

Executive Committee Meeting
February 17, 2011

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes



**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species
Collaborative Program
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA
February 17, 2011
9:00 am – 1:00 pm**

LOCATION: Bureau of Reclamation, 555 Broadway Blvd NE, Albuquerque, NM

- 1. INTRODUCTIONS AND REVIEW OF PROPOSED AGENDA** *5 minutes*
- 2. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 20, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY*** *10 minutes*
- 3. NEW SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY POLICY – February 1, 2011*** *10 minutes*
- 4. UPDATE ON LOS LUNAS REFUGIUM PERMIT AMENDMENT** *10 minutes*
(NMISC and USFWS)
- 5. SEPTEMBER 2010 EC RETREAT DECISIONS*** *45 minutes*
 - a. Recovery Implementation Program vs. Recovery Program
 - b. Annual Work plans derived from revised LTP
 - c. Service's determination of annual sufficient progress
 - d. Adaptive Management Plan Development and Implementation
- 6. ITEMS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION** *10 minutes*
 - a. Formation of an Adaptive Management ad-hoc Workgroup
 - b. Meeting Facilitation in Absence of Reese Fullerton
 - c. Non-federal PMT liaison

BREAK

- 7. USFWS and PVA/BIOLOGY UPDATE** *20 minutes*
- 8. USACE UPDATE** *10 minutes*
- 9. RECLAMATION BA and HYDROLOGY UPDATE** *(L. Croft/M. Hamman)* *30 minutes*
- 10. COORDINATION COMMITTEE/PROGRAM MANAGER REPORT** *30 minutes*
 - A. Fish Passage Peer Review Update
 - B. Adaptive Management Plan Development Update*
 - C. LTP Update
 - D. Annual Report Update
 - E. Workgroup Update and 2010 Accomplishments*
- 11. OTHER BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS** *10 minutes*
- 12. PUBLIC COMMENT** *10 minutes*

Members

ABCWUA
ISC
NMDA
Sandia Pueblo
UNM

APA CABQ
Isleta Pueblo
NMGF
Santa Ana Pueblo
USACE

NMAGO
MRGCD
Santo Domingo Tribe
USFWS
Reclamation

13. NEXT SCHEDULED EC MEETING – March 17, 2011 (alternate dates?)

BREAK

14. CLOSED SESSION – EC MEMBERS ONLY (if needed)

**Denotes read ahead material provided for this topic*

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
February 17th, 2011 9:00 am to 1:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation, Albuquerque Area Office
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Decisions

- With a quorum present and no objections, the EC rescheduled the March meeting to March 29th to overlap with the PVA work group meeting.
- With a quorum present and no objections, the January 20th, 2011 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.

Requests

- Based on the Los Lunas Silvery Minnow Refugium (LLSMR) spawning permit amendment submitted on February 3rd, the biological constraints, and the Service's internal (informal) consensus to move forward, the general EC perspective was to inform Jericho Lewis that the spawning permit would be moving forward. It was requested that the Service ES Office be informed of future permit amendment submittals to the Regional Office via email or phone for better coordination.
- Some EC members suggested that alternatives to bentonite lining be considered for the Minnow Sanctuary channel water retention. The example suggested was a lagoon lining covered with dirt and gravel.
- Some EC members suggested that for both LLSMR and the Minnow Sanctuary, updated public outreach announcements would be timely.
- During the discussion of EC Retreat Decisions, some members requested clarification and definition for the phrase "compliance vehicle" as it relates to the Program and what the phrase might mean to federal partners, non-federal partners, water users, etc.
- All non-federal signatories were asked and encouraged to consider providing a part-time or full-time PMT member to replace Amy Louise.
- It was requested that the Service's 1-page bulleted update on the biology be made available as a handout at the meetings from now on. The 10(j) reintroduction biologist IA annual report will be posted for EC information.
- There was general agreement to continue the EC meetings on the 3rd Thursday of each month. The co-chairs and PM will review the meeting agendas to determine if facilitation services might be needed (on an individual basis).

Announcements

- The PVA models and preliminary outputs will debut at the March 29th, 2011 PVA work group meeting; EC and CC members are invited and encouraged to attend.
- The executives were invited to the Corps' outreach event on February 18th to stakeholders in Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas to discuss issues and opportunities. There will be several presentations as well. If planning on attending, please allow extra time to clear security.
- The Annual Rio Grande Compact Commission reception and meeting will be held in Albuquerque this year. Both will be held at the MCM Elegante located near the intersection of University and Menual. The reception will be held from 5:30 pm until 8:00 pm the evening of Tuesday March 29th while the annual meeting will be held on Wednesday March 30th from 9:00am to 12:00pm. Please contact Linda Tenorio (linda.tenorio@state.nm.us) if you have questions or need more information.

Actions

- Wally Murphy will contact the Service's Regional office to communicate the MRG ES Collaborative Program's priority placement on the ISC Los Lunas Silvery Minnow Refugium spawning permit amendment.
- Wally Murphy will draft the descriptions of a Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) and a Recovery Program, including the processes, elements, documents and agreements required to formalize either program.
- The consultation team will work with Service representatives to draft a 1 page summary document describing how the Long-term Plan, adaptive management plan, annual work plans, PVA/PHVA models, Biological Assessments and Biological Opinion are envisioned to interface/integrate.
- Jericho Lewis and Yvette McKenna will explore administrative (note taking, recording emails, documentation, etc.) support options for the adaptive management sessions.
- The CC will develop a range of options for the adaptive management sessions (formation of an ad hoc work group?, formation of a standing work group?, etc.) and will present this information to the EC for the March meeting.
- Yvette McKenna will work with Stacey Kopitsch to confirm the March 29th PVA agenda in order to inform the timing and ordering of the EC meeting the same day.
- Reclamation will draft a simple clarification letter explaining what more is needed (substantive) in the non-federal action list to facilitate determining all non-federal actions (and the appropriate federal nexus) that need to be included in Reclamation's BA.
- Yvette McKenna will email Stacey Kopitsch, Dave Campbell, David Gensler, Leann Towne, and Reese Fullerton to coordinate a facilitated PVA/PHVA joint meeting in April.

Next EC Meeting: March 29th, 2011 from 9:00am to 1:00pm at Reclamation.

- Tentative March Agenda Items: (1) Update from the March 8th Propagation and Genetics Work Group meeting (J. Remshardt); (2) decision – formation of an adaptive management ad hoc work group;
- Tentative Future Agenda Items:
 - April Agenda Items: (1) after action analysis of MRGCD, Reclamation, and ABCWUA October 2010 change in water operations.

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
February 17th, 2011 9:00 am to 1:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation, Albuquerque Area Office
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102

February 17th, 2011 Meeting Summary

- **Introductions and Agenda Approval:** Brent Rhees brought the meeting to order and introductions were made around the room. The meeting agenda was reviewed and approved with no changes.
- **Approval of the January 20th, 2011 Meeting Summary:** The January 20th, 2011 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.
- **New Scientific Integrity Policy:** Several months ago, the Program developed a Scientific Code of Conduct. Recently, Interior Secretary Salazar issued a new scientific policy for all DOI employees. A copy of the cover letter is being provided to the EC as the last sentence of Paragraph 4 explains that the Secretary expects this policy to be applied to all government employees. This is a policy of DOI and thus applies to the Program agencies in their roles as signatories - it effectively replaces the code the Program developed. The issuing of this policy validates the Program's efforts. The Program is "ahead of the game" and is already doing many of the activities (such a peer review) specifically mentioned.
- **Update on Los Lunas Silvery Minnow Refugium Permitting:** Updates on the Los Lunas Silvery Minnow Refugium (LLSMR) were presented at the January EC meeting. In a follow up, it was shared the permit amendment request for the spawning study was submitted to the Service on February 3rd, 2011. A contract extension request was submitted to Jericho Lewis via email a week later.
 - The spawning study permit amendment was submitted separately; ISC has other permit amendments (such as the long-term operations) that will be submitted to the Service next. ISC needs to know of the approval as soon as possible in order to prepare the facilities and make sure there is sufficient time to stock minnow.
 - It was acknowledged that the Service's Regional office has the amendment but it has to be processed through the Service's internal procedures. Some members expressed concern that any delay could negatively impact Reclamation's contract extension approval. The contract has already been extended once and it could become challenging for Reclamation to hold the money. There is also a biological time line that coincides with the spawning.
 - It was shared that the Service's Regional and Fisheries offices are aware of the situation; there is an internal and informal consensus to move forward with the permitting. However, Wally Murphy will contact the Service's Regional office to communicate the MRG ES Collaborative Program's priority placement on the ISC Los Lunas Silvery Minnow Refugium spawning permit amendment. The Service recommends renewing the contract.
 - Based on the Los Lunas Silvery Minnow Refugium (LLSMR) spawning permit amendment submitted on February 3rd, the biological constraints, and the Service's internal (informal) consensus to move forward, the general EC perspective was to inform Jericho Lewis that the spawning permit would be moving forward. It was requested that the Service ES Office be informed of

future permit amendment submittals to the Regional Office via email or phone for better coordination.

- Some members shared that there is a public piece to the refugiums that should not be overlooked. When refugiums are dry, the public might have the perspective that money is being wasted. After a brief discussion, there was general agreement that some public outreach – such as a news article describing the facility maintenance procedures and successes – could be pursued after the refugiums were operating.
- In an update on the Minnow Sanctuary, it was shared that there have been issues with the intake (clogging issues and broken pump pieces) and channel leakage. Currently, options to increase water-holding capabilities are being explored (ex., bentonite lining, etc.). It is not known if these are design or construction issues. The Minnow Sanctuary is still in the pre-operational phase. The security and fencing have been completed and Reclamation's Socorro Office construction crew will do the revegetation work. The target to be operational was last year.
- **September 2010 EC Retreat Decisions:** The August 2009 Taos EC Retreat (initial goals developed) and September 2010 meeting (goals reviewed and espoused) decisions were reviewed with the intent of keeping them “fresh.”
 - The Program goals as agreed to at the 2009 Taos Retreat are: (1) to alleviate jeopardy to the listed species (currently being addressed by identifying and answering scientific questions to develop a greater understanding of the system and to develop an adaptive management plan); (2) to conserve and contribute the recovery of the listed species – stabilizing existing populations and developing self-sustaining populations; (3) to protect existing and future water uses; and (4) to report to the community. The EC still agrees on these goals.
 - The decisions from the September 2010 meeting are: (1) the EC agreed that the Program goals are accurate and appropriate and will be kept as is; (2) the EC agreed that the Long-term Plan (LTP) is the up-to-date road map for implementing Program activities, provides priorities for implementation, is the basis for development for annual work plans and budgets, provides identification of responsible parties for carrying activities, and provides the basis for the Service determining compliance with the ESA upon implementation. The EC committed to making the Program a recovery compliance vehicle with the LTP as the guidance. In September, the EC added a new bullet specifically stating the agreement to follow an adaptive management approach throughout the recovery process to ensure that research and management actions are implemented in a timely manner and adjusted as necessary.
 - **Recovery Implementation Program vs. Recovery Program**
 - At the 2009 Taos Retreat, it was agreed that the Program would not strictly be a traditional recovery implementation program (RIP) but would be an amalgam. As long as there is a foundation and clear understanding of what is meant, it does not matter what the Program decides to call itself.
 - While there is no formal agency direction, no official guidance or directives, and no handbook, there are general RIP and recovery program processes that do exist. There is a range of options between a RIP and a recovery program. Either one is acceptable.

- A RIP involves a very formal process. The Secretary of the Interior is involved and provides authorization. The governor of the state(s) also has to sign and agree to the RIP. For the Middle Rio Grande (MRG), this includes the governors of the pueblos. The next step involves all participants in the Program signing a cooperative agreement – this gives the Service the sufficiency to make the annual sufficient progress reports. There is very specific and legal terminology with a RIP.
- There is a very different process for a recovery program (RP). A RP would be totally internal to this Program. For example, the regional directors of Reclamation, the Corps, and the Service (as the federal agencies) would sign an agreement document. There would then be another agreement that *all* Program signatories signed. Again, this is needed to give the Service the legal foundation for making determinations and issuing annual progress reports.
 - There are basically 2 tiers: the first being the federal agreement and second being the agreement of everyone else involved including the federal agencies. This leads to the Section 7 consultation with adaptive management, LTP, annual work plans, Biological Assessments (BAs), and Biological Opinions (BOs) that all form the Reasonable and Prudent Activities (RPAs) that are looped back to the Program.
 - The process leads into the Section 7 by incorporating the signed MOU as authorized by Congress and the LTP, etc. The Principles Document could be the contractual piece, but it was cautioned that the title could not refer to “section 7.” It was instead suggested that the document be referred to as “Program Guidance” to avoid any conflict or misunderstanding.
 - The consultation team will work with Service representatives to draft a 1 page summary document describing how the Long-term Plan, adaptive management plan, annual work plans, PVA/PHVA models, Biological Assessments and Biological Opinion are envisioned to interface/integrate.
 - The Service will draft the descriptions of a Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) and a Recovery Program, including the processes, elements, documents and agreements required to formalize either program
- It was pointed out that the MRG can really only contribute to avoiding jeopardy or creating a stable population in the MRG. Downlisting and delisting is a range-wide issue that has a requirement of 3 self-sustaining populations. This comes back to sufficient progress – the Service will be making the annual sufficiency reports based on avoiding jeopardy as that is what can be accomplished here. The Program can contribute its own “piece” but will have to rely on and potentially be involved with/support

others to achieve species recovery (especially considering funding constraints, authority limitations, etc.).

- The recovery goal language “to aid and contribute to preventing extinction” is not just avoiding jeopardy. The Program has to develop adaptive management options that will prevent one bad year from creating crisis.
- **Item’s for Executive Committee Consideration:** These items are informational for this meeting with the intent of becoming decision items, if needed, at the next meeting.
 - **Formation of an Adaptive Management ad-hoc work group:** Currently, there is a good cross-section of different technical people attending the adaptive management working sessions. However, the group is not chartered so there is no official membership list. Since adaptive management is not expected to be a short-term effort, it has been suggested that a new ad hoc work group be formed. The benefits of making the group “official” include having a formal charter with identified members, increased commitment to the process, continued diversity during the implementation stages, and increased coordination and documentation. Disadvantages include increased PMT work load, additional administrative costs (note taking), and increased work for agency representatives (co-chairs).
 - It was commented that other similar programs have only 3 work groups- one of which is an adaptive management group.
 - If formed, an adaptive management work group could be consolidated later (i.e., dispersed throughout the other existing work groups) or it could be kept as a separate standing work group. Adaptive management is much bigger than just the science or PVA group. Habitat restoration, monitoring, water operations, etc. all need to be included in the adaptive management. It was suggested that the Program wait until the adaptive management contractor has provided their recommendations before creating a new work group.
 - Some members expressed concern that the details of the adaptive management process are not being captured or made available in a consistent manner. The record keeping on the plan development is one of the most critical components as these notes will provide the support and justification. It was explained that the contractor is meeting their contractual obligations.
 - **Meeting Facilitation in Absence of Reese Fullerton:** It was shared that Reese Fullerton is no longer available to facilitate the EC on the 3rd Thursday of each month as he has entered a 12-month contract with obligations at the same time. At last month’s meeting, there was discussing that the EC co-chairs and PM would review the draft agenda and assess need for a facilitator. The EC will need to decide whether or not they would like to pursue other facilitation through GenQuest.
 - **Non-federal PMT liaison:** Amy Louise resigned from ISC for a position with the Corps. All non-federal signatories were asked and encouraged to consider providing a part-time or full-time PMT member to replace Amy Louise.
- **USFWS and PVA/Biology Update:** For the minnow, Lori Robertson reported updates on the river drying, salvage efforts, population monitoring, and reintroduction work updates. There were no updates on the flycatcher as the bird is not yet in the state.

- The reported numbers from NM FWS Conservation Office are slightly different from those reported at last month's meeting. There was 28.2 unique river miles in Isleta and San Acacia Reaches salvaged over the 42 days from June 28th to October 17th. In total, 9,668 minnow were salvage and released alive upstream in the same reach. Total incidental take per the 2003 BO was 95.
- Big Bend sites were sampled on February 1st, 2nd, and 3rd. Minnow (last year's spawn fish) were present at 3 of the 6 sampling sites. The fish were found to be healthy and developing eggs and sperm.
- The annual summary of progress on the reintroduction work was submitted per the IA with Reclamation. The summary covered the hiring of biologist Mark Brennan (who started in mid-April last year). He has been focused on reviewing all the available literature, familiarizing himself with the Program and Program work, participating in Program work groups (HRW, DBMS, ScW), and familiarizing himself with regulatory documents that go with recovery. The feasibility of augmentation of the Cochiti Reach is under way; communication with San Felipe, Santo Domingo, and Cochiti Tribes and Pueblos has been initiated. The decision tool (spreadsheet matrix) to determine best location for reintroduction has been developed but is not yet completely populated.
 - In the monthly report on the reintroduction work, it was shared that Mark has been contributing comments to the adaptive management review and San Acacia Peer Review process. He has also been meeting with the San Felipe Pueblo consultant on restoration work and with the BIA to discuss communications with Cochiti Reach Pueblos. Since September, Mark's efforts have focused on Cochiti. However, it was cautioned that this technically can't be termed a "reintroduction" but is actually an "augmentation." There is no timeline available for augmentation of the Cochiti Reach yet because the Service first has to develop milestones and have Pueblo consent to move forward. Mark continues to work on the safe harbor in the San Acacia Reach; this benefits the Program by providing Mark the training and experience with developing safe harbor agreements.
- **USACE Update:**
 - It was shared that based on the preliminary February forecast and current population index, the minnow need a good recruitment year. The interpretations of the modeling results are cautiously optimistic that recruitment flows could be provided naturally. This exercise will be done in March again. Attendees were encouraged to let the Corps know if there is any additional information (ex. credit relinquishments or non-standard operations) that might need to be included in the modeling.
 - The Corps' BA is essentially complete at this point. Meetings will be scheduled with the other federal partners and with the Service to work through details. A copy will be provided to the EC along with the formal submission to the Service. The proposed actions include flood control, San Juan/Chama storage at Abiquiu, and various other operations.
- **Reclamation BA and Hydrology Update:** The next PVA meeting is scheduled for all day March 29th; the tentative agenda includes the models debut and preliminary outputs for at least one of the models as well as a report out on the recent adaptive management session. The EC and CC are invited and encouraged to attend the modeling portion of the meeting.

Reclamation's BA is not ready for submittal at this time but there is an extensive planning effort in order to be able to submit to the Service by October 1st, 2011.

- The initial government to government (between Reclamation and the Pueblos) consultations are expected in May. The completed draft BA will be released to the Pueblos for a courtesy review in the beginning of July. The completed draft BA is expected to be submitted to the EC and the Service on August 1st. There will be a 30 day review period to end on September 1st. This gives Reclamation 30 days to address comments and submit the final BA to the Service on October 1st. It is anticipated that negotiations will take place throughout 2012 with the new BO in place for the 2013 water season.
 - The draft BA to be available on August 1st will include the District's coverage under the Interrelated and Interdependent (I and I), non-federal nexuses, the water leasing program, and the Low Flow Conveyance Channel (LFCC) pumping and maybe some conservation measures as well. Even with some of the "tools" added upfront, it is assumed the result will be a jeopardy opinion.
- There are currently 3 distinct actions to be described in the BA for new sustainable water operations: (1) water operations – San Juan/Chama; (2) water operations – MRG; and (3) river maintenance. An affects analysis will be done for each. All identified non-federal actions will be discussed appropriately. However, there are not a lot of non-federal actions that can be identified at this time. The identified non-federal actions include: ISC's river maintenance and Compact obligations and MRGCD coverage under the I and I.
 - The non-federal action list that was developed is too vague to allow for the identification of the federal nexus. Non-federal partners asked Reclamation to provide clarification on what "substantive" information is needed in order to include actions in the BA.
- Concern was expressed by some members that previous discussions implied that there would be broad ESA coverage for NM water users. The purpose of the Program was to cover needed actions as a group. It was explained that Reclamation cannot provide broad coverage - specific actions have to be identified in order to identify the appropriate nexus. Reclamation has to do an action-by-action analysis. The Program is the "keeper" of the baseline (through the LTP, adaptive management, etc.). We keep the baseline together and if the species fail, we all go down together. It would trigger reinitiation for all of us. Broad coverage might be discussed in the negotiation process during which time agency participation is brought to the table.
- Concern was expressed that the 2003 BO is remaining the baseline for the new consultation. It was explained that deviating from the 2003 BO at this time would be considered "arbitrary and capricious." Instead, it will take several years of active adaptive management to provide the necessary justifications. However, some members expressed that there are at least 7 years of scientific data and information that could be utilized.
 - It is recognized that the 2003 water operation requirements are not sustainable but this was a policy decision that was made to provide comfort to both agencies (Reclamation and the Service) until the

adaptive management plan was in place and implemented. Some members were concerned that one of the reasons for the new BO was to get away from the 2003 flow regime but it is now apparent that the Program will have to wait a certain amount of years for adaptive management to occur. This means the process will have to be started all over again with the new information. How many years of adaptive management will be considered enough? Who will make that decision?

- It was replied that it will be a Program recommendation when there is enough information to formulate a testable hypothesis. Some members expressed concern that there is no lack of testable hypotheses (ex. minnow spawning habitat preference) that have already been identified. However, from the water operations side, not much has been tested under the 2003 BO. The EC will have to determine the key water question(s) to test.
 - Another concern expressed by some members was that the 2003 BO was defined for a specific period of time and that it wasn't set up to be flexible but to operate the system for the best for the fish (as based on best knowledge at the time).
 - It was commented that since neither BA will be front loaded, there will most likely be a jeopardy determination and the adaptive management piece will have to be considered in the RPAs.
- It was shared that the Service is still committed to one BO even though there will be 2 BAs. It was commented that there are somewhere around 30 BOs already in the MRG and most are tiered to the 2003 BO or are restoration or river maintenance related. There won't be just a single BO. It was clarified that there will be one BO for water operations in the MRG – excluding the ABCWUA BO.
 - Concern was expressed by some attendees that the PVA and PHVA work groups seem unable to schedule necessary joint meetings. The PHVA perspective is that they have provided much of the desired information in the past but since there is still a disconnect, they have asked that the specific data needs be provided in writing – this has not been done. Other issues include that the PHVA is very focused on meeting Reclamation's goals and there is a resource issue in that Leann Towne is the PHVA co-chair but she is very occupied with the BA work. The technical issue is that the PVA group wants daily data for the long-term but the PHVA cannot find a way to provide those at a defensible level.
 - The PVA perspective is that they are trying to get more information from the PHVA in order to determine what exactly is available and how it could be used (i.e., what are the options for the PVA). What is needed is better communication so it can be determined how to best adapt to the technical limitations.
 - Part of the scheduling issue is that there are 2 PVA modelers that have to fly in for meetings. Reclamation committed to making Leann available for a ½ day joint PVA/PHVA

meeting provided it was facilitated and there is a set, specific agenda. There was general EC agreement with this approach.

- The PVA should be an integral part of the adaptive management process. Unfortunately, they will not be done in time for use in the BO process; once the model platforms are complete they still need to be validated/calibrated. Reclamation will be using the URGWOM model for the affects analysis.
- **Hydrology:** There has not been a lot of change in the start scenario. There has been a slight reduction in the forecast from January to February. The National Weather Service reports that there is an equal chance of being drier or around normal in northern NM but the forecast drops as it goes south. There is a 33% probability that we will be drier than normal for next 30-60 days; however, we do have good carry over storage. The 2003 BO has been met only because nature has provided. However, this may not be the situation in the very near future. The amount of available San Juan/Chama water for lease is not sustainable. Only 12,000 cfs is expected for the next 5 to 6 years but even that amount is expected to decline to 8,000 cfs. All partners will need to be actively engaged in exploring management options for the years we remain under the 2003 water requirements while adaptive management is first implemented. It is likely that the system will be in Article VII all year. *Please refer to the “water bucket” diagram for specific details.* The San Juan/Chama deliveries out of Heron are complete. There are minor amounts of water in the system for Santa Fe and diversions. The irrigation system will begin charging soon.
- **Coordination Committee/Program Manager’s Report:**
 - **Fish Passage Peer Review Update:** The San Acacia Diversion Dam Fish Passage Phase 1 results were presented on January 26th with an open comment period through February 9th. The comments have been compiled and submitted to the contractor. The revised report is expected in the middle of March. The draft report identified additional data gaps and the contractors recommended that the relationship between genetic diversity and the dam be explored further. Phase 2 review and additional studies (if warranted by the Phase 1) have already been approved in the budget. These will be pursued if funds become available.
 - **Adaptive Management Plan Development Update:** Technical representatives from each of the work groups attended an adaptive management working session in early February. The current focus is to identify critical scientific uncertainties. The list of uncertainties will eventually be categorized into “nice to know” and “need to know.” The next adaptive management sessions are scheduled for April 5th -7th; the format will be the same with the first 2 days being the technical session and the 3rd day being a half-day open session. There is a workshop scheduled for May 18th and 19th (which coincides with the May EC meeting on the 19th) to allow for executive participation.
 - **Cost Share:** As of January 2011, the Program is still \$225,000 short on cost share although several agencies have not submitted their reporting yet. All non-federal partners were encouraged to report their cost share for all the years they have been involved.
 - **LTP update:** The CC reviewed the draft table of future activities. GenQuest is editing the future activities. The past activity summaries are all completed. The work group co-chairs will present proposed activities at the next CC meeting.
 - **Regular CC business:** At the February 9th working meeting, the CC elected Brooke Wyman to continue as CC Chair. This means the CC charter will need to be revised to

- remove the term limits. The Chair and Vice Chair positions will also be renamed to “co-chairs” instead. These changes will be brought to EC for decision next month.
- George Dennis (FWS) presented on the FEMA floodplain consultation work. George will be working with the SAR work group on the development of the floodplain encroachment study.
 - The Monitoring Plan Team (MPT) presented results on the low intensity monitoring they conducted. The CC agreed that the MPT should continue with plans for the second year of low intensity monitoring. They are developing the draft SOW for the proposed high intensity monitoring food availability study.
 - **Work group update and 2010 accomplishments:** The PMT liaisons will be helping the work groups revise the 2011 work plans to include adaptive management milestones and participation. Reclamation has filled the Program administrative assistant position; the start date is March 13th. The work group updates are in the read ahead handout. There have been several PMT liaison changes: Stacey will be supporting ScW, PVA and MPT; Terina will support SAR, SWM, and PHVA. Monika supports HRW and DBMS; she is completing her mandatory rotations at the Corps, but she is still very active and has done a great job of maintaining communication. Right now, ISC is in a hiring freeze so they will be unable to replace Amy Louise.
 - **Other Business/Announcements:**
 - The executives were invited to the Corps’ outreach event on February 18th to stakeholders in Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas to discuss issues and opportunities. There will be several presentations as well. If planning on attending, please allow extra time to clear security.
 - The Annual Rio Grande Compact Commission reception and meeting will be held in Albuquerque this year. Both will be held at the MCM Elegante located near the intersection of University and Menual. The reception will be held from 5:30 pm until 8:00 pm the evening of Tuesday March 29th while the annual meeting will be held on Wednesday March 30th from 9:00am to 12:00pm. Please contact Linda Tenorio (linda.tenorio@state.nm.us) if you have questions or need more information.
 - Printed hard copies of the Velarde Reach and Albuquerque Reach A&Rs are available for EC signatories to pick up, if desired.
 - The EC discussed possibly meeting on a different day (instead of the reoccurring 3rd Thursday of the month) in order to have Reese available to facilitate. Member’s have already scheduled around the 3rd Thursday for the next several months and there should only be the need for facilitation occasionally. There was general agreement to keep the schedule as is for now and evaluate facilitation needs on a monthly basis.
 - The next EC meeting is scheduled for March 17th but that week is the last week of the legislative calendar and is spring break. It was suggested that the EC meet on March 29th which corresponds to the PVA meeting (with models debut and data analysis). The EC agreed to postpone the March meeting until the 29th to allow executives to attend the model debuts and data analysis presentations.
 - **Public Comment:** There was no public comment.
 - **Next EC Meeting:** **March 29th, 2011 from 9:00am to 1:00pm at Reclamation.**

- Tentative March Agenda Items: (1) Update from the March 8th Propagation and Genetics Work Group meeting (J. Remshardt); (2) decision – formation of an adaptive management ad hoc work group; (3) decision – review and approve CC charter changes
- Tentative Future Agenda Items:
 - April Agenda Items: (1) after action analysis of MRGCD, Reclamation, and ABCWUA October 2010 change in water operations.
- **Closed Session:** The EC met in closed session directly following the regular business. Please contact an EC representative for details.

Executive Committee (EC) Meeting Attendees
February 17th, 2011, 9:00 am to 1:00 pm

Attendees:

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Seat</i>
Brent Rhees (P)	Dept. of the Interior	Federal co-chair, non-voting
Rolf Schmidt-Petersen (A)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	ISC
Lisa Croft (P)	Bureau of Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
LTC Jason Williams (P)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	USACE
Brian Gleadle (P)	NM Department of Game and Fish	NMDGF
Janet Jarratt (P)	Assessment Payers Association Of the MRGCD	APA
Wally Murphy (P)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	USFWS
Rick Billings (A)	ABCWUA	ABCWUA
Steve Farris (P)	NMAGO	NMAGO
Ann Watson (P)	Pueblo of Santo Domingo	Santo Domingo
Hilary Brinegar (P)	NM Department of Agriculture	NMDA
Subhas Shah (P)	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	MRGCD
Bruce Thompson (P)	UNM	UNM

Others

Yvette McKenna – PM	Bureau of Reclamation
Mike Hamman	Bureau of Reclamation
Terina Perez	Bureau of Reclamation
Mary Carlson	Bureau of Reclamation
Kristie Michel	Bureau of Reclamation
Anndra Vigil	Bureau of Reclamation
Kathy Dickinson	Bureau of Reclamation
Kris Schafer	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Susan Bittick	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
LeAnn Summer	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
William DeRagon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Lori Robertson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jen Bachus	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Christopher Shaw	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Grace Haggerty	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD
Ann Moore	NMAGO
Sarah Cobb	Senator Udall's Office
Mike Bogan	City of Corrales
Rick Carpenter	City of Santa Fe/BDD
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech