white papers. SAR provided POC information and made suggestions for data that should be added to the Program database that was not included in the spreadsheet. The SAR workgroup objectives were finalized with a few minor changes and the Agency Response to Themes was tabled for the June meeting. The workgroup had a brainstorming session for ideas for white paper topics. The next meeting is scheduled for June 24 at Reclamation from 12:30-2:30 pm.

Population Viability Analysis (PVA)/Biology Workgroup

The PVA workgroup is scheduled to meet again for a full day on June 29 and a half day on June 30 at Reclamation. The workgroup will be focusing on the variables for use in analysis and ensuring that functional models are available by September 30, 2010.

Population Habitat Viability Assessment (PHVA)/Hydrology ad hoc Workgroup

The PHVA/Hydrology workgroup met on May 18 and discussed the 2003 Biological Opinion (BO) runs. The 2003 BO model runs are on hold; the model runs are currently set to be 10 year simulations but there is a possibility that the simulations could be more than 10 years. The workgroup, with input from the consultation team, recommended the 2003 BO model run be an unlimited supply run. The 2003 BO Unlimited Supply model run will not be initiated until (1) the tech team completes model upgrades and (2) the proposed duration of the new Biological Assessment (BA)/BO is determined (i.e., 10 years, 30 years, 50 years, etc.). The next meeting is scheduled for August 10.

Public Information and Outreach Workgroup

Julie Maas, Stacey Kopitsch, Monika Mann and Yvette McKenna will be participating in the Sandia Pueblo Earth Day celebration on June 18. Mary Carlson and Julie have been compiling a mailing list to distribute the Program DVDs, along with an introduction letter to accompany the DVD and a news release. In order to accomplish upcoming planned activities (i.e. the Open House in Fall 2010), this workgroup needs much more participation from representatives of EC signatory agencies and is in jeopardy of disbanding due to lack of participation and commitment.

Database Management System ad hoc Workgroup

The DBMS workgroup sent the data spreadsheet used for the needs analysis to the workgroups with a request to review and comment on the data needs and identify any data gaps and POCs for each dataset. The following tasks and target dates were provided:

- 1) Identify data sets to provide and POCs- 9 July 2010 by COB.
- 2) All data will be due to the contractor- 15 September 2010 by COB.
- 3) POCs will coordinate with contractor- 19 July- 30 December 2010 as needed.
- 4) POCs and signatory representatives will test pilot DBMS- July 2011.
- 5) POCs and signatory representatives will test production DBMS- April 2012.

Activity summary assignments were completed on May 19. It was determined that the entire Middle Rio Grande will be used for the pilot program per the contract with DB Stephens, and the contractor will provide the format, methods, meta data, etc. needs to put into the database to create a standard for future data input. The next meeting is July 12 at USACE from 1-2 pm. Kenny Calhoun will present the database acquisition webpage, and the workgroup will discuss the data acquisition process and workgroup role.

EARTH DAY

the Environment
Department

June 18, 2010



**Will be hosting
“Mother Earth”
Earth Day Festivities
from 10:00am. to 2:00 p.m. at
the
Sandia Wellness Center**

**Followed by
“Father Sky”
Stargazing Festivities
From 7:30 p.m. to 10:30 p.m.
At North Windmill on East
Range
Bussing Provided**

Stop by and find out what you can do to help save the environment. Information about your GIS, Water Quality, Water Resources and Turkey Program will be on hand to give valuable information. Our staff will be joined by a number of vendors, including: Bureau of Indian Affairs, US Fish and Wildlife, New Mexico Herpetological Society and New Mexico Game and Fish.

**Lunch will be provided between
11:30 and 1:30.
Stop by and see us.**



*Brigadier General Rock Donahue
Commanding General, South Pacific Division
U. S. Army Corps of Engineers
requests the pleasure of your company at a
Change of Command Ceremony for the Albuquerque District
in which
Lieutenant Colonel Kimberly M. Colloton
will relinquish command to
Lieutenant Colonel Jason D. Williams
on the sixteenth of July 2010
at ten o'clock in the morning*

*Albuquerque District Headquarters Building
4101 Jefferson Plaza NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico*

Reception follows in the Headquarters Building

*R.S.V.P. by 30 June 2010
POC: [Jeannette Alderete](#)
601-342-3432*

*Military: Duty Uniform
Civilian: Southwest Casual*

