

Coordination Committee Meeting
April 13, 2011

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
April 13, 2011 – 12:30 pm to 4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

Conference Call-in Line for April 13, 2011
Toll Free Number: 9-1- 800-857-5756
Participant Passcode: 21600
(1st Committee member or contractor to arrive, please dial in)

Draft Meeting Agenda

- Introductions and Agenda* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 03/16/11 CC meeting summary*
- Action Item Review (see below)
- Review draft 2011 work plans*
- Discuss San Acacia Reach fish passage peer review recommendations*
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC

Next meeting – May 4 working meeting @ Reclamation from 10:00 am – 4:00 pm

Upcoming meetings

Executive Committee meeting – April 21 @ Reclamation from 9:00 am – 1:00 pm

PHVA/PVA joint meeting – April 22 @ Reclamation from 8:30 am to 12:00 pm (PVA will continue meeting in the afternoon)

Adaptive Management Workshop w/Executive Committee – May 18-19 @ Reclamation from 8:30 am to 4:00 pm

****denotes read ahead***

March 16, 2011 Actions

Actions

- CC members will review the LTP past and future activity summaries in preparation for the May 4th CC meeting.

- Yvette McKenna will send Kathy's summary of the San Acacia Reach fish passage peer review recommendations to the workgroup Co-Chairs for workgroup feedback on which recommendations should be the top priorities. ✓
Kathy's summary was compared to the panelists' prioritized list and will be provided to the CC for consideration and to meet their EC directive as stated below.
- Susan Bittick and Stacey Kopitsch will follow up with Jericho Lewis to determine if the SOW is needed before an IDIQ can be issued for the high intensity effectiveness monitoring.

Directive (from March 29 EC meeting)

- The EC directed the CC to continue the "synthesis of all existing data" discussions and brainstorm how to accomplish the actual synthesis work. It was recommended that these discussions take place simultaneously with the LTP development as the synthesis work may inform LTP priorities and activities.

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Coordination Committee Meeting
April 13th, 2011 Meeting – 12:30pm to 4:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation

Decisions

- With a quorum present, the March 16th, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with no changes.

Requests

- The CC requested the City of Albuquerque provide the Program with an official designation letter introducing Roland Penttila and explaining his roles and responsibilities for COA within the Program.
- The CC requested that the work groups review the listed San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage Peer Review recommendations (as found in the *Recommendations for Implementing Fish Passage* read ahead document) in the context of their proposed activities for the Long-term Plan (LTP). The work groups were asked to provide a summary report back to the CC that addresses: (1) where the fish passage recommendations might fit into the LTP; (2) if any of their current/future LTP activities would help address the recommended actions; (3) how the recommendations might impact the work group activity prioritizations; (4) if any current/future activity could be easily modified or updated to address the recommendations; and (5) any recommendations the work group might have on how to effectively and efficiently address the “synthesis of data” issue. The summary should also include the work group’s opinion on the “relevancy” of the recommendations in line with the work group’s paths forward (ex. same idea discussed but is still 10 years away; or partially addressed in this specific action; or this idea was never discussed/though of before, etc). In order for the CC to make realistic implementation recommendations, it would be useful to have the work groups complete the LTP fields for the recommendations (category, lead agency, suggested rank in priority, assumed time line, etc.). These recommendations should be considered in both the fish passage and general minnow life history context. The work groups will have several months to address this request.
- The CC requested the ScW work group write a scope of work to *Determine the Impact That Augmentation has had on Silvery Minnow Genetic Variability Over Time (SADD Fish Passage Peer Review recommendation #5)*. The scope should include a specific task(s) to compare the reach-specific pre-stocking and post-stocking genetic data; this is to determine what the reach genetic differences were and why in order to provide information on what the future genetics might be if the augmentation program were to be discontinued. In order to have the FY11 funds obligated, the SOW will be written by May 15th to allow for a 2 week review period and still be provided to Jericho Lewis by June 1st.
- The CC requested the PVA/PHVA joint meeting originally scheduled for April 22nd, 2011 be postponed to a future date in order to accommodate the PVA modeler’s schedules and contracting issues.

Action Items:

- ✓ The PMT will correct the SWM and SAR work group 2011 work plans; the revised versions will be electronically distributed to CC members via email by close of business tomorrow (04/14/11) for CC review and approval recommendation. – *complete*;
- Stacey Kopitsch will add the San Acacia Diversion Dam Fish Passage Peer Review recommendations to the next PVA and ScW meeting agendas.
- Yvette McKenna will seek Jericho Lewis’ input/advise on how to obligate the budgeted \$50,000 for fish passage research.

- Stacey Kopitsch will add the development of a scope of work for the *Impacts of Augmentation to Silvery Minnow Genetics* project to the next ScW agenda.
- ✓ Yvette McKenna will seek permission to release all comments and information from the 4 agencies that provided feedback on the 5 year minnow status review. - *complete; per Ann Moore: Regarding the discussion at CC meeting about comments submitted in connection with FWS's Five Year Review, the comments can be made publicly available at any time, so there should be no problem with using them in the data synthesis.*
- Once permission has been given, Lori Robertson will supply the CC with the comments, feedback, and other information that was provided for the minnow status review.
- ~~Yvette McKenna will inform Jericho Lewis of the contracting situation for Dr. Miller.~~ *Note: Jericho has been in direct communication with the Service on this matter.*
- ✓ Yvette McKenna will inform the PVA and PHVA co-chairs of the CC directive to postpone the April 22nd, 2011 meeting; the PVA co-chairs will also be instructed to complete the assigned action (12/08/10) of providing a written letter to the PHVA with specific PVA needs. - *complete;*
- ✓ Tetra Tech will find and copy the language regarding the PVA written data needs request letter. This language will also be provided to Yvette McKenna for use in her follow up with the PVA and PHVA co-chairs. - *complete;*
- ✓ Yvette McKenna will update the April EC agenda based on the CC feedback. - *complete;*

Next meeting – May 4th, 2011 from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm @ Reclamation

- This is an all-day LTP working meeting; please remember to bring lunch. Interested participants are encouraged to review the LTP activity summaries found on the Program website in preparation for this meeting: Library > Revised LTP Development. Note that you must be logged in to view content on this page.
 - Tentative agenda items include: (1) LTP development

MEETING SUMMARY

- **Introductions and Agenda Approval:** Brooke Wyman opened the meeting and introductions were made. A quorum was confirmed. The agenda was approved with the addition of: (1) Update on Contract Status for Dr. Miller and the April 22nd, 2011 Joint PHVA/PVA work group meeting; (2) Note Taking Concerns; (3) Concerns with the April 2011 Adaptive Management Technical Sessions; and (4) Review of the Draft April EC agenda.
 - The City of Albuquerque (COA) introduced Roland Penttila as a participant for COA. Roland is a supervisor engineer with the City's Storm Water Management Group. Recent discussions on the impacts of storm water on ESA prompted the City to be more engaged in this issue. COA was asked to provide an official designation letter.
- **Approval of 03/16/11 CC meeting summary:** The March 16th, 2011 meeting notes were approved with no changes.
- **Action Item Review:**
 - CC members will review the LTP past and future activity summaries in preparation for the May 4th CC meeting. – *ongoing;*
 - The May 4th meeting is a LTP working meeting scheduled all day from 9:00am to 4:00pm. The past activity summaries can be accessed on the Program's website after logging in: Library > Revised LTP Development > Past Activity Summaries.

- The future activity summaries are sorted by work group. The Corps' activity summaries are found in a separate module. Table 7 can be used as an index for activities. Please let Yvette McKenna know if any activity summaries are missing.
 - ✓ Yvette McKenna will send Kathy's summary of the San Acacia Reach fish passage peer review recommendations to the workgroup Co-Chairs for workgroup feedback on which recommendations should be the top priorities. – *complete*;
 - Kathy's summary was compared to the panelists' prioritized list and was provided to the CC for consideration.
 - ✓ Susan Bittick and Stacey Kopitsch will follow up with Jericho Lewis to determine if the SOW is needed before an ID/IQ can be issued for the high intensity effectiveness monitoring. – *completed*;
 - Yes, a scope of work (SOW) is needed. The Monitoring Plan Team (MPT) will work on the scope at the April 18th meeting. The expected time frame for completion is by the end of April.
- **Review Draft 2011 work plans:** The intent is to provide the 2011 work group work plans to the EC at the April 21st meeting. These are being provided to the CC for review in order for the CC to make an approval recommendation.
 - The PMT and work groups have been updating the membership list at the top of each work plan. The purpose of listing members is to be clear on designations and roles (ex., prime, alternate, contractor, etc.). Contractors are being identified. Having a clearly defined membership list will assist the work group in determining quorums or consensus agreement; it also helps to ensure that there is one "voting voice" per EC signatory agency regardless of the number of agency attendees. There is a different role for an observer versus a voting member. The intent is to have the work plans drafted by the end of each December and approved through the EC by February of each year.
 - The CC specifically reviewed the Species Water Management (SWM) and San Acacia Reach (SAR) work plans. Several SAR activities were accidentally captured in the SWM work plan.
- **Discuss San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage Peer Review Recommendations:**
 - At the request of the Program, the SADD fish passage peer review panelists provided a prioritized list of their recommendations. The FY11 budget has a line item for Phase II Fish Passage Peer Review should it be warranted; unfortunately there is no money to obligate at this time. However, the money set aside under the *RGSM Studies* line item (at \$50,000) is expected to be available.
 - The top prioritized recommendation is a synthesis of data and information. The synthesis activity(s) could potentially be considered under the *RGSM Studies*. The CC needs to consider how much focus will be given to the recommendations lists; what is reasonable to try to fund; how much will be spent; how to attempt the synthesis of information; what portions of the synthesis work will be delegated and to whom; etc.
 - There is a document module on the Program website under the SADD Fish Passage Peer Review page that contains the documents that the panel used in their review. There is general agreement within all Program levels that synthesizing the existing data and information is a worthwhile exercise that needs to be done. This effort could provide the opportunity to utilize data that has already been collected, avoid duplication of efforts, and facilitate a better understanding of what is known. However, a true "synthesis" of data would also include analysis and interpretation.

- *Recommendation #1: Synthesize results from the considerable literature on silvery minnow to document what factors have major detrimental effects on the species.* The Executive Committee (EC) directed the CC to continue the “synthesis of all existing data” discussions and brainstorm how to accomplish the actual synthesis work. The crux is determining what causes detrimental affects on the species. Synthesis and correct analysis (and/or interpretation) would have to involve the fish biologists and Service field staff. The Population Viability Analysis (PVA) is doing a small part of the information synthesis, but the need is much bigger than the scope of that group. Attendees discussed what “all existing data” means and whether or not to limit the synthesis to just Program-funded projects or to expand the synthesis to include the science behind the fish passage requirement or nation-wide information. It was cautioned that limiting the synthesis to just Program-funded projects would be an incomplete “picture” as there is much information from other sources that should be included.
- *Recommendation #2: Determine what factors are imposing the major controlling constraints on silvery minnow populations.* It was cautioned that recommendations #1 and #2 not be completely separated. The PVA models are intended to help tease out controlling constraints. The rationale is having increased knowledge of the minnow will allow for the development of recovery actions that are most likely to succeed and to identify the most critical things for the species. It was shared that the Service’s compiled perspective on constraints and threats already exists in past documents (i.e., recovery plans, 2003 BiOp, etc.). Several agencies have provided feedback to the Service as part of the 5-year species status review; it was suggested that the information/comments could be released to the Program as a starting point. The CC was given a brief update on the Program’s database development – the pilot database is expected to debut soon. The database will be an instrumental tool in helping to identify and understand major controlling constraints on the species.
- *2003 BiOp Fish Passage Requirement:* Attendees discussed the concern that the fish passage requirement remains even though the peer review results were inconclusive. The concern is how to move forward meeting the BiOp requirement even though there are cautions not to proceed until the constraints and factors impacting the species be identified and understood. It was recommended that the synthesis exercise include the bibliography for the 2003 BiOp to better understand why the Service required it.
 - Both the DEC review and the peer review were undertaken to try to assess the probability of fish passage success. The DEC review mentioned several of the same uncertainties that the peer review panel pointed out (ex. uncertainty on how well minnow will be able to find the entrance point; uncertainty on the ability of the minnow to successfully navigate the passage; uncertainty on the ability of the side wall to direct fish upstream versus them being washed downstream again; etc.). The crucial question (especially considering the cost) is “do we really know that fish passage is the most critical thing that can be done for the species to improve the species population?” This is related to Recommendation #2 and determining the controlling constraints.
 - Some CC members recommended seeking clarification from the EC on the data synthesis directive and then begin exploring step by step process to address. The ends of the continuum are: (1) just do a “specific” fish passage review but that would ignore the EC directive or (2) just do the

broader data synthesis but that would ignore the need to show movement on the fish passage requirement.

- *Recommendation #4: The panel articulated a number of data or knowledge gaps that were encountered during their review. They urged the consideration of these topics in the research program that develops from the foregoing list of recommendations...* The CC discussed the high probability that the research projects will have to be multiple-year studies in order to achieve useable results.
- *Recommendation #5: Determine the impact that augmentation has had on silvery minnow genetic variability over time.* Attendees discussed how this activity could potentially be a one-year study funded with FY11 money because the data has already been collected. It is assumed to be a straight forward exercise.
- *Peer Review Process:* The CC briefly discussed the lack of established “process” or “procedure” to address any input from expert peer reviews. Instead, the lack of process creates another level for people “to pick and choose” their interpretations from the recommendations. How can the Program best address this type of review in an effective manner that will enable the recommendations to be processed through the Program to reach a workable plan or path forward? It was shared that several members have previously suggested the development of a process but the recommendations were never followed up on; there was never agreement on how to frame the peer review and what to do with the results.
- *Project(s) to fund in 2011:* The CC discussed what, if any, of the recommendations could be turned into a reasonable project and get funded with FY11 money. The synthesis of data task is huge – it needs to be framed in terms of the LTP; and sequencing, timing, and funding all have to be considered.
 - Some attendees shared their impression from the peer review report that a more reasonable first step [instead of the fish passage] is to improve the habitat within each reach. Good, contiguous habitat is a better use of money with more immediate and potentially more significant impact to the species compared to a multi-million dollar structure. There is a huge risk factor with the fish passage considering there is not a good handle on potential success. Unfortunately, this does not remove the obligation for the fish passage. It is unknown when the focus can be removed from the fish passage; it is also unknown if the Service will accept data synthesis as sufficient progress toward the fish passage requirement. Attendees were reminded that there has to be sufficient scientific support to justify any deviation from the 2003 BiOp requirements.
 - It was suggested that Recommendation #5 might be appropriate for a single-year project to fund with FY11 money. Genetic data has been collected/monitored for a number of years and there is at least one year’s worth of pre-stocking information. It is already known that the augmentation program has alleviated the pre-stocking reach genetic differences but it is not known what the reach genetic differences *were* and *why*. In a brief stocking update, it was shared that Jason Remshardt might have to consider stocking Angostura this November as that reach is being rapidly depleted.
 - There was agreement to task the Science (ScW) work group with writing a scope of work to *Determine the Impact That Augmentation has had on Silvery Minnow Genetic Variability Over Time*. Specifically, the

scope should include a specific task to compare the reach-specific pre-stocking and post-stocking genetic data. In order to have the FY11 funds obligated, it was agreed that the SOW be written by May 15th to allow for a 2 week review period and still be provided to Jericho Lewis by June 1st.

- *Recommendation #6: Conduct field-oriented studies to determine what external and internal factors (e.g. drying, food availability, predation, rheotropic response, temperature, turbidity, geomorphology, hydrology) cause silvery minnow to move among habitats in the river. These studies would directly inform fish passage as well as benefit the habitat restoration program.*
 - In an update on the PIT tag study, it was shared that this is the last year of the study. The passageway is very simple – almost a by-pass – and the minnow do use it. Jason Remshardt has opinions on fish passage based on his on-the-ground experience.
 - It was suggested that the State of the Science work shop notes and conclusions be reviewed.
- *Delegated Work: The CC discussed acquiring technical input and feedback from the work groups in order to make informed plans on how to meet the EC directive [to address the synthesis of data recommendation]. After discussing several options, the CC tasked the work groups with reviewing the peer review recommendations in the context of their proposed activities for the LTP.*
 - The work groups were asked to provide a summary report back to the CC that addresses:
 - (1) where the fish passage recommendations might fit into the LTP;
 - (2) if any of their current/future LTP activities would help address the recommended actions;
 - (3) how the recommendations might impact the work group activity prioritizations;
 - (4) if any current/future activity could be easily modified or updated to address the recommendations; and
 - (5) any recommendations the work group might have on how to effectively and efficiently address the “synthesis of data” issue.
 - The summary should also include the work group’s opinion on the “relevancy” of the recommendations in line with the work group’s paths forward (ex. same idea discussed but is still 10 years away; or partially addressed in this specific action; or this idea was never discussed/though of before, etc).
 - In order for the CC to make realistic implementation recommendations, it would be useful to have the work groups complete the LTP fields for the recommendations (category, lead agency, suggested rank in priority, assumed time line, etc.). These recommendations should be considered in both the fish passage and general minnow life history context.
- *Recommendation #7: As part of the MRGESCP adaptive management process, develop an integrated, strategic habitat restoration plan for one reach of the MRG to maximize connectivity within the reach and determine the influence of habitat restoration on movement, growth, survival and reproductive success of*

the silvery minnow within the reach as habitat restoration occurs. It was suggested that Recommendations #6 and #7 would probably need to be joint work group efforts.

- **Update on Contract Status for Dr. Miller and the PHVA/PVA joint work group meeting on April 22nd:** The CC was informed that Dr. Miller (PHVA modeler) has not been under contract since the end of October 2010. He has volunteered some of his time and efforts but he can no longer participate. This means that Dr. Miller will not attend the joint PHVA/PVA meeting scheduled for April 22nd and will not be moving forward on the RAMAS PVA at this time. This situation will be in a “hiatus” until Reclamation can contract him again. The last source of funding was Reclamation through the Service to sole source; however, his contract is no longer funded through the mechanism of the Service. Reclamation’s restrictions on sole sourcing present a challenge.
 - It was also shared that Dr. Goodman has instructions to not attend the joint PHVA/PVA meeting either. The PVA work group co-chairs are aware of this issue and David Gensler and Dave Campbell will be the participants representing PVA at the joint meeting.
 - The EC had very high expectations in terms of deliverables, schedules, and written consensus from this joint meeting; the CC discussed that it is not likely that just the PVA co-chairs and the limited PHVA representation would be able to meet the EC directives. Considering that (1) the PHVA was requested at this meeting, (2) scheduling has been very difficult, (3) April 22nd is Good Friday, (4) the PVA has not yet supplied PHVA with the requested written letter clarifying data needs, and (5) now the PVA modelers will not be in attendance, the CC recommended the joint meeting be postponed until further notice.
 - The CC was informed that the PHVA has been working to resolve this issue with PVA for many months now. Over a year ago, the PVA work group was given the complete output from one pre-ESA scenario. The modelers should be able to look at that information and provide feedback to PHVA on what will or won’t work. That has never been done. Most recently, in December 2010, the PHVA requested the PVA submit data needs in writing. At the request of CC attendees, the following excerpt has been copied from the December 8th, 2010 PHVA meeting notes for clarification:
 - “The PHVA work group needs to understand exactly what is needed for the PVA models. Once that has been clarified, the work group could brainstorm scopes of work for developing the needed information.”
 - “Once the written letter of clearly stated PVA needs has been provided, the PHVA work group could respond in writing as to how to approach meeting the needs.”
- **Note Taking Concerns:** Some members of the CC expressed concerns that the last ScW work group meeting notes are ineffective and of poor quality. The importance of the meeting notes was stressed – content, context, details, and factual information need to be captured and discussions accurately reflected in order for Program notes to be of best possible quality. The opinion was shared that it is unfortunate but quality notes do not exist for the last ScW or SAR work group meetings. CC members were informed that Reclamation is working closely with GenQuest to resolve any issues. Attendees were encouraged to report any concerns that may arise - preferably in writing.
- **Significant Non-decision Items to Brief EC On:**
 - *Concerns Regarding the April 2011 AM Technical Session:* The most recent adaptive management (AM) plan technical sessions took place on April 2nd and 3rd, 2011. Some CC members shared their concern that this meeting was an “ineffective use of staff

time.” The agenda was disregarded and the AM contractor was not able to accomplish the intended goals. Agency staff did not provide any of the technical input that they were in attendance for. It was shared that some agency staff have been instructed to leave if this situation ever happens again; it is disrespectful to staff and meeting participants. It was recommended that from now on the agenda be followed, the meetings be managed, and people should not be allowed to dominate the meeting to the exclusion of others.

- The background on the AM technical sessions was briefly provided to the CC. The purpose of the technical sessions has been to gain information and feedback from work group members. The April session was a follow-up to the February session which had limited participation due to inclement weather. It is in the scope of the AM contract for the contractors to meet with Program participants. It was shared that similar concerns were expressed after the February meetings. It appears that some entity representatives are now questioning every step of the process and introducing legally defensible concerns even though there is a finalized contract. One opinion shared was that the behavior displayed at the April session was “appalling” and attendees were “stunned.” It was suggested that the future AM sessions may have to be facilitated.
- Attendees were reminded that the Program *chose* these AM contractors to lead us down this path and everyone should be able to voice opinions and input. The AM contractors are almost to the point of completing the work group technical interaction and moving toward the development of the “MRGESCP AM Plan – version 1.”
- This issue will be discussed at the April 2011 EC closed session.
- *April 21st, 2011 Draft EC Agenda for CC review/discussion*
 - CC members briefly reviewed the draft agenda for the next EC meeting. Suggestions included: (1) removal of the Joint PVA/PHVA update (originally Item #3b) based on the CC’s request to postpone; (2) provide an update and path forward on the CC discussions regarding the SADD fish passage peer review recommendations – this should include the recommendation to fund Recommendation #5 with the ScW work group tasked to develop a draft scope to be funded in FY11; and (3) work groups tasked with providing technical feedback on all the SADD fish passage peer review recommendations and data synthesis.
 - The April Draft EC Agenda will be revised as discussed.

Next meeting – May 4th, 2011 from 9:00 am to 4:00 pm @ Reclamation

- This is an all-day LTP working meeting; please remember to bring lunch. Interested participants are encouraged to review the LTP activity summaries found on the Program website in preparation for this meeting: Library > Revised LTP Development. Note that you must be logged in to view content on this page.
 - Tentative agenda items include: (1) LTP development

**Coordination Committee
13 April 2011 Meeting Attendees**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | PHONE NUMBER | PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O) | EMAIL ADDRESS |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|--|----------------------------|
| Brooke Wyman | MRGCD | 247-0234 | P – Chair | brooke@mrgcd.us |
| Yvette McKenna | Reclamation | 462-3555 | O | yrmkenna@usbr.gov |
| Ann Moore | NMAGO | 222-9024 | P | amoore@nmag.gov |
| Kathy Dickinson | Reclamation | 462-3555 | O | kdickinson@usbr.gov |
| Ann Watson | Santo Domingo | 465-0055 | P | awatson@sutilities.com |
| Lori Robertson | FWS | 761-4710 | P | lori_robertson@fws.gov |
| Terina Perez | Reclamation/PMT | 462-3614 | O | tlperez@usbr.gov |
| Monika Mann (via phone) | COE | 342-3250 | O | monika.mann@usace.army.mil |
| Hilary Brinegar (via phone) | NMDA | 575-646-2642 | P | hbrinegar@nmda.nmsu.edu |
| Jim Wilber | Reclamation | 462-3548 | P | jwilber@usbr.gov |
| Matt Schmader | COA | 452-5200 | P | mschmader@cabq.gov |
| Stacey Kopitsch | FWS | 761-4737 | O | stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov |
| Rick Billings | ABCWUA | 796-2527 | P | rbillings@abcwua.org |
| Brian Gleadle | NMDGF | 222-4700 | P | brian.gleadle@state.nm.us |
| Roland Penttila | COA/storm water mgmt | 768-2778 | O | rpenttila@cabq.gov |
| Ali Saenz | Reclamation/Admin Assist | 462-3600 | O | asaenz@ucbr.gov |
| Marta Wood | Tetra Tech | 259-6098 | O | marta.wood@ttemi.com |