

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**  
**Habitat Restoration Workgroup Meeting**  
19 October –12:30pm - 3:30pm  
**Interstate Stream Commission**

**Actions**

- Rick Billings and Monika Mann will revise/update the FY10 HRW Annual Work Plan with suggestions for FY11; the revised will be provided for discussion at the November meeting.
- Rick Billings and Sarah Beck will draft a synopsis on the 2009 ISC Habitat Restoration Monitoring report for the November meeting.
- Monika Mann will compile a list of HRW's prioritized FY11 activities and will provide the list to the CC for approval (scopes of work are not to be written until approved by the CC).
- Monika Mann will take the following HRW suggestions to the PMT tomorrow (10/20/10) for feedback: (1) prioritize a programmatic or at least reach-wide compliance package or mechanism and (2) explore establishing a Program restoration "team" with operators and heavy equipment (owned by the Program).
- Anders Lundahl will distribute the recent Santo Domingo or San Felipe survey done in the Cochiti reach to HRW members.
- Rick Billings will check with Yvette McKenna on the progress with pueblo consultation and provide the suggestions from the HRW; ideally, the agreements with the pueblos would be in place prior to the award of the restoration work.
- Sarah Beck will incorporate the suggested changes and narrow down the scope of the *Isleta Refugial Drying* based on today's conversation.
- The remaining HRW FY11 draft scopes are due to Ondrea Hummel by the end of the week.
- Gina Dello Russo and Anders Lundahl will write a draft scope of work for the system wide monitoring using the list of from monitoring meetings.
- Monika Mann will forward the scope of work from the adaptive management contract to HRW members.
- Robert Padilla and Gina Dello Russo will write a draft scope of work for Analysis of Options and Techniques to Address Degradation in the San Acacia Reach.
- Anders Lundahl will send the 2009 ISC Habitat Restoration Monitoring report or link to Rick Billings and Sarah Beck.

**Decisions**

The August 17<sup>th</sup> and September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2010 Habitat Restoration Workgroup (HRW) meeting minutes were approved with no changes.

**Recommendations**

- Members of the HRW expressed concern over the lack of priority given to habitat restoration. It was suggested that the CC be asked: how important is restoration work to the Program? What is enough? Is 100 acres a year enough? It was noted that all the HRW activities in the LTP Table 7 were listed by the work group as Priority 1 – supporting the standpoint that the work group believes the restoration work is needed and should be priority. However, at this time on-the-ground restoration work does not appear to be given priority and it is noted that there are no dollars allotted for habitat restoration construction for FY11. Direction from the Program on the priority of restoration will guide annual funding priorities and will help the work group understand their purpose.

**Meeting Summary**

- Rick Billings brought the meeting to order. After introductions were made, the agenda was approved with a slight change in order. The scope of work discussions were moved to last. Both the August 17<sup>th</sup> and September 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting notes were approved with no changes.
- In an update on the Adaptive Management Workshop, it was shared the contractors are experienced with similar systems and issues and are skilled with facilitating large group collaborations. The contractor proposed an aggressive schedule. The next steps include meeting individually with EC members and then with the work groups. There was brief discussion about forming a new adaptive management ad hoc work group but nothing was decided yet. If a new work group is to be formed, it is assumed that it will be comprised of the co-chairs from all the key work groups in order to efficiently coordinate the various aspects of the Program. There will be additional meetings and workshops later in the year.
- Each year the work groups are required to submit an annual work plan for the EC to approve. The work plan should outline the tasks the work group expects to accomplish that year. The easiest way to develop the new work plan is to revise and update the previous year's plan. Rick Billings and Monika Mann volunteer to revise/update the FY10 HRW Annual Work Plan with suggestions for FY11 for discussion at the November meeting.
- In an update on the Long-term Plan (LTP), it was reported that the CC is still working on the text narratives and reviewing the last of the future activity summaries. A complete draft LTP is expected in March 2011; HRW members were encouraged to review the draft version (when available) in order to make sure the HRW projects and priorities have been accurately included and not omitted.
- Sarah Beck briefly presented on the Population Estimation synopsis. The population estimation program was started in 2007 or 2008; there have been some methodology changes between years and it is not known if more changes will have been implemented in the 2009 sampling. The population estimation includes information on the mesohabitat type - which is potentially really useful information for guiding future work and studies. For 2009, it was estimated that there were  $3.5 \pm 1$  million minnow between Angostura and Elephant Butte; this translates to roughly 20,000 fish per river mile. The highest population estimates are for the Isleta Reach. It is difficult to make any definitive statements with only 2 years of estimation data, but in general it appears that every year the population estimates increase - meaning the population is doing well.
- After a brief update on the Criteria 1 and 2 projects that the CC approved for FY11 funding, HRW members discussed whether or not habitat restoration was a Program priority. Other large collaborative programs spend up to half of their annual budget for on-the-ground restoration and construction with annual goals of 500 acres restored yearly. There is concern with the lack of concrete on-the-ground activity that will help ensure we are moving toward recovery. It is understood that with the BA/BO consultations currently underway, everyone is "on hold" or hesitant, but with the environmental compliance delays it often takes a year or two before actual construction can begin. It was also acknowledged that restoration projects are costly - \$300,000 might only translate into 10 or 15 acres restored. Attendees brainstormed options to help decrease the expense of implementing restoration projects. Suggestions included streamlining the environmental compliance process and purchasing equipment to be owned by the Program; this suggestion included a "team" of equipment operators. Having the ability to complete some of the work "in-house" would offer the Program options for construction work – contractors could be used for larger, immediate projects but the in-house team could be utilized for smaller projects or project maintenance.
- The work group reviewed 2 draft scopes that were developed in response to the September workshop. Attendees discussed pueblo participation, approval and permission for the *Cochiti* scope. There needs to be government to government consultation prior to issuing the RFP in order to ensure that the tribe is on-board as the work would require access to pueblo lands. It was suggested that the scope be modified to include: (1) specifics on the pueblo benefits and Program benefits including products and deliverables; (2) description in terms of physical and biological environment; and (3) blank sections to allow for the tribe to include their concerns and desires into the written scope. It was then strongly encouraged that the Program

facilitates the government to government consultation. The Program Manager had volunteered to lead this task, but the status is unknown. For the *Isleta refugial drying* scope, references to “find water” will be rephrased to “find alternative water sources.” It was agreed that this is a planning or feasibility study project. Specific suggestions for analysis included: (1) decreasing diversions at Isleta; (2) use of return water from the District; and (3) drilling a shallow well with attached water rights. The work group also agreed to specify the site area as 10 miles around Los Lunas.

- HRW members prioritized activities for the CC. In order, the recommended projects are: (1) streamlined environmental compliance; (2) San Acacia Reach: flycatcher habitat adjacent to Elephant Butte – expand near existing territories, potential habit, beetle; analysis and construction; (3) Albuquerque Reach: System wide analysis; (3) Isleta Reach: RGSM refugial & drying habitat; (4) San Acacia Reach: Degradation management – limited refugial habitat RGSM; (4) Cochiti Reach: Floodplain connectivity improvement construction; (5) Cochiti Reach: prioritize areas (combine info from Cochiti & SD subreach A&R info); (6) Bosque Farms Entrapment Alleviation Construction and (6) Albuquerque Reach: Floodplain HR construction.
- **Next Meeting – November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010 from 8:30 to 3:30 at ISC.**
  - Tentative meeting agenda items: (1) Review draft HR 2011 Annual Work Plan (Monika/Rick); (2) 2009 ISC Habitat Restoration Monitoring Report Synopsis (Rick/Sarah); (3) SAR peer review process symposia: benefits, highlights for work group awareness/discussion (Gina/Anders); and (4) SWCA: COA monitoring status presentation;

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**  
**Habitat Restoration Workgroup Meeting**  
19 October –12:30pm - 3:30pm  
**Interstate Stream Commission**

**Meeting Notes**

- **Introductions and Changes to Proposed Agenda:** Rick Billings brought the meeting to order. After introductions were made, the agenda was approved with a slight change in order. The scope of work discussions were moved to last.
- **Approve August 17<sup>th</sup> and September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2010 Meeting Minutes:** Both the August 17<sup>th</sup> and September 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting notes were approved with no changes.
- **Update on Adaptive Management Plan:** An adaptive management plan workshop was held on Wednesday, October 13<sup>th</sup> with the awarded contractors. An aggressive schedule for completion was proposed, but it is acknowledged that the schedule will probably be revised as needed in the future. The next step will be individual interviews with EC members before December. Formation of the adaptive management plan should be a very transparent process and there was discussion about forming another work group but nothing was decided yet. If a new work group is to be formed, it is assumed that it will be comprised of the co-chairs from all the key work groups in order to efficiently coordinate the various aspects of the Program. There will be additional meetings and/or workshops with work groups and key people later in the process. The contractor provided a good overview of their experience and expertise, including work with similar systems, issues, and players on the Platte River issues and facilitating large group collaborations. HR members were encouraged to participate in reviewing all stages of the draft adaptive management plan in order to help ensure that it properly ties in with the PVA and other models, LTP, BAs, etc.
- **HR 2011 Annual Work Plan:** Each year the work groups are required to submit an annual work plan for the EC to approve. The work plan should outline the tasks the work group expects to accomplish that year. The easiest way to develop the new work plan is to revise and update the previous year's plan.

**Action:** Rick Billings and Monika Mann will revise/update the FY10 HRW Annual Work Plan with suggestions for FY11; the revised will be provided for discussion at the November meeting.

- **Long Term Plan Update:** The CC is still working on text narratives and reviewing the last of the future activity summaries. Based on direction from the 9/16/10 EC meeting, the targeted completion date is March 2011. HRW members were encouraged to review the draft version (when available) in order to make sure the HRW projects and priorities have been accurately included and not omitted.
- **Presentation of Population Estimation synopsis:** The intent of the synopses is to help keep HRW aware of Program activities and reports/results. HRW can discuss how to use the information and generate questions for follow up.
  - Sarah Beck briefly presented on the Population Estimation synopsis. The population estimation program was started in 2007 or 2008; there have been some methodology changes between years and it is not known if more changes will have been implemented in the 2009 sampling. The population estimation includes information on the mesohabitat type - which is potentially really useful information for guiding future work and studies. For 2009, it was estimated that there were 3.5 ( $\pm$  1) million minnow between Angostura and Elephant Butte; this translates to roughly 20,000 fish per river mile. The highest population estimates are for the Isleta Reach.
  - The work group briefly discussed some of the known differences between population monitoring and the population estimation. For population monitoring, there are a number of sites that are revisited year after year (the sites may partially be chosen for access issues). The population

monitoring basically consists of seining and collecting channel width data in order to arrive at a total area for the site and to then be able to make statements about fish density. A lot more data is being collected in the population estimation work.

- The population estimation process was briefly summarized. An open PVA-frame enclosure (with no bottom or top) is dropped into the river. Electrofishing is used to get depletion sampling. The population estimation sites are randomly generated using SDRAW.
- The population estimation sampling occurs once a year in October while the monthly population monitoring is still being done at the existing sites.
- The science work group has had discussions on whether or not population estimation offers a valid contribution and is worthwhile to continue funding. HR members discussed that even if the population estimation is flawed, as long as there is yearly consistency, useful information could be garnered. The recovery goals have a specified certain density (5 fish each sampling event at all 20 sites) and although ASIR doesn't estimate a density as part of their work, the logical next step could be to determine where the population is in terms of density.
  - Members briefly discussed the Colman report (for ISC) results which concluded that the recovery density will never be achieved. It was shared that clarifications provided afterward helped to straightened out some of the wrong assumptions that were used arrive at the "never" prediction. Attendees talked about the possibility of never reaching the recovery criteria but achieving a "physical sustainable ecosystem" through restoration and flow management. As a society, we can take solace in the "sustainable ecosystem" whether or not it is a recognized "political" solution.
  - It was cautioned that 2 years of population estimation data is not a large enough base to really evaluate the population; as more yearly data is collected with consistency, then the information could be used to inform projections.

**Action:** Rick Billings and Sarah will draft a synopsis on the 2009 ISC Habitat Restoration Monitoring report for the November meeting.

- **Program Update:** Monika Mann provided a brief Program Update. Work groups need to be working on the FY10 accomplishments to report to the EC and FY11 work plan for EC approval. The CC approved all FY11 Criteria 1 and Criteria 2 (note: these used to be referred to as off-the-top activities) with the exception of 2 fish passage projects: San Acacia Diversion Dam Fish Passage environmental compliance and San Acacia Diversion Dam Fish Passage studies. The follow list is the CC recommend Criteria 1 and 2 projects for funding in FY11:
  - *Peer Review (Phase 2) – Evaluate Alternatives for Providing Fish Passage at SADD* at \$120,000;
  - *Conduct studies recommended for the Phase 1 external peer review panel* at \$0 and move this project to a Criteria #3 space holder for the ScW FY11 work plan;
  - *Monitor Habitat Restoration Projects* up to \$300,000 with the addition of a clarifying comment "to be determined based on scope of work";
  - *USGS MRG River gage operations and maintenance* at \$95,000;
  - *FWS Dexter RGSM Rearing/Breeding O&M* at \$300,000 with correction to the spacing in the first paragraph and deletion of the first sentence;
  - *Assessment and monitoring of RGSM genetics* at \$190,000 with a wording change under the ESA Compliance Requirement section to read "in support of RPA elements Y-AA...";
  - *FWS Augmentation and Monitoring* at \$100,000;
  - *COA BioPark O&M* at \$150,000 with a wording change under the ESA Compliance Requirement section to read "in support of RPA elements Y-AA...";

- *FWS Rearing/Breeding O&M (Minnow Sanctuary)* at \$150,000;
- *ISC Naturalized Refugium Rearing/Breeding O&M* at \$280,000 with a change in title to: ISC Los Lunas Minnow Refugium (LLMR) O&M and deletion of the paragraph under the estimated cost that specifies “modification of a 5-year grant...”;
- *RGSM Rescue/Salvage* at \$300,000;
- *RGSM Egg Monitoring in Canals* at \$35,000;
- *RGSM Spawning monitoring* at \$100,000;
- *RGSM Population Monitoring* at \$190,000;
- *RGSM Population Estimation* at \$135,000;
- *Program Technical and Administrative Support – Contracted* at \$280,000;
- *CP Public Outreach* at \$15,000;
- *CP Webpage Hosting and Maintenance* at \$29,000;
- *FWS Program management and ESA support* at \$200,000;
- *Continue Modeling Effort to Support the new Biological Assessments/Biological Opinion (BA/BO) [URGWOM]* at \$100,000;
- *PVA Modeling* at \$42,000; and
- *USGS GW/SW Interaction* at \$200,000.

**Action:** Monika Mann will compile a list of HRW’s prioritized FY11 activities and will provide the list to the CC for approval (scopes of work are not to be written until approved by the CC).

- In a discussion regarding funding pertaining to restoration, HR attendees talked about Dr. Paul Hook’s recommendation to “determine, as a Program, what priority restoration is.” While learning more about the species is good, concrete action on the ground is needed to ensure forward movement toward recovery. Other similar species programs spend a significant amount of their budget on restoration – up to half of the annual budget – with goals of 500 acres restored every year. Members recognized that with the BA/BO consultations in progress, everyone is “on hold.” Collaborative Program money is being spent on water and modeling and databases – which are good – but how much is contributed to moving forward toward recovery? None of the FY11 HR scopes are even above Criteria 3.
  - In addition, FY10 efforts were on the effectiveness monitoring - and there is validity to determining where the system/species are at and how successful the past work has been. Also, restoration activities are expensive with \$250,000 or \$300,000 only restoring 10 to 15 acres.
    - Attendees also discussed the quantification of the acreage restored and the claim of 1000 acres restored to date. Are those 1000 acres really still operating on-the-ground and effective. There might be the need to evaluate projects to confirm the restoration numbers (ex. is 50 acres of cleared salt cedar really restoration?). Projects need to be objectively evaluated at the technical level in order to be better able to answer the questions: are we doing enough? Does HR need to be advocating for more? Where did the 1000 acres come from and is it appropriate? How much of those restored acres need to be maintained or redone? Is the restoration sustainable - how long does it remain of high quality? What would need to be done to maintain the restoration and what might the cost be?
    - It was suggested that the CC be asked: how important is restoration work to the Program? What is enough? Is 100 acres a year enough? It was noted that all the HRW activities in the LTP Table 7 were listed by the work group as Priority 1 – supporting the standpoint that the work group believes the restoration work is needed and should be priority. However, at this time on-the-ground restoration work does not

appear to be given priority and it is noted that there are no dollars allotted for habitat restoration construction for FY11. Direction from the Program on the priority of restoration will guide annual funding priorities and will help the work group understand their purpose.

- With predictions of a “bad” winter and poor water year next year it is even more important to have sites restored to a maximum potential to be effective with limited water available. The Program cannot be reactive with habitat restoration since the environmental compliance can take over a year and vegetation (especially for the flycatcher) can take 5 to 10 years to mature; existing projects can be expanded or modified.
- Members discussed that as long as projects are “piecemealed” then they will continue to be expensive. Instead, it was suggested that funds could be applied toward the capital to make the restoration projects easier to accomplish. For example, use funds to buy an excavator that would then save money on every project (estimated to be \$50,000 or \$60,000 per project in savings) for years. The equipment could also assist in reducing the cost of maintaining projects.
  - Other suggestions to expedite projects and decrease cost included (1) establishing a programmatic compliance mechanism or streamlined approach; (2) having an ID/IQ with a single contractor – as a first step – in building a programmatic compliance mechanism and one task could include collecting and standardizing the restoration techniques that are believed to be appropriate or adequate for each reach; (
  - While Reclamation’s Socorro office has done some restoration work themselves, the disadvantages include (1) storage; (2) transport of machinery to restoration sites; (3) equipment maintenance and upkeep; (4) having team of equipment operators; (4) scheduling and management of operators and equipment, etc.
  - In an example, it was shared that the NM Invasive Species Strike team in operates an in-house team but still relies on contractors for big projects that have to be done immediately. Together, utilizing both options allows the group to meet the needs of the refuges. It may be that the Program should consider a mixture of in-house capabilities and contractors as needed.
- Monika Mann will take the following HRW suggestions to the PMT tomorrow (10/20/10) for feedback: (1) prioritize a programmatic or at least reach-wide compliance package or mechanism and (2) explore establishing a Program restoration “team” with operators and heavy equipment (owned by the Program).
- **Discuss Scopes from September 22<sup>nd</sup> HR Workshop:** Only 2 draft scopes were developed with enough completion to be reviewed by the work group: Cochiti Reach Floodplain Connection and Isleta Refugial Drying. Clarification on Cochiti minnow habitat and reintroduction was provided by the Fisheries and ES office: the Program is welcome to pursue habitat wherever they choose to. The EC also provided direction and clarification regarding the 10(j) biologist position: the first year priority is to be focused on the Cochiti reach and the potential for reintroducing minnow in Cochiti.
  - *Cochiti Reach Floodplain Connection*
    - A new task for “1 year of monitoring of restoration sites for fish” was added as part of the scope of work to help address the lack of data in that reach (Cochiti has not been adequately surveyed for fisheries habitat and the last time occurred in 1995). Attendees discussed the challenge in getting pueblo permission/agreement on that portion.

Permission from the pueblo will be needed for all contractor access for sampling and monitoring.

- Members discussed the need for government to government consultation prior to issuing the RFP in order to ensure that the tribe is on-board as the work would require access to pueblo lands. It was then strongly encouraged that the Program facilitates the government to government consultation. The Program Manager had volunteered to lead this task, but the status is unknown. Ideally, an active partnership between the Program and the tribe could be established with a clear understanding of the products and benefits.
- It was suggested that the scope be modified to include: (1) specifics on the pueblo benefits and Program benefits including products and deliverables; (2) description in terms of physical and biological environment; and (3) blank sections to allow for the tribe to include their concerns and desires into the written scope.
- Attendees also briefly discussed safe harbors on pueblo lands; Santa Ana is currently the only pueblo with a safe harbor agreement. Each tribe could have different views on the safe harbor agreements especially considering that having a safe harbor agreement acknowledges that the ESA applies to them. The pueblos have always wanted other stakeholder to understand that just because the pueblos have open, undeveloped lands and just because Cochiti is located within a reach that stayed wet it doesn't mean that they necessarily have to take on the major responsibility for maintaining the species when the impacts on the species are all throughout the reaches. Recovery cannot be based on habitat in Cochiti since the responsibility of maintenance would then fall to the tribe – instead the recovery responsibility has to be shared by all.

**Action:** Anders Lundahl will distribute the recent Santo Domingo or San Felipe survey done in the Cochiti reach to HRW members.

**Action:** Rick Billings will check with Yvette McKenna on the progress with pueblo consultation and provide the suggestions from the HRW; ideally, the agreements with the pueblos would be in place prior to the award of the restoration work.

- *Isleta Refugial Drying*

- It was agreed that this is a planning or feasibility study project.
- Specific suggestions for analysis included: (1) decreasing diversions at Isleta; (2) use of return water from the District; and (3) drilling a shallow well with attached water rights. The work group also agreed to specify the site area as 10 miles around Los Lunas.
- One professional opinion is that, especially in the reaches that dry, there is no realistic way to guarantee that water can be supplied to the site of concern. Farmers can and will take water when needed and reliable delivery of water through the District's system cannot be guaranteed.

**Action:** Sarah Beck will incorporate the suggested changes and narrow down the scope of the *Isleta Refugial Drying* based on today's conversation.

- The remaining HRW FY11 draft scopes are due to Ondrea Hummel by the end of the week.
- In conclusion, attendees discussed the March presentation of management of long-reach conditions and the degradation in the San Acacia Reach. The degradation management scope of work - which was meant to be proactive – will take planning, compliance, and preparing to do any on-the-ground work. While it is a Reclamation project outside the Program, HR members suggested a possible next step could be an evaluation or analysis of technique options.

**Action:** Gina Dello Russo and Robert Padilla will draft a scope of work to tier off the Reclamation San Acacia degradation work.



- After discussing the lack of forward movement on the system wide monitoring, HRW decided to take a first step at starting the system wide monitoring scope using the already developed lists and leaving blanks for ScW input. The concern is that if neither group takes a lead, then it will not get done.
- **Prioritization of HRW projects for CC approval:** Using the list generated at the September HR workshop, HR projects were prioritized as follows:
  - 1) Streamline Compliance;
  - 2) HR Construction a) San Acacia Reach (Sevilleta to EB) SWFL habitat enhancement adjacent to existing territories, potential habitat, beetle; b) Cochiti Reach floodplain connection; c) ABQ reach floodplain construction;
  - 3) System Wide Analysis;
  - 4) Isleta Reach RGSM refugial & drying habitat;
  - 5) SA Reach Degradation Management;
  - 6) Cochiti Reach Planning.

**Action:** Gina Dello Russo and Anders Lundahl will write a draft scope of work for the system wide monitoring using the list of from monitoring meetings.

**Action:** Monika Mann will forward the scope of work from the adaptive management contract to HRW members.

**Action:** Robert Padilla and Gina Dello Russo will write a draft scope of work for Analysis of Options and Techniques to Address Degradation in the San Acacia Reach.

- **Announcements**

- There is a river restoration conference in December in Tucson with a focus on bringing back riparian systems. The conference includes a tour of the Colorado River delta. Please contact Gina Dello Russo for additional details.
- The San Acacia Reach (SAR) Habitat Restoration Tour is scheduled for November 4<sup>th</sup>, meet at the Bosque del Apache Refuge visitors center at 9:00am. The group will be visiting several sites that pertain to the issues and concerns identified by the stakeholders at the February 2009 San Acacia workshop and include the ET tower, RM 83 project, Rhodes Project, San Acacia Diversion Dam, and other upstream sites depending on time. The Save Our Bosque Task Force (SOBTF) website has information on the Rhode's site and the area plan.
- **Next Meeting – November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2010 from 12:30 to 3:30 at ISC.**
  - Tentative meeting agenda items: (1) Review draft HR 2011 Annual Work Plan (Monika/Rick); (2) 2009 ISC Habitat Restoration Monitoring Report Synopsis (Rick/Sarah); (3) SAR peer review process symposia: benefits, highlights for work group awareness/discussion (Gina/Anders); and (4) SWCA: COA monitoring status presentation;

**Habitat Restoration Work Group Meeting  
19 October 2010 Meeting Attendees**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>POSITION</b>	<b>AFFILIATION</b>	<b>PHONE NUMBER</b>	<b>EMAIL ADDRESS</b>
Colin Lee	HR Member	KeWa (Santo Domingo) Tribe	465-0055	clee@sutilities.com
Jill Wick	HR Member	NMDGF	476-8091	jill.wick@state.nm.us
Rick Billings	HR Chair	ABCWUA	796-2527	rbillings@abcwua.org
Anders Lundahl	HR Member	ISC	383-4047	anders.lundahl@state.nm.us
Peter Wilkinson	HR Member	ISC	827-5801	peter.wilkinson@state.nm.us
Sarah Beck	HR Member	USACE	342-3333	sarah.e.beck@usace.army.mil
Gina Dello Russo	HR Member	FWS	835-1828	gina_dellorusso@fws.gov
Terina Perez	PMT	Reclamation	462-3614	tlperez@usbr.gov
Robert Padilla	HR Member	Reclamation	462-3626	rpadilla@usbr.gov
Danielle Galloway	---	USACE	342-3661	danielle.a.galloway@usace.army.mil
Ondrea Hummel	HR Member	USACE	342-3375	ondrea.c.hummel@usace.army.mil
Monika Mann	PMT Liaison	USACE	342-3250	monika.mann@usace.army.mil
Marta Wood	Admin support	Tetra Tech, EMI	259-6098	marta.wood@tetrattech.com