Executive Committee Meeting

May 19, 2011

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

Coordination Committee and Program Manager Update

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA
May 19, 2011
8:30 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 APRIL 21, 2011 MEETING SUMMARY and ACTION ITEMS*** *20 minutes*
3. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP*** *-- 3 hours – See attached agenda*
4. **ISC UPDATE ON WATER RIGHTS LEASE** *(R. Schmidt)* *10 minutes*
5. **USFWS and BIOLOGY UPDATE** *15 minutes*
6. **USACE UPDATE** *10 minutes*
7. **RECLAMATION and HYDROLOGY UPDATE** *(M. Hamman/L. Towne)* *10 minutes*
8. **COORDINATION COMMITTEE/PROGRAM MANAGER REPORT** *10 minutes*
   (B. Wyman, Y. McKenna)
   - **A. LTP Update**
   - **B. Annual Report Update**
   - **C. Workgroup Updates**
   - **D. Contract Update** *(J. Lewis)*
9. **OTHER BUSINESS/ANNOUNCEMENTS** *5 minutes*
10. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
11. **NEXT SCHEDULED EC MEETING – June 15, 2011 (9:00 am to 1:00 pm @ Reclamation)**

Denotes read ahead material provided for this topic

Members

ABCWUA	APA	CABQ
ISC	Isleta Pueblo	NMAGO
NMDA	NMGF	MRGCD
Sandia Pueblo	Santa Ana Pueblo	Santo Domingo Tribe
UNM	USACE	USFWS
		Reclamation

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE ENDANGERED SPECIES COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM
Adaptive Management Plan Development

Workshop with the Executive Committee

Bureau of Reclamation – 555 Broadway Blvd NE, Albuquerque, NM, Rio Grande Room
May 19, 2011 – 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. MST

The purpose of this EC workshop is to **present and solicit feedback on our draft strategic design ideas** for Version 1 of the AM Plan, **explore potential roles and responsibilities** if such a design were to be implemented, including what 'closing the loop' (adjustment) might entail, and **discuss some high-level AM implementation issues**.

This draft design will describe how some of the critical uncertainties facing the Program could be tested over several years using a rigorous adaptive management approach. The actual actions to be implemented, as well as the associated methods of monitoring, evaluation and adjustment) would need to be determined and refined through much interagency and intra-agency discussion over the next year or so. What we will describe and jointly discuss is a relevant *example design* to illustrate the full AM cycle, rather than anything the Program has actually committed to. The **focus will be on Step 2** in the AM cycle, although discussion of how the suggested treatments could be implemented, monitored and evaluated, and what adjustments might be expected based on what is learned, will provide **initial information for Steps 3-6** as well.

We will also be **available for informal discussions** in the afternoon, for anyone wishing to have more time with us to talk about design issues or anything else about the AM Plan.

Time	Topic
9:00 – 9:15	**Opening** • Welcome and introductions • Orientation of where we are in the AM Plan development process • Workshop objectives, agenda, expected outputs, and participation principles • Overview of what we've done since the last Planning Session
9:15 – 9:45	**Presentation of high-level overview of draft strategic design** • Slide presentation (and handout) of draft design, including verbal refinements from the technical workshop the previous day • Specific questions for EC based on this design
9:45 – 10:30	**Feedback on draft strategic design** • *Silent generation.* Think and jot down ideas on a feedback form (to be handed out), responding to questions on each step (15 min) • Roundtable answers, and other thoughts/impressions (30 min)
10:30 – 10:45	Break
10:45 – 11:05	**Feedback on draft strategic design cont'd** • Continue with roundtable feedback on initial impressions
11:05 – 11:45	**Inhibiting and enabling factors for AM** • Discussion (and handout) on enabling factors for AM which relate to the parking lot issues raised during the February Planning Session • Discussion of what Program needs to do to effectively implement AM
11:45 – 12:00	**Review and Closing** • Overview of workshop results • Summary of next steps towards completion of a full draft of Version 1 of the AM Plan by end of June

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
May 19th, 2011 8:30 am to 1:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation, Albuquerque Area Office
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102

Decisions

- With quorum present, the April 21, 2011 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with two minor edits.

Actions

- EC members should send feedback on the "Silent Generation Questions" posed by the adaptive management contractors and any comments on the draft strategic design to Yvette McKenna by Friday, May 27, 2011.
- Jen Bachus will follow up with Jason Remshardt to see if tagging methods to track where augmented silvery minnow are released into the river will be implemented this year.

Directives

- The EC directed the CC and the PMT to begin development of a charter for an adaptive management work group and, on a parallel track, consider how the work groups can be structured to be made as effective as possible. Discussions can be continued at the next EC meeting.

Next EC Meeting: June 16, 2011 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM

- Tentative June Agenda Items: (1) Peer review recommendations process document; (2) 2008 – 2009 Annual Report; (3) Discussion on formation of an adaptive management work group and restructure of the work groups;

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
May 19th, 2011 8:30 am to 1:00 pm
Bureau of Reclamation, Albuquerque Area Office
555 Broadway Blvd. NE
Albuquerque, NM 87102

May 19th, 2011 Meeting Summary

Introductions and Agenda Approval: Estevan Lopez brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. It was corrected that the next Executive Committee (EC) meeting will be on June 16th from 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM. The agenda was approved with the addition of the dissemination of the SECURE Water Act Report during Other Business.

Approval of the March 29th, 2011 Meeting Summary:

- With quorum present, the April 21, 2011 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with two minor edits: (1) a correction to the numbering of the bullets that list the changes to the March 29th meeting summary; and (2) the last bullet in the changes to the March 29th meeting summary will be moved from the bulleted list to the body of the summary.
- Attendees were updated on the two directives from the March 29th CC meeting. Plans for a Population Habitat Viability Assessment (PHVA)/Population Viability Analysis (PVA) joint work group meeting are in process but a date has not yet been selected. The Coordination Committee (CC) will present the EC with a white paper for addressing peer review recommendations at the June EC meeting.

Adaptive Management Workshop:

- *Opening:* Attendees were shown an opening presentation on where the Program is in the Adaptive Management (AM) Plan process, what has been done in the planning process, and what the workshop objectives and expected outputs are.
    - The next step for ESSA and Headwaters will be the first full Draft Adaptive Management Plan Version 1, which will be submitted June 20th, 2011. The Program will then have until August 15th, 2011 to review the draft. It was explained that this review period is a little shorter than previously presented in order to allow sufficient time for comments to be incorporated.
    - A diagram was shown that briefly describes AM. AM takes the scientific process of research and "elevates" it to help solve/address management problems.
    - Attendees were then shown a diagram of the 6-stepped AM Cycle:
        - Step 1: Assess;
        - Step 2: Design;
        - Step 3: Implement;
        - Step 4: Monitor;
        - Step 5: Evaluate; and
        - Step 6: Adjust.
        - The majority of the time has been invested on Step 1 (Assessment) in order to have a thorough understanding of the big questions that managers wrestle with and the underlying technical questions.

- This AM session will focus on Step 2 (Design) and will briefly touch on the remaining steps.

- *Presentation of high-level overview of draft strategic design:* Attendees viewed a presentation on what AM would look like and what it means for the Program and the Middle Rio Grande (MRG). Step 2 (design) consists of designing actions and monitoring evaluations to meet MRG goals and rigorously test hypotheses.
  - 1. An example of the purpose of the preliminary design and demonstration of the steps was provided in handout form.
  - 2. *Design AM Plan Version 2 Detailed Process:* There was discussion on designing the AM Plan Version 2 detailed process. There needs to be open/good discussions between the policy group(s) and the technical group(s) in order to have a process in place. The policy makers talk about strategies in a general sense while the technical group provides the expertise to convert those strategies to actions and possibly suggest other actions.
    - If completed properly, design can meet both management and learning goals. There are 4 basic questions: (1) what is the year's forecast (i.e., what kind of year will it be?); (2) how do water, hatcheries, and habitat need to be managed?; (3) what are the expected effects on minnow, flycatcher, and water uses?; and (4) what are the observable effects on the minnow and flycatcher?
  - 3. *Key Decisions*
    - An AM plan helps to structure decisions about flow management, habitat rehabilitation and management, hatchery stocking decisions, etc.
    - Implementation time will vary for different types of decisions.
    - Key questions can be "boiled down" into the underlying hypotheses. The list of decisions and the corresponding key questions can be provided to decision makers.
  - 4a. M*innow – Critical Uncertainties*
    - What flows are required?
    - How does river drying effect population viability?
    - Connectivity across and along channel?
  - 4b. *Flycatcher – Critical Uncertainties*
    - The tables of critical uncertainties helpful in moving further toward an experimental design.
  - 5. *Draft set of AM Actions*
    - An example of a sufficient action for implementing and monitoring was provided. Remember, there are ESA constraints on the experiments that can be done which add to the challenge.
  - *Peak flows vary a lot from year to year*
    - How can managers plan around the variation and how does the minnow population respond? Is flow really the driver? To what degree do other things like temperature become a factor?
  - *Spawning flows strongly affect minnow success.*
    - One key question to consider is: if the channel were to be changed to have more overbank flooding in Albuquerque or Isleta (for example) could this result in more recruitment at lower flows?
  - 5. *Channel shape affects flooded area*
    - How many acres inundate per mile and at different flows?
    - In some areas, the cross section of the bank could be modified to get a larger flooded area and assumed better recruitment (a solution posed by A. Lundahl and ISC).
    - This is an important part of the potential set of actions that are worth exploring.

- 5. *Example draft AM actions*
- A graphical illustration of the Table 5 example set of actions showed how the examples might differ from the 2003 BiOp.
    - Regarding the 5 to 7 day peak flow, an option to explore is to instead time it to when the hydrograph would naturally occur. Less than the 30 day period might actually be more beneficial if there were good spawning and recruitment of larvae back to river; however, this could vary year to year.
    - One option to explore is whether during very dry years is it better to focus on maintaining wetter refugia and not necessarily the whole length of the Rio Grande.
    - The continuous flow requirement of the 2003 BiOp could also look different. The start of the continuous flow could remain November 15th but could only continue until the spawning flows (instead the June 15th set date).
    - An important part of all of these options is major channel rehabilitation and more overbank flooding during spawning at lower flows.
- 6. *Monitoring*
    - It was emphasized that the accuracy and the precision of monitoring will have a huge effect on the ability to reliably evaluate an action.
    - Another key point is creating and utilizing contrast to test hypotheses.
- 7. *Evaluation*
    - In terms of "contrast", consider each reach spatially and within each there are areas of channel rehabilitation and refugia and others areas without. The contrast occurs over time and space. The Cochiti Deviation is a real MRG example - tried a 2-day spawning peak that was then moved. It was learned that there was more spawning success.
- 8. *Adaptation/adjustment*
    - How effective are decisions rules under different conditions? In a string of dry years, what would happen? Is there any way to save water during wet time periods for other drier time periods? These types of adjustments will be on multiple scales – including seasonal adjustments (ex. if there is a good monsoon). As you learn from each year's monitoring, you make changes for the rest of the year. And then across for future years. Remember that several years of information may be needed to get feedback on habitat restoration sites.
    - Monitoring methods will also change over time.
    - One thing used elsewhere (ex. Columbia River) is to consider triggers and early warnings. Perhaps maintain a water reserve in those conditions to ensure the species at risk are maintained.
- 9. *Independent science review*
    - Independent Science Review has been shown to be helpful in other programs (ex. Platte River, Columbia River). The Platte has an annual symposium where the folks doing work on the system provide management-oriented presentations to independent scientists and management. Questions and feedback are taken into account as the reports are written afterward.

- *Discussion*
    - ***Comment:*** There is an inconsistency on the discussion of the role of salvage and our ability to test its effectiveness in the "big scheme." Salvage should be included on the presentation slide as a key question and its role and the ability to use AM to test its effectiveness over time.
        - ***Response:*** That is good point. Apologies were offered for the oversight.

- ***Question:*** One of the classic areas of dispute - or potential dispute - is the relationship between research and policy. This was touched on a little but there needs to be a methodology or approach for looking at what degrees of uncertainty we are willing to accept before making decisions and moving forward. What is your experience with other programs on this and what advice or approaches would you give to the EC on how to move forward with and designing the AM process?
    - ***Response:*** You first need to know what the uncertainty is. If, for example, you only know minnow density to ± 70%, that will lead to a considerable amount of uncertainty in terms of knowing the effects of actions going forward. This might be the justification to request more money to try to better determine abundance. Also, models and simulations can be used to look at the risk of making the wrong decision (ex. of the Chinook salmon in the Columbia River). The simulations indicated that there is likelihood of mistakes when the monitoring is more precise. It was also learned that if species densities are really low, simple monitoring is usually good enough. The uncertainty and decisions varies depending on how close you are to the threshold where you will make a change. Some decisions might not have any flexibility (ex. no control over particular deliveries of water).

- ***Question:*** What I hear is that this is kind of like a "decide what you feel like" situation. The Service is going to start with the flow targets for the BiOp. How can we move away from those flow targets and still keep the Service comfortable? How do we tackle the uncertainty – to the point where we can get permitting to deal with it? How do we manage in order to be allowed to implement changes?
    - ***Response:*** An example was provided under Table 5. The process of getting to Version 2 involves simulating a variety of rules that mimic the minimum flow rules. The simulation results will have to be analyzed to determine how well those alternatives met the recovery goals, the water user's goals, etc. If a set of alternatives is determined to work well in wet years then it has to be determined how to "tweak" those alternatives to make them work in dry years. Everyone will have to converge on something that is an acceptable option and that involves evaluating the uncertainty.
        - A comment was made that it really comes down to identifying the risk of a wrong decision and getting that to an acceptable level (e.g., by PVA modeling or other simulation).
        - There is the idea to include a "safe fail" approach and make sure that nothing is done that could have an irreversible negative effect. This could include doing something first at a pilot scale or small-level studies. All the entities need to be convinced the actions are effective so we may have to consider "proof of concept" testing phases before expanding to full scale.

- **Feedback on draft strategic design**
    - Attendees were provided "feedback documents" with "silent generation questions." Participants were given about 15 minutes to answer the questions during the meeting. Questions included:
        - 1. Does this example design help you understand what AM might be able to provide for the Program?;
        - 2. Does the suggested overall process for getting from Version 1 to Version 2 of the AM Plan (Figures 1a and 1b, Table 1) make sense to you? Would this

process help the Program to converge on an acceptable set of actions and associated monitoring and evaluation?;
- 3. Do you like the principles for designing actions (blue box in Section 5.)? What principles would you add, delete, or change?;
- 4. Given that well designed monitoring and timely evaluation are essential to understanding action effectiveness, are you willing to invest sufficient resources to make that feedback loop effective?; and
- 5. Would you be willing to attend an annual 1-day symposium on what's been learned about key management questions? Would you be willing to participate in about 6 meetings over a year-long period to implement the process outlined in Figure 1b?

- In a roundtable discussion, EC members shared feedback on the design phase.
  - ***Corps Comment:*** Generically, the response for our agency would be "yes" to all the questions. In terms of Question #2, the flow chart is helpful to the process and I think it goes in the right direction. But where do the decision points enter into? There are multiple entry points and real-time considerations. In employing the AM Plan, how do you go through that decision making process? I would suggest there be a clear step/or arrow on the back end that indicates when it should go to the decision making body. Regarding Question #3, I would comment that there is perhaps a better way to define or alternatively define contrast over time. Regarding Question #4 and the investing of sufficient resources, the easy answer is yes…to the extent of what my authority can allow. That will probably be common around the table.

  - ***COA Comments:*** Our response is basically yes, with qualifications, to all the questions. Regarding Question #2, it should be noted that the Program will not be able to "converge" until players are willing to "go all in" by offering key resources (such as water, control, land, etc.). Regarding Question #3 and the attributes of the actions, I just want to add that they need to be monitorable and practical. We will probably have to "hierarchicalize" and stratify the types of decisions and require the do-loop of extensive research.

  - ***NMDA Comments:*** It is still unclear on how we will get from Version 1 to Version 2. Approximately 4 years ago, we tried to draw the framework of the Program but we couldn't do it. And while it's hard to diagram these out, I think we have the pieces in place. The CC is the policy and management group and we have technical work groups. I see Version 1 as the strategy design and Version 2 being more detailed where AM steps 1-6 are actually performed. I remain curious as to what Version 2 will look like. Regarding Question #3, I like Item D (reflecting advances in scientific understanding) which is a challenge the EC has talked about this year. Item H (sustainability only) will probably apply to different situations but not necessarily all, in that we shouldn't pursue actions proved to be unsuccessful. I would also like more explanation for the "use of contrasts."

  - ***Santa Ana Comments:*** Regarding Question #4, we can give a qualified yes; but like others have stated given our specific support and financial ability I think we would wish to continue monitoring efforts we've done.

- ***Service Comments:*** Regarding Question #3, we have the example of flow and habitat and the fact that we want to make sure we are not missing out on any areas of species performance. We need to make sure we are still looking at how species, habitat, and flow are doing. In situations where fish end up dead – that cannot be reversed. We would recommend using the word "adjustable" because some things cannot be reversed. Also, somewhere in the box we have to be able to evaluate the risk to the species. We need to make sure that as we move forward we have a rigorous evaluation. It would be great if we can have a "safe fail" method that works but evaluation is still imperative. Regarding the questions we would say yes to everything with the same constraints already pointed out (specifically for Question #4).

- ***ISC Comments:*** I could probably say yes to all in some degree. Regarding Question #2, I like the previous comment on needing the "all in" from everyone. I think we can't converge unless we have buy-in - regardless of the process. We also have one entity here that has a special role as regulators - the Service. We will need buy-in from the Service in a different way. Their buy-in should be in terms of how they will apply this to the BiOp. Regarding Question #3, I think what we should add is realistic recovery or listing criteria. Regarding Question #4 and willingness to provide sufficient resources, I don't think this is directed toward individual entities but the Program as a whole. I think that is a part of the buy-in.

- ***MRGCD Comments:*** I think the current draft design much better represents the concept. The example given is heavily weighted to Steps 1 and 2 but I think to really understand the concept all steps need to be given equal weight. I agree with the need to have an "all in" approach. There are a lot of key issues of how AM is or could be used that could have been settled before we can address the details and design. Regarding Question #2, these figures appear to represent the AM process instead of the evolution of the design into a Version 2, Version 3, etc. Regarding Question #3, I think the concept is good although I agree with comments from others that there are specific things that need to be addressed in Item 1j. That should be its own item number and elaborated on a great deal after that. Regarding Question #4, I think it is a tremendous point and hope that we continue commitment to monitoring and the science. Regarding Question #5, yes, we will commit as much time as necessary.

- ***NMAGO Comments:*** Regarding Question #1, the detail seems geared more towards our Program but it is unclear what exactly it would do. I thought we were looking for some way of moving away from the rigid flow targets but it is unclear how this would be accomplished. I understand the concern the Service raised and that they cannot approve something that jeopardizes the fish. Regarding Question #2, I share concerns with others that I don't know what Version 2 might look like. Regarding the principles, I tend to agree with the other comments. I would also add that whatever we look at needs to be affordable. There needs to be a realistic understanding of the funding and that budgets are shrinking. Regarding Question #4, the AGO doesn't have money to invest in projects but we acknowledge that it is certainly important.

We are in support of meetings and certainly an annual symposium. We would be willing to participate in 1d to get it.

- ***ABCWUA Comments:*** I would easily say yes Questions 1 and 2. Regarding Question #3, the principles are good but I would like to see some commitment. The monitoring is problematic - how much?, how soon?, how often? Plus the results need to be evaluated. Regarding "reinforcing success and abandoning failure quickly" we have to be willing and able to apply lessons learned and suffer the consequences. I am optimistic that AM will get there.

- ***Reclamation Comments:*** I would reply "yes" to pretty much everything. I agree with the discussion on Question #2 about needing to have buy-in but I would add that it has to occur irrespective of the development of Version 2 because this is an implementation. We also need to have a good understanding of all available tools in order to best design Version 2 of the AM plan. Regarding Question #3, if we look at the Blue Box [from presentation/handout] Item E (reducing critical uncertainties) has strong ties to both Items G and H. We have to design and expand Item G to some degree in order to define the relationship between our scientists and managers and to determine the accepted levels of uncertainties. That will be a critical piece. We at the EC level need to have robust conversations with our scientists to better understand the risks and effects of not devoting resources. Regarding Question #4, yes we need to have effective monitoring and we need to understand how to prioritize those resources to the most effective target. The EC needs to provide that leadership in this process. It is critical that within the first 2 years we decide what the "umbrella" or coverage will be under Program and how to provide that coverage to all.

- ***UNM Comments:*** I'm amazed at the amount of uncertainty - some of it is inherent, some of it is the inability to measure survival of the species well. Regarding Question #3, I support the principles of AM but I think Questions #2 through 5 are critical and I don't know if we have the tools at present for maximum effectiveness. I would suggest that any strategy that is part of AM needs a clear and quantitative statement of objectives and some attempt at recognizing uncertainties. This will help us to know (within the statement of objectives) that there is a way of measuring success and we can test the effectiveness of strategy. There needs to be a formal recognition of the uncertainty in the final document.

- ***APA Comments:*** Regarding Question #2, yes I understand; these discussions have been happening at the work group level. I think we have a lot of information although it may need to be gathered and formalized to "feed" into the diagram. My question is on implementation on the diagram: what is the likelihood of the Service permitting some of the experiments? When is the draft AM to be included as part of the BiOp? Much of what is in the diagram has been done, even if it has not been formalized appropriately. How do we implement this diagram? And how does it become part of the BiOp process? Regarding Question #3, Item 1c is a statement that everyone knows is good. The desired state of river is highly subjective. If that is a precept I would be cautious of using that. Also, "efficient water use" has a

multitude of definitions depending on user. I would caution about using "efficiency" there. Regarding Question #4, along with buy-in, I think it will also depend on "bang for our buck" and the Service's flexibility and timing. There needs to be Service commitment to give us some criteria that is reasonable and part of AM. Regarding Question #5, I would share the observation that a lot of this is happen through the work group process. Things can certainly be prioritized and the focus improved; one way to do that is to charter an AM work group with the same formalized process (with notes, dissents are registered and logged, etc.). As long as the recovery criteria are site specific we will never make progress because it is a very dynamic system with ever changing habitat. We need realistic and achievable recovery criteria that should match the dynamic system.

- There is value in formalizing things especially for this group that has done a lot of work over the years.
- Regarding the need for "contrast", one of the issues that was first applied to AM was the harvesting of fish populations. For example, salmon managers were worried about having the situation/relationship where there are too many spawners and too much competition for resources which affects the recruits. Every year there would be a fixed number of spawners returning. However, they began to collect a lot of data for that "fixed" number. You need to be able to change things and in this example increase/decrease the amount of returning spawners. Effectively, you need some contrast. If you keep doing the same thing over and over again you don't know if things can be done differently or more effectively. For the MRG, the variability in flow is one contrast that happens naturally.
- It was explained that the current plan is address comments in the draft that will be completed by the end of June. The contractor took workshop notes which will be made available on the website. Any additional comments should be emailed to the Program Manager by the end of next week (by next Friday) for forwarding to the contractor.

- **Inhibiting and enabling factors for AM**
  - Through the interview process, the AM contractors realized that there are a lot of hopes for AM; and some of those are probably beyond the ability of AM to meet. Part of this disconnect is due to various levels of people's experiences with AM.

  - *Institutional/organization challenges* (from the "parking lot" list developed in February) include:
    - Work group/decision-making disconnect
    - Turnover
    - Communication
    - Participation
    - Scientific rigor/variability recognizing 'good' science
    - Program identity
    - Permits
    - Transparency
    - Appropriate workload prioritization
    - The contractors also shared since the time of the interviews, they have since learned that there are serious trust issues. This is not really surprising given that different entities have different mandates, histories, interests,

responsibilities, and degrees of decision making authority. It is making it hard set up the best possible AM.

- *Enabling factors*:
  - There are 10 identified factors that help to make AM successful:
    - Context
      - The context sets the stage. Are there legal instruments that say you have to do AM or that grant the flexibility to try things? This can impact the development of an "enabling environment."
      - What can be done to make less enabling factors more enabling? Having the collaborative effort is an important enabling factor.
    - Leadership
      - AM needs to have champions. This helps "behind the scenes" to keep things moving. There needs to be leadership not just at the top but at the local, technical/implementation levels as well.
    - Executive Direction
      - Organizational embracing of AM can actually be formalized in driving documents. This holds true for legislature as well - how AM is incorporated in legislative mandates can be included in the record of decision.
      - ***Question:*** You mentioned examples of legislative mandates; in your opinion, where do you think that would feed into in our Program?
        - ***Response:*** As the BiOps are being written, how do they refer to AM? Do they refer to it as different plan? How descriptive of AM are they? Do they say the exact structure of AM? The other groups said that AM will be the method to reduce the amount of uncertainty. It is recommended that Reclamation, the Corps, and the Service at least be given the opportunity to look through the documents in order to be on board with the wording; this could be very helpful as we write the plan.
      - ***Question:*** Isn't the Columbia NOAA Implementation Plan currently involved in litigation? Do you know if the judge has issued an opinion on that?
        - ***Response:*** I am not sure where it is at.
        - Some members expressed interest in knowing if the plan was passing court scrutiny.
          - There is some rumor that various people are writing briefs on whether or not it was true AM. It is speculated that if there were briefs it would indicate another "round."
          - Dr. Goodman shared that the current round is not focusing on AM issues but on other issues of the BiOp. It's a BiOp that was struck down by the court in 2005 and they

still don't have a BiOp in place. The important part of the story for this group is that in 2008 an AM plan was submitted along with the BiOp as a justification for a no jeopardy decision but the judge would not accept that. The judge felt that an AM plan that wasn't part of the BiOp itself was not binding enough for the court to accept as part of a rationale for a no jeopardy decision. As of Monday, the judge had not yet rendered an opinion. At the moment the focus is not on AM but on whether the technical details of the jeopardy assessment are acceptable.

- Problem Definition
  - The problem needs to be clearly defined. You need to define exactly what it is you are doing and what it is you want to learn. If this isn't done correctly now, then the Program will end up paying for it later because a lot of time, energy, and focus will be spent evaluating factors that might not be leading to anything.
  - *Find the problem that's tractable; the problem that doesn't have a short temporal life span*. This is one reason why you shouldn't worry about getting stuck in Step 1. What are the real critical management uncertainties? What are the underlying technical uncertainties?
- Communication/organization structure
  - Communication has to be both top down and bottom up. If you think you have enough communication, you probably don't. Successful communication should be tailored to the specific audience.
- Community involvement
  - It is important to involve those who will be affected. Find out the reasons why some may not want to be involved. When involving the community, you have to be very clear on expectations and what is expected of them.
- Planning
  - Some say it is safer to do what we think is best rather than try uncertain alternatives to see if something might be better.
- Funding
  - Yearly funding is important but it is in the 3rd tier. Not having funding has forced other groups to be creative and to seek out other funding sources.
- Staff training
  - It is critical that people participating in the AM implementation understand what it is and what it can or can't do. Regardless of the combination of groups the Program has, it is important that everyone get training in AM so they know what it is they are trying to accomplish. The DOI

apparently has training but it is not known how or when they offer courses.

- Science of how AM is conducted
  - During the kickoff, we discussed "active" versus "passive." The degree of rigor that goes into the AM becomes an enabling factor. The more rigorously you do the science behind the AM, the more you learn.

- *Review and Closing:* The draft AM Plan version 1 will be delivered to the Program on June 30th. Program members were encouraged to submit any other documents to the AM contractors that would be helpful.

ISC Update on Water Rights Lease: Page Pegram gave a brief presentation on the where the Interstate Stream Commission (ISC) is on attempting to populate the Strategic Water Reserve (SWR) in the MRG with water rights. The presentation gave background on the SWR Statute and described a lease with the Village of Los Lunas.

- The SWR Statute is a management tool that allows ISC to purchase, lease, or receive by donation water rights to be used for interstate river compact compliance and to assist state and water users in efforts to benefit threatened and endangered species. A main recommendation from a listening session conducted in 2008 was that water rights leases be focused on as the acquisition method for getting water into the reserve. It was shared that the ISC does a yearly designation of priority basins and in 2011 the Pecos, the Canadian, and the Middle Rio Grande (MRG) were designated as priorities for acquisition activities.
- The SWR has been used less extensively in the MRG partly because water rights are expensive and difficult to come by. The ISC plans to use water acquired for the SWR to meet Program goals, for example to assist in meeting BO flow targets, RPAs and RMS, and to assist in the recovery of the species. Any of the SWR water that is not applied directly to Program goals will go to meeting compact compliance. There is only one permit that has been approved for the SWR use in the MRG and that is for 30 acre-feet of water for use at the Atrisco habitat restoration project.
- In January 2001, a lease agreement between ISC and the Village of Los Lunas to lease up to 1000 acre-feet per year of pre-1907 surface water rights was fully executed. The lease is for 10-years with two 10-year renewal options. The lease was presented in public session and approved by the ISC Commissioners and the Los Lunas Village Council. The ISC and the Village of Los Lunas have agreed to jointly file an application with the State Engineer to temporarily transfer the rights to the SWR by June 17th. The lease price for the water rights is $80 per acre-foot per year with yearly escalation for inflation. The lease will follow the standard Office of the State Engineer (OSE) permitting process which requires application, legal notice, and opportunity for public protest. If there are no protests, the permit could be approved by Fall 2011.
- The leased water will be used to help further the goals of the Program by offsetting increased depletions from habitat restoration projects, offsetting increased depletions from Cochiti deviation, and offsetting increased depletions associated with short-term flow augmentation. There may also be ways to use the water to further Program goals that have not yet been considered. The timing of use will be dependent on the OSE permitting process and the accounting will be dependent on the OSE conditions of approval.
- The SWR Statute requires that the SWR management "be done in conjunction with collaborative programs or processes where they exist." ISC believes that the Village of Los Lunas lease and permit applications meet the requirements of the SWR Statute and support Program goals and today's meeting with the EC is considered ISC's coordination with collaborative programs. Questions can be addressed to Page Pegram or Chris Shaw.

- *Questions*
    - ***Question***: Does ISC interpret "in conjunction with collaborative programs" as meaning that the water will be used as part of the Program's identified projects? ***Response***: ISC interprets it as meaning that the water must be used for things that support the objectives of the Program.
    - ***Question***: If there were storage rights in the system would it be possible for the SWR water to be stored and used that way?
      Response: The current application is structured for the water to be used for offsetting increased depletions for storage but ISC would be willing to look at other uses. There would have to be additional applications to the OSE if the water is used in other ways.
    - ***Question***: It was asked how projects with longer durations would be handled as the lease is at a minimum 10 years.
      Response: It was explained that the water would be used for pilot projects and will be used as an example of one of the ways that pre 1907 water rights can be acquired for use in the SWR. The preferred method for water to be acquired for the SWR is via leases but there are other methods such as through donation. The thinking is to build a type of portfolio that is a tool to use to deal with these issues on a longer term basis.
    - ***Question:*** What was the original point of use of the water rights?
      Response: The water rights were probably originally from agricultural lands that a developer transferred into or purchased. ISC has given thought to the restriction in the SWR Statute that says that water rights cannot be acquired from a district and it's believed that once water rights are no longer being used by a district that they are not transferred back to the original point of use. It would be difficult to find water rights that were never in a district.
    - ***Question:*** Depending on how much is used per year, is there a minimum amount that is paid to Lo Lunas?
    - ***Response:*** These are water rights that they may need in the future to offset pumping and since they don't know what will happen in the future they have an ability to reduce the amount of water a little bit each year if needed but they have to let ISC know 18 months in advance how much water will be available. As there is excess of water rights in Los Lunas it's not expected that they will be pulling water back any time soon and it's hoped that by the time they do need to pull water back there will be other assets in the SWR portfolio.

USFWS and Biology Update: Jen Bachus reported updates on the river drying event, the silvery minnow population monitoring, and the Southwestern Willow Flycatcher, as well as highlights and updates on the Reintroduction/Cochiti reach biologist monthly work.

- *River drying event:* Sometime before April 22, 2011 the Rio Grande went dry for approximately 9 miles in the Bosque del Apache reach. The river drying was inconsistent with the 2003 BO dry year flow requirement to maintain continuous flow until June 15th. 527 dead adult Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (silvery minnow) were collected and 1,124 silvery minnow were rescued and relocated. Most of the dead and rescued silvery minnow were sexually mature. Immediate steps were taken by Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and other water management partners and by the afternoon of April 25, 2011 the river had reconnected.
    - It was discussed that since the 2003 BO has been in place the river has not dried during that timeframe; however, prior to 2003 drying in that area was not an uncommon occurrence. After June 15th this is one of the first areas to dry and is one of the most difficult places on the river to manage.
- *Silvery Minnow Population Monitoring:* Preliminary information for the April 2011 monitoring is available and indicates that the density of silvery minnow has decreased.

- *Reintroduction/Cochiti reach biologist:* Mark Brennan has met with Jacob Pecos, Cochiti Pueblo Natural Resources Director, to discuss Cochiti's perspective on augmenting silvery minnow. Mark also participated in Tribal ESA Training at the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) campus, participated in a webinar on environmental flow management from Rio Conchos, Mexico, in Big Bend region for conservation needs. Mark has also followed up with communications to San Felipe Pueblo and Santo Domingo Tribe regarding silvery minnow augmentation and is continuing interpretation of USGS Cochiti Reach water quality data relative to silvery minnow spawning, development and retention potential.
- *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (flycatcher):* The update included graphs from BOR that showed the recent trends of flycatcher territories in the Elephant Butte Reservoir and Bosque del Apache areas. There were 291 flycatcher territories in Elephant Butte in 2010 which is down from 309 territories in 2009. It's expected that this year Elephant Butte Reservoir will have a decrease in territories with the territories expanding down in elevation toward the reservoir pool. The population at Bosque del Apache is expected to expand.
    - The flycatcher had previously expanded their territories because of overbanking that was due to a sediment plug. As its not likely for the plug to recur it was asked what the indication is that the same number of flycatcher will return.
        - It was commented perhaps current sediment characteristics and the pattern of inundation indicate that the area could support the same amount of flycatchers.
- It was briefly discussed that at a previous EC meeting when Jason Remshardt was giving an augmentation report he had indicated that though augmented silvery minnow are not currently marked according to where they are placed back into the river, it would be possible to do so. It's believed that this is something Jason is looking into but it was not known if it will be done this year. Marking the fish to indicate where they are placed in the river will yield information about where they have gone after being augmented and could be valuable to water management decisions. Jen Bachus will follow up with Jason Remshardt to see if tagging methods to track where augmented silvery minnow are released into the river will be implemented this year.

USACE Update: The U.S. Army Corp of Engineer's (USACE) Biological Assessment (BA) has been provided to the Program signatories and the tribes for comments. The comments that have been received were appreciated and will be reviewed and considered. USACE is currently working on the schedule for their next steps.

Reclamation and Hydrology Update:

- *BA Update:* Reclamation is making steady progress on their internal schedule for releasing their BA by August 1st, 2011. Reclamation has begun formal consultations with the 21 pueblos and tribes in New Mexico by sending each a letter to inquire whether they would like to formally consult with Reclamation on the BA drafting process. Six of the pueblos have indicated that they want to have formal consultations. The process was kicked off with a technical session for the pueblos on May 17th; four of the local Rio Grande pueblos were in attendance. The purpose of formal consultations with the pueblos is to get their views and comments on the BA process and proposed actions; this will help to include the perspective of the pueblos into the draft BA.
- *Hydrology Update:* An update of the hydrology situation was distributed to meeting attendees. All of the BOR storage goals at El Vado for emergency drought water and P&P have been met. Once the flow targets are reached it will be strictly inflow-outflow operations. Snow pack data is at 106% in Chama basin and at 94% in the upper Rio Grande.

Coordination Committee/Program Manager Report: *Please refer to the CC/PM report read ahead for details and additional information.*

- *Coordination Committee:*

- In response to an EC directive for the CC to develop a process for peer reviews the CC has looked at language from the Department of the Interior (DOI) website on how to implement recommendations from peer reviews. What is basically drawn from the DOI text is that though peer review recommendations are an important factor they are not the sole consideration and it is the agencies' discretion on how the recommendations fit with their view point. The CC came to the conclusion that the Program has already been utilizing this process and that trying to apply a uniform process to the results of peer reviews may not be practical. The CC approves of the text from the DOI website but will be cleaning it up to make it more relevant to the Program and will be making a decision on the document at their next meeting.
- The CC had an all-day working meeting to review the LTP. The CC reviewed a comprehensive list of past activities that goes back to 2001. The CC has also reviewed priority 2 and 3 future activities that had not been previously reviewed. The CC has not reviewed all the summaries but will be having a future meeting to further address LTP activities. The original time frame for the LTP has been changed to FY 2012 – FY 2023.
- The next CC meeting will be June 1st from 12:30 pm to 4:00 pm.

- *Annual Report Update:* The Program Management Team (PMT) and the CC have reviewed the 2008 – 2009 Annual Report. USACE was also able to have a technical editor and various USACE staff who worked on the projects review the document. GenQuest is incorporating comments and the report should be available to the EC by the June meeting.
- *Contract Update:* The EC was updated that Jericho Lewis has been preparing the funding opportunity announcement for habitat restoration and the announcement should be coming out soon. Attendees were updated that the issues with the new GenQuest note takers are being addressed; the current note takers from Tetra Tech will be assisting with training.
- *Work group Update:* PIO is still coordinating with ISC to see if a Congressional field trip is possible. If the field trip does not occur PIO is looking to hold a Program Open House with technical sessions and field trips on October 7th and 8th. Comments on the high intensity monitoring SOW are still being received.

Other Business/Announcements:

- It was proposed by an EC member that the Program reconsider development of an AM work group in order to have a more formalized process and more thorough documentation of the process.
  - Attendees were reminded that the CC has previously discussed formation of an AM work group/restructuring of the Program and had recommended not to undertake either of these tasks until the AM Plan is available; the EC did not disagree with this decision.
  - It was suggested that with the draft AM plan being released at the end of June this might be an appropriate time to begin development of a charter for an AM work group. A charter can always be discarded if it's determined that the work group is not needed but it will at least be a start in ensuring that AM moves forward.
  - Concern was raised that with the recent budget cuts and there being only 3 PMT members that Program agencies may be unable to support an additional work group unless a current work group is disbanded. The question was posed whether or not it would make sense to consolidate some of the work groups.
    - A suggested option was that the current adaptive management participants become the work group. The group wouldn't have to meet more frequently It would just mean more formality to the group and to the documenting process.
    - Concerns for a more formalized process were seconded - the AM meetings are crucially important to the Program and it is important for them to have a formal

process. Concern was again expressed with there being a large number of work groups and it was suggested that consolidation may help in concentrating efforts.

- There was agreement from several EC members and attendees that these issues merit consideration and that there should be further conversations. The EC Co-Chair asked if there were any objections to the EC giving direction to the CC and PMT to begin developing text that would embody the charter of an adaptive management work group and to also consider consolidation/restructure of the workgroups to create a more streamline process.
    - No objections were made, however it was pointed out that no further adaptive management meetings are scheduled and it was suggested that adaptive management could be a recurring discussion topic in technical work group meetings.
    - It was commented that formation of a work group would ensure that progress in AM continues to be made. Once the AM Plan is provided then the Program needs to start implementing it. The AM effort seems more important and "in center" than other activities and the Program needs to consider the best way to merge AM into the Program.
    - It was commented that work group consolidation should not be concurrent with the formation of an adaptive management work group as restructuring the Program will take time and there is concern that it might interfere with AM implementation.
    - The EC was cautioned to really think through how to keep the many technical people (who have been directed to attend technical work groups and have been faithfully contributing) engaged.
    - The intent of any restructuring of the work groups is to maximize the technical people's efforts.
    - Participants in the technical work groups have understandings and knowledge that will be useful in AM and it may be more effective if these people are absorbed into AM.
    - In the San Juan the technical work groups consist of hydrology, biology, and habitat. It was suggested that a structure along these lines be introduced to the Program with the technical work groups determining where under these categories they fall.
    - Another option is to amend AM into the charter of an existing work group.
    - It was suggested that in the mean time, as the Program is considering formation of an AM work group that a draft charter begin to be developed as it can always be modified or discarded.
    - It was commented that if the Program decides to completely "buy-in" to AM, then AM will need to be the glue that ties everything (science, habitat restoration, water management, etc.) together and the expertise for AM will be found in all the technical work groups. People may need to be pulled out for AM.
    - It was commented that more specificity should be given in the EC directive that the CC and PMT consider how the Program workgroups can be restructured to be as effective as possible.

- The EC directed the CC and the PMT to begin development of a charter for an adaptive management work group and, on a parallel track, consider how the Program work groups can be restructured to be made as effective as possible. Discussions can be continued at the next EC meeting.

- The SECURE Water Act Report was distributed to Program agencies. It was explained that Congress had directed BOR to look at climate change and its impacts to water supply in the U.S. The report lays out the climate risk assessment process and also includes information on collaboration among water partners where the Rio Grande basin has been recognized as an initial effort. It was commented that the report is enlightening because it discusses some of the issues that the Program will need to start considering.

Public Comment: There was no public comment.

Next EC Meeting: June 16, 2011 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM

- Tentative June Agenda Items: (1) Peer review recommendations process document; (2) 2008 – 2009 Annual Report; (3) Discussion on formation of an adaptive management work group and restructure of the work groups;

Executive Committee Meeting Attendees
April 21st, 2011, 9:00 am to 1:00 pm

Attendees:

Representative	*Organization*	*Seat*
Estevan Lopez (P)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	ISC
Mike Hamman (P)	Bureau of Reclamation	USBOR
Janet Jarratt (P)	Assessment Payers Association APA Of the MRGCD	APA
Michelle Shaughnessy (P)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	USFWS
Ann Moore (A)	NM Attorney General's Office	NMAGO
Subhas Shah (P)	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	MRGCD
Matt Schmader (P)	City of Albuquerque	COA
LTC. Jason Williams (P)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	USACE
Alan Hatch (A)	Pueblo of Santa Ana	Santa Ana
Rick Billings (A)	Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority	ABCWUA
Ann Watson (P)	Santo Domingo Tribe	Santo Domingo
Bruce Thomson (P)	University of New Mexico	UNM

Others

Yvette McKenna – PM	Bureau of Reclamation
Terina Perez	Bureau of Reclamation
Leann Towne	Bureau of Reclamation
Jim Wilber	Bureau of Reclamation
Dagmar Llewellyn	Bureau of Reclamation
William DeRagon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Susan Bittick	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Jen Bachus	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Christopher Shaw	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Grace Haggerty	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Peter Wilkinson	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Rolf Schmidt	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Page Pegram	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD
Stacey Kopitsch	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Rick Carpenter	City of Santa Fe/BDD
David Gensler	MRGCD
Wally Murphy	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Sarah Cobb	Tom Udall's Office
Chad Smith	Headwaters Corp.
Ralph Monfort	University of New Mexico
Daniel Goodman	Montana State University
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech

Coordination Committee and Program Manager Update
Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
May 19, 2011

Update

The **Adaptive Management (AM) Planning Workshop** is underway (May 18-19, 2011) with our contractors, ESSA and Headwaters. Executive Committee (EC) representatives are participating for half the day (8:30 am – 12:00 pm) on May 19. The purpose of this EC workshop is to present and solicit feedback on the draft strategic design ideas for Version 1 of the AM Plan, explore potential roles and responsibilities if such a design were to be implemented, including what 'closing the loop' (adjustment) might entail, and discuss some high-level AM implementation issues.

Information on adaptive management planning has been posted on the Program website (www.middleriogrande.com) under "Library >> Adaptive Management." No logins or passwords are required to access this information.

Coordination Committee

Peer Review

The EC requested that the CC develop a process to document the justifications for which peer review recommendations they suggest pursuing and explain why other peer review recommendations were not preferred. This topic was discussed at the CC meeting on May 4, 2011 and highlights of that discussion follow:

- Language from an Office of Management and Budget (OMB) letter on the Department of the Interior (DOI) peer review website on how to implement recommendations and findings from peer reviews was discussed. What is basically drawn from DOI text is that though a peer review is an additional source of information, it is the agencies' discretion on how the recommendations fit with their viewpoint. Reviewers' recommendations are an important factor but are rarely the sole consideration; the recommendations are important but cannot discount what the technical people know and the reality of the situation.
- There was general agreement that this is what the CC/Program has been doing and that to try to apply a uniform process to the results of peer review is not going to work. A "cookie cutter" process may not be practical for incorporating recommendations.
- Currently the CC has decided to take the San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) fish passage peer review recommendation to the workgroups and see if they could fit any of them in as a beneficial activity in the Long Term Plan (LTP). It was commented that this is a good way to utilize the information and make it specific to the Program. The workgroups may have thought of some of these recommendations already.
- Feedback from CC members was that they liked the paragraphs but that they should be cleaned up to be more relevant to the Program. There should also be a few more sentences on the technical recommendations being disseminated to the appropriate workgroup for them to look at and see if it has been considered and if they meet needs in the LTP.
- The CC notes that captured the guidance from the last CC can be used to show how the process is formulating itself.

The CC can make a decision on this process at the June 1st CC meeting and the process can get reviewed at the EC in June.

Revised Long Term Plan Development

- *LTP Past Activities:* The past activities have been used in the draft 2008 and 2009 Annual Report. This is the most complete compilation of past activities that the Program has. The past activities are grouped by LTP section and have been provided as a basis for moving forward with the future activities that will be in the LTP. The past activities go back to 2001, which was when Collaborative Program funding was first received. The past activities will be an appendix in its own separate volume to the LTP and have already been provided for inclusion in the Database Management System (DBMS). The original timeframe for the revised LTP was 2011 to 2022 but it will now be FY2012 to FY 2023.
- *LTP Future Activities as of December 2010:* For the first time, the CC reviewed the work group Priority 2 and 3 LTP future activities. Attendees were reminded that the start dates may no longer be applicable as the timeframe for developing the LTP has changed. The activities are currently organized by workgroup but also listing the future activities by LTP category will help to capture the progression and logical order of future activities.

It was shared that the future activities will also be reviewed at the workgroup level as workgroups address the SADD peer review recommendations.

The next CC meeting will be on June 1, 2011 from 12:30 to 4:00 pm at Reclamation where the CC will continue discussing the peer review process and habitat restoration projects, and may be presented with the RGSM Fish Health Study results recently shared with the Science workgroup (ScW).

Program Management Team

Annual Report

The PMT and the Coordination Committee (CC) reviewed the Collaborative Program Annual Report for 2008 and 2009 and provided comments to GenQuest. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) utilized a technical editor and appropriate technical staff to submit comments. Comments are being reviewed and incorporated and the final report is expected by the end of May 2011. Work on the 2010 Annual Report will begin soon after the 2008 and 2009 report is finalized.

PMT liaison support for workgroups is as follows: Monika Mann for the DBMS ad hoc workgroup and the Habitat Restoration workgroup (HRW); Stacey Kopitsch for the ScW, Population Viability Assessment (PVA)/Biology and Monitoring Plan Team (MPT) ad hoc workgroups; Terina Perez for the Species Water Management (SWM) workgroup, the Population Habitat Viability Assessment (PHVA)/Hydrology and the San Acacia Reach (SAR) ad hoc workgroups; and Ali Saenz for the Public Information and Outreach (PIO) workgroup. The PMT liaisons reviewed the 2008 and 2009 annual report and continue to facilitate meeting coordination and fulfill action items.

Jericho Lewis continues to assist with Albuquerque Area Office (AAO) obligations and is training new staff members. Jericho is preparing a funding opportunity announcement (FOA) for Habitat Restoration proposals, and will work on awarding the high intensity effectiveness monitoring requirement once the scope is finalized. Diana Herrera continues to work on: Program cost share updates, expenditure reports, water leasing obligations, and FY2012 and FY2013 Program budgets. Chip Martin, Edward McCorkindale, Lisa Freitas, Carl Boaz, and Charmaine Clair, GenQuest, and Christine Sanchez and Marta Wood, Tetra Tech, continue to assist the Program in the revised LTP development, annual report preparation, and meeting support and summaries.

Habitat Restoration Workgroup

The Habitat Restoration Workgroup (HRW) met on May 17th where topics such as the Entrapment Alleviation project and a low river flow was discussed in relation to habitat and monitoring. The CC's request to the workgroups was also discussed where a response to the CC will be pursued in the near future.
The HR Physical Model will continue to be developed with the feedback and help form the whole workgroup.

The next HR workgroup meeting will be held on June 21st at ISC where topics such as the new maintenance/ monitoring phase of HR work and a presentation on the Corps' Bernalillo to Belen Flood Risk Management project will be discussed.

Monitoring Plan Team ad hoc Workgroup

The MPT began this spring's low-intensity monitoring the last week in April, however, not much data has been gathered due to the low flows in the river. It is expected that this effort will pick up in the next couple of weeks during the peak run-off. A draft Statement of Work (SOW) has been developed for the high-intensity portion of the Effectiveness Monitoring, with a focus on habitat food availability. This SOW is currently undergoing revision and a final draft should be available this month, with the intention that a contract will be awarded this summer. The MPT also received numerous comments on the Draft 2010 Effectiveness Monitoring Report, and is working on finalizing this report.

Science Workgroup

The ScW held a regular working meeting on May 17. The workgroup discussed sexing of the RGSM samples used in the Age and Growth Study, and will be recommending that the CC approve additional funding for this work to be done. The workgroup also discussed the CC directives to ScW regarding the SADD fish passage peer review recommendations. A smaller subset of the ScW met on May 3 to begin drafting a SOW for the recommendation "Determine the impact that augmentation has had on silvery minnow genetic variability over time." A preliminary draft has been developed, however, it is unclear at this time whether the objectives of this SOW can be achieved given various unknowns about what genetics data is available. Roland Penttila from the City of Albuquerque, who is also a new member of the ScW, gave a joint presentation to the Science and HR workgroups on the City's stormwater program. The next regularly scheduled ScW meeting will be held on June 21 at the New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission (NMISC).

Species Water Management Workgroup

The SWM workgroup is still in need of a non-federal Co-Chair and after discussion at several SWM meetings it was determined that none of the non-federal participants are able to fill that role at this time. The workgroup is also in the process of reviewing the most recent USGS Groundwater (GW)/Surface Water (SW) Interaction report and has agreed to pursue a written "agreement" with Reclamation staff on the transect data collection project. This project should be implementable once the appropriate Program approvals have been granted. SWM is also working on updating the charter to reflect the workgroup's current role.

The next regularly scheduled SWM meeting will be held on June 1and will include a Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)/NMISC Atrisco Project Fieldtrip.

San Acacia Reach ad hoc Workgroup

The SAR workgroup hosted an educational field trip on April 29. Although the trip was originally intended to be a float trip, due to very low flows in the reach, the participants toured the area by van instead. The tour provided an educational opportunity and highlighted some issues in the SAR such as Floodplain Land Use,

Geomorphology/Sediment Transport, Water Availability/Water Delivery, Habitat Restoration, and River Infrastructure/Flood-risk Management. Read-ahead materials that were provided prior to the trip can be found on the Program website (www.middleriogrande.com) under: Committees & Work Groups>>SAR. The next regularly scheduled SAR meeting will be on May 26 at Reclamation.

Population Viability Analysis (PVA)/Biology ad hoc Workgroup

The next regularly scheduled PVA meeting will be held for a full day on May 24 at Reclamation. Agenda items include discussion of the March 29 EC meeting directives to the PVA workgroup, which include reaching a consensus data set, having discussions to compare and contrast the analysis conducted in each PVA model, and to reach a resolution regarding the incorporation of hydrology scenarios into the PVA models. Also to be discussed is the finalization of a letter from the PVA workgroup to the PHVA workgroup detailing hydrologic data needs. There currently is no contract in place for the RAMAS-based modeling effort. Reclamation is working on getting a Request for Proposals (RFP) out as soon as possible so that development of the RAMAS-based PVA can continue. The joint PVA/PHVA meeting will be rescheduled in the near future as directed by the EC.

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

The URGWOM tech team continues to work on model calibration in support of the biological assessment (BA) process. The PHVA workgroup will schedule their next meeting as needed via email.

Database Management System ad hoc Workgroup

The DBMS met on May 9 to discuss the last couple remaining data sets that the workgroup is incorporating into the DBMS including the possibility of augmentation, flycatcher and subsurface data. Coordination has started for the Pilot DBMS phase regarding logistics and allowing maximum participation.

Monthly DBMS meetings have been cancelled starting next month and will be scheduled on a needed basis. The contractor will remain in regular contact, giving monthly updates on the DBMS status to the co-chairs.

Public Information and Outreach Workgroup

Julie Maas, NMISC and Ronnie Schelby, USACE, of the PIO Workgroup attended a meeting May 17 with Rolf Schmidt-Petersen and Liz Zeiler, NMISC, and Dennis Garcia, USACE, to talk about logistics for an August Congressional trip suggested by Congressman Pearce's Socorro staff. Rolf will be polling the other Congressional staff members at the EC meeting on May 19 to gage their interest. The Collaborative Program may be able to combine efforts and hold a 10th Anniversary Open House with Science workshops. The PIO is also considering the possibility of coordinating a separate event on October 7 and 8, 2011 if the August trip falls through.