

Coordination Committee Meeting  
*June 1, 2011*

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program  
Coordination Committee Meeting  
June 1, 2011 – 12:30-4:00 pm  
Bureau of Reclamation  
555 Broadway Blvd. NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

Conference Call-in Line for June 1, 2011  
Toll Free Number: **1-800-619-9983**  
Participant Passcode: **30450#**  
(1<sup>st</sup> Committee member or contractor to arrive, please dial in)

**Draft Meeting Agenda**

- Introductions and Agenda\* Approval
- **Decision** – Approval of 05/04/11 CC meeting summary\*
- Action Item and EC Directive Review (see below)
- **Decision** - Discuss draft CC process to document the justifications for which peer review recommendations they suggest pursuing and explain why other peer review recommendations were not preferred; review draft document; and, provide recommendation to EC (*revised document to be posted/handed out*)
- Habitat Restoration by reach discussion – guidance to workgroup
- HRW and PVA – potential interaction\* (*R. Billings*)
- Contract update
- Significant Non-Decision Items to Brief EC

**Next meeting** – CC meeting – July 6, 2011 @ Reclamation from 12:30 – 4:00 pm

**Upcoming meetings**

EC meeting – June 16, 2011 @ Reclamation from 9:00 am – 1:00 pm

**\*denotes read ahead**

---

**May 4, 2011 Actions**

- Yvette McKenna will find out when the Program began contributing funding to Dexter and include the information in the 2008 and 2009 Annual Reports. ✓

- Yvette McKenna will follow up with Grace Haggerty on a document that ISC generated to describe what can be used as cost share. ✓ *email sent 05/16/11*
- Susan Bittick will discuss the suggestion of a Program-wide technical presentation of the LIDAR data and digital photography with John Peterson.
- Susan Bittick will communicate with Robert Padilla regarding the *Geomorphic/hydrodynamic data collection* USACE future activity to see if he would like to look over the SOW and meet with Stephen Kisson.
- Susan Bittick and Terina Perez will initiate communications between Grant Kolb and Ed Kandl to see how the USACE's *Groundwater-Surface water interactions in the riparian zone* project can correspond with the SWM *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction* project. ✓
- Susan Bittick will give the cost for the *Hydraulics of Los Lunas Habitat Restoration Site* activity so it can be included in the project's activity sheet. ✓ *email received 05/17/11 indicates \$42,000.*
- Ali Saenz will verify with the PIO work group that the two PIO LTP future activities are still relevant. She will also find out if they will be making any changes to the activities. ✓
- Yvette McKenna will confirm with Carol if the Adaptive Management workshop meeting is open. ✓

**Directive from April 21 EC meeting:**

- 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.

**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. *On-going*

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program  
Coordination Committee Meeting  
June 1, 2011 – 12:30-4:00 pm  
Bureau of Reclamation  
555 Broadway Blvd. NE  
Albuquerque, NM 87102**

**Actions**

- Grace Haggerty will follow up on a document that ISC generated to describe what can be used as cost share.
- Susan Bittick will discuss the suggestion of a Program-wide technical presentation of the LIDAR data and digital photography with John Peterson. (*Ongoing from 5/4/11*)
- Susan Bittick will communicate with Robert Padilla regarding the *Geomorphic/hydrodynamic data collection* USACE future activity to see if he would like to look over the SOW and meet with Stephen Scissons. (*Ongoing from 5/4/11*)
- Terina Perez will see if the SWM workgroup can provide an updated activity summary and cost estimate for the *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction Project* to the CC at their June 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Grace Haggerty will ask Rich Valdez how other programs address peer reviews.
- Rick Billings will look into the guidelines that academic institutions use to address peer reviews.
- Jericho Lewis will draft text describing the peer review process for the CC to review for inclusion in the *Peer Review Process* document.
- Comments (by agency) on the *Peer Review Process* document are due to Yvette McKenna by COB June 17<sup>th</sup>.
- Stacey Kopitsch will coordinate with Jericho, ScW, HRW, and MPT to have the Food Availability Study reviewed again after the current comments/edits have been incorporated.

**Decisions**

The May 5, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with several edits.

**Next Meeting: June 29th 12:30 to 4:00 PM**

- Tentative agenda items include: Review/discussion on the *Peer Review Process* document.

**Meeting Summary**

**Introductions and Agenda Approval:** Susan Bittick brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was approved with no changes.

**Approval of the 05/04/11 CC Meeting Summary:** The May 4, 2011 CC meeting summary was approved with several edits. Major edits include:

- Susan Bittick's action item will be corrected to read "Susan Bittick will communicate with Robert Padilla regarding the *Geomorphic/hydrodynamic data collection* USACE future activity to see if he would like to look over the SOW and meet with Stephen Scissons."
- The last two sentences on page 3 will be changed to read "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 view point. Reviewers' recommendations are an important factor but are rarely the sole consideration."

- The first sentence in the Recap of the Recent River Drying Event will be corrected to read "Stacey Kopitsch reported: The Rio Grande dried on April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2011 with there being 9 miles of drying in the Bosque Del Apache Wildlife Refuge. The drying occurred prior to June 15<sup>th</sup> - which is in violation of the flow requirements in the 2003 BiOp."

**Action Item Review:** Meeting attendees performed an action item review.

- Yvette McKenna will find out when the Program began contributing funding to Dexter and include the information in the 2008 and 2009 Annual Report.
  - Complete.
  - Yvette was provided with a detailed breakdown of the Operation and Maintenance for Dexter; it was also found that the Program contributed funding for some facility expansion as well. The funding information was provided to GenQuest to include in the report.
- Yvette McKenna will follow up with Grace Haggerty on a document that ISC generated to describe what can be used as cost share.
  - Complete.
  - Yvette sent an email to Grace on May 16<sup>th</sup>. Grace is in the process of locating the document. Grace Haggerty will follow up on a document that ISC generated to describe what can be used as cost share.
- Susan Bittick will discuss the suggestion of a Program-wide technical presentation of the LIDAR data and digital photography with John Peterson.
  - Ongoing. Susan has been in contact with John; they are working on finding a date for a Program-wide presentation.
- Susan Bittick will communicate with Robert Padilla regarding the *Geomorphic/hydrodynamic data collection* USACE future activity to see if he would like to look over the SOW and meet with Stephen Scissons.
  - Ongoing. Susan is communicating with Robert via email.
- Susan Bittick and Terina Perez will initiate communications between Grant Kolb and Ed Kandl to see how the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) *Groundwater-Surface water interaction in the riparian zone* project can correspond with the SWM *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction* project.
  - Complete.
  - It was found that the USACE project would not have redundancies with the SWM project; Ed Kandl will only be collecting data for the SWM project and Grant is still fine tuning the scope of work for his project so it's not yet known exactly what he will be doing.
  - Terina updated meeting attendees that the SWM work group has found that the scope of work for the *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction* project will be more intense than they had anticipated. In a meeting with USGS Ed Kandl learned that data collection occurs twice a year and that the AA batteries the data loggers use are replaced at that time. The last time the batteries were replaced was in August 2010 so it is likely that the batteries have died and that data will be lost. The SWM work group will need to come

back to the CC with an updated project summary and cost estimate as it was learned that there will be a lot clean up associated with the data collection and it's not known if Reclamation has the capability to clean up the data in-house. This will need to be coordinated internally in Reclamation before SWM can work on the SOW. The SWM work group might be able to provide the CC with an updated summary and cost estimate by the next CC meeting. Terina Perez will see if the SWM workgroup can provide an updated activity summary and cost estimate for the *Ground Water/Surface Water Interaction Project* to the CC at their June 29<sup>th</sup> meeting.

- Susan Bittick will give the cost for the *Hydraulics of Los Lunas Habitat Restoration Site* activity so it can be included in the project's activity sheet.
  - Complete.
- Ali Saenz will verify with the PIO work group that the two PIO LTP future activities are still relevant. She will also find out if they will be making any changes to the activities.
  - Complete.
- Yvette McKenna will confirm with Carol if the Adaptive Management Workshop meeting is open.
  - Complete.

**Draft CC process to document justifications for peer review recommendations:** This portion of the meeting was a working session as attendees reviewed the draft *Peer Review Process* document. Attendees were reminded that at the last CC meeting it was discussed that text from an OMB document on how to implement recommendations and findings from peer reviews would be used as the basis for the CC's *Peer Review Process* document. The draft *Peer Review Process* document has since been edited to be more specific to the Program's process and has been revised with comments from the last CC meeting.

- The first paragraph discusses the history of how the document came about.
  - There were no comments on the first paragraph of the document.
- The second paragraph discusses the amount of funding spent in FY10 on peer review.
  - Information on the amount of funding that has been spent on or obligated for peer review in FY11 can be added for completeness.
  - It was suggested that the sentence "Approximately \$216k was available for independent scientific peer review of Program projects in FY10." be moved to the beginning of the paragraph for better flow.
- Process Steps
  - It was suggested that it be clarified that the criteria referred to in Step 2 are listed on page 2 of the document. Above the questions on page 2 it should say "The criteria used to evaluate whether projects merit peer review."
  - There may need to be another list for how the CC prioritized.
  - There was discussion on whether the questions are criteria or priorities because the question "Are the results of the study controversial?" seems like a priority.
    - One possibility is to not refer to them as criteria or as priorities but to say that they are questions that were used to evaluate the projects proposed for peer review.
    - Another opinion was that they should continue to be referred to as criteria as they are all criteria for the most part. If everybody agrees on the report or project then there is no need for a peer review. But if there is a lot of dissention on the data or the recommendations from the report; if the study is outside of the technical people's expertise; or if the Program determines more input is needed before additional actions are taken then a peer review may be warranted.

- Some members expressed the opinion that the document could be made more basic by stating that unless a project is controversial or the Program does not have the expertise then projects will not be peer reviewed.
      - Some members expressed the opinion that the process is good and listing out the questions and criteria is good but the CC should work on the document development more before it is presented to the EC.
        - For clarity, a project should not be referred to as a “peer review project” unless it has been determined that the project should be reviewed.
    - The CC reviewed the paragraph at the top of page 2. The paragraph is a recap of the April 14, 2010 CC meeting.
      - It was discussed that though the CC did not go through this list of criteria specifically to recommend projects for peer review in 2010, the discussions did build towards answering these questions.
    - The document describes what was done to recommend projects for peer review. On page 3 there is a short paragraph that explains that a similar process may be used in the future to identify projects for peer review. This paragraph is where the document transitions into a guidance document.
      - It was commented that the CC needs to discuss whether this process will stay the same in the future. It was recommended the document be reviewed periodically to keep it current and applicable.
    - Priorities and Status of Peer Review Projects
      - The listed status of the Peer Review Projects is current.
    - How the Program will use Results of Peer Review.
      - This section of the document will convey what will be done with the results of future peer reviews and explains what was done with the results of the San Acacia Diversion Dam (SADD) Fish Passage peer review results.
      - In the last paragraph on page 3, it was suggested that language be added explaining that a peer review could also identify critical areas within a project that might need to be added, modified, or removed.
      - In response to a clarification question on “information dissemination” and how it applies to the Program, it was explained that this document pulls from the OMB peer review guidance so it can be edited if not relevant to the Program.
        - In order to make it more general, attendees agreed that “information dissemination” could be removed from the paragraph.
        - The first sentence of the paragraph was edited to say “The results of peer review are often only one of the methods used to inform decision makers.”
      - Attendees discussed the second sentence regarding funding decisions. It was asked if this paragraph is referring to additional projects that are recommended by a peer review and if so should that be clarified.
        - It could be useful to see how other organizations utilize peer reviews.
        - One interpretation expressed was that the intent of the paragraph was to clearly state that (after the peer review is completed) the Program decides how to implement and use the information. It was suggested that it would be simpler for the paragraph to state that a completed peer review will reside with the Program to inform decisions makers.
- There is also discretion at the agency level for which peer review moves forward (ex. a fish passage was required). In order to be reflective of the process that will occur within the Program, it was suggested that the document contain details on which action agencies will need to weigh in on decisions. It was added that the EC representatives are still the decision makers for the Program and they will decide

how funding is spent. While there are agencies that have to follow the BO, this document and process is to outline what the Program will do.

- However, the EC is always respectful and sensitive to agency positions and issues. There is always further discussion and compromise especially with discussions on funding. Because of this fact, some members expressed the opinion that specific agency obligations, authorities, etc. do not need to be included in this document.
- Attendees discussed the EC directive. It was thought that the EC was looking for an explanation of how to address (deal with) any controversy and what the Program process will be. For example, if it is a science question, how does the ScW deal with it? Do they have to have consensus? How do they move it back up to the CC? Will it be a report that says they recommend that the CC follow these 3 recommendations but not these ones and an explanation for why?
- Attendees discussed the generalized steps and the current example for how the Program is utilizing the SADD Fish Passage Peer Review recommendations.
  - In response to a question on specifically identifying who receives the final peer review (in Step 1), it was stated that the funding agency would receive the final report and recommendations.
    - It was suggested that Step 1 read “Cognizant contracting agency receives final peer review recommendations and provides the peer review report to the Program Manager for dissemination to the Program.”
    - Typically the COTR receives the recommendations which are then provided to Yvette or the PMT for dissemination to the Program. Once the peer review report is received it becomes the property of the Program and is not owned by the project’s corresponding work group.
    - Feedback from work group representatives indicated that the project’s corresponding work group should be involved with the process for determining peer review as well as involved with the peer review process itself. The example was given that in academia the authors and the people who did the work communicate with the peer reviewers.
      - In the first peer review the Program had, there was no interaction with the peer reviewers but in the second peer review there was interaction between the authors, the work group, and the peer reviewers. For example, in the peer review of the San Acacia A&R members of the work group could view and watch what the reviewers were compiling via a website.
      - There was agreement from other attendees that supported this type of interactive relationship with the peer reviewers. It was discussed that the level of interaction would depend on what was being peer reviewed. For example, the Population Estimation Report review will be different because it’s the actual report that is being reviewed. The Fish Passage review was more unique in the sense that it was more of a high level view of a lot of things.
      - It was suggested that the steps for a peer review should be laid out clearly and as explicitly as possible - even if that means using “if/then” statements. Otherwise, there may be questions in the future when the process isn’t clear or is missing components.
      - It was suggested that an invitation could be distributed Program-wide for members to meet with the panelists and the work group. This would facilitate the work group interaction with the panelists while also



- opening up the process to other Program participants (who might not be represented in a technical work group).
- It was suggested that there be a separate section that describes the actual peer review process.
    - Jericho Lewis volunteered to draft text that describes what has happened in the peer reviews; he will include the concerns for work group involvement from today's discussions.
  - Page 5 of the document is specific to what the CC asked the work groups to do with the Fish Passage recommendations.
    - Attendees were updated that the ScW will be developing a statement of objectives instead of a statement of work; however the statement of objectives will still include a scope of work.
    - It was discussed that part of the EC directive was for the CC to provide justification for pursuing some recommendations and not others. This document does not currently address that issue.
      - Attendees discussed adding a fifth step to the process clarifying that the CC will document the final recommendation(s) and why it was chosen and present it to the EC. Attendees decided that step 5 will be "The CC will review the work group recommended activities; prepare a final recommendation to be presented to the EC for decision."
      - It was discussed that the rationale behind doing one recommendation over another would need to come from the work groups. Number 4 should be changed to read "Work group recommended activities *and justification* will be reviewed by the CC..."
    - In step 3, the work groups are evaluating the recommendations and coming up with practical ways to address them. For the SADD Fish Passage peer review, the work groups were given direction from the CC on how to evaluate the recommendations and their feedback is expected in a couple of months.
  - Attendees discussed providing a progress update to the EC. Some members expressed the desire to have an approved process in place before the Population Estimation peer review report is available.
    - It was suggested that the document be further reviewed in preparation for the next CC meeting. The CC should also develop a schedule for the anticipated Fish Passage peer review workgroup reports indicating what has been done and what still needs to be completed.
    - It was suggested that specific information on the SADD peer review be separated from the document as it's own section.
  - In brief work group updates on the topic, it was shared that ScW is writing a scope of work for the augmentation study to address the EC directive to evaluate the recommendations and develop a targeted study. There is funding available and there isn't a need for further data collections since we already have the pre- and post-augmentation data.
    - The HRW has been looking at the recommendation that is applicable to habitat and intends to provide the CC with a white paper document.
    - It was suggested that the PMT coordinate with work groups on how they should "interact" with the list and how to provide their reviews of the recommendations to the CC.
    - It was pointed out that results of a pre- and post-augmentation study would only be useful if the cessation of augmentation is also being considered.

- In response to a question regarding the value of pre- and post-augmentation data, it was explained that it would be beneficial to understand the affects of augmentation on the minnow population in the different reaches. Also, this project can be completed in a short amount of time as the data is already available.
- It was noted that the SOO for the pre- and post-augmentation study will be provided to the CC for final recommendation. After further consideration it may be determined that the project is not needed.
  - The CC will continue to review the draft document and provide comments to Yvette to be consolidated; the revised document will then be provided as a read ahead for the next CC meeting.
- Comments (by agency) on the *Peer Review Process* document are due to Yvette McKenna by COB June 17<sup>th</sup>.
  - Meeting attendees agreed to reschedule the July 6<sup>th</sup> CC meeting to June 29<sup>th</sup> as several CC members will be unable to attend the July 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Habitat Restoration Discussion:** It was briefly discussed that the Program should look at planning the LTP and future activities according to the needs, constraints, and opportunities within each reach. It needs to be recognized that there are distinctions between the reaches regarding hydrology, the minnow, and habitat. It was suggested that the CC and technical work groups discuss what should be done particularly when there are low levels of supplemental water and drought. One fit won't work for all reaches even with flows – a spring runoff is different for Albuquerque and San Acacia reaches. It was suggested that the CC begin discussion on what can be done in the areas that need work and how the work should be done.

- It was commented that some of these concepts are being discussed within the HRW.

**HRW and PVA – potential interaction:** Rick Billings showed meeting attendees a presentation that he made to the Population Viability Analysis (PVA) ad hoc work group on potential interaction between the PVA and HRW. Rick said that though this presentation has not been reviewed by the HRW work group everything covered in the presentation is being discussed within the HRW. *For specific details please see actual presentation.*

- The presentation covers what the HRW is currently working on and addresses how the two work groups may be able to assist one another.
  - What is HRW up to?
    - HRW has been developing a “new” conceptual model, working with the Monitoring Plan Team (MPT) to determine monitoring “effectiveness”, and synthesizing results from restoration.
    - The monitoring has slowed down a little this year but it needs to move forward as the monitoring will be beneficial for adaptive management.
  - How can HRW help the PVA?
    - HRW is considering restoration needs and results on a reach wide scale. The HRW has learned a lot with small projects but in terms of adaptive management and the PVA the HRW may need to look at larger projects. The larger projects would not have to be constructed in one season and shouldn't be in order to make use of adaptive management.
      - It was commented that Dave Marmorek (adaptive management contractor) had said that with habitat restoration you need to “go big or go home”.
    - The HRW has discussed that land ownership is an issue that needs to be worked out when it comes to larger restoration projects.

- Rick shared that the PVA work group had indicated that they would find it useful for HRW to apply techniques necessary for more inundation to support recruitment and more in-channel habitat complexity for below average flow conditions.
      - The HRW hasn't really done any in-channel work in the past. The PVA can help determine if in-channel projects will work. In drought years in-channel is the only area available.
    - The HRW is also working on cross attendance between work groups.
  - What can PVA do for HRW?
    - Dr. Goodman indicated the he was comfortable using the PVA model to look at the HRW's requests; Dr. Miller was not at the PVA meeting.
    - It was expressed that if the results of studies to estimate the effects on the population in a reach will be meaningful to both PVA and HRW and if it can technically be done then management needs to find a way to do the studies.
    - It was discussed that one of the issues is finding the starting population number. How do you know if the restoration was an improvement if the starting population is not known?
  - Rick explained that the intent of the HRW is to utilize the PVA as a tool and Dr. Goodman had said that the PVA can be helpful in answering the HRW's questions. Rick also shared that Dave Campbell (Service) suggested that Rick attend a San Juan meeting where they will be bringing in peer reviewers to evaluate how the San Juan Recovery Implementation Program is doing. Dave Campbell had said that he thinks that peer review works well for the San Juan Program but there are differences with this program.
- An HRW member expressed that they too share Rick's concern on the importance for the PVA and other work groups to work together. Though work groups have had joint meetings in the past there was not much of a product or strategy and there is not much continued interface between the work groups.
  - It was suggested that there be joint working meetings or focused workshops with product driven interaction, so that the work groups can be on a shared "track." These meetings would also keep the technical people aware of things that are going on outside of their workgroups. It was commented that previous working meetings in HRW to prioritize activities were thought to have been very constructive and more in depth just in terms of focusing on the reaches and what opportunities there were. This type of interaction would recharge the technical work groups.
- The CC was cautioned that models always have assumptions and inaccuracies. The Program should be clear about any assumptions when using models for habitat restoration. There is also the issue that there is limited information about the Rio Grande system. There is comfort with using the models as tools but there should be caution in letting the models determine what work should be done.
  - There was agreement from some CC members that the models are useful but shouldn't be the sole consideration for decisions, and that modeling and habitat restoration without adaptive management is useless. There needs to be more time spent getting input from all HR members, and we need to look for opportunities in all reaches and not limit ourselves, if we are going to succeed in recovery.
- It was said that the HRW has been calling for a system wide analysis that would describe the different reaches and the physical processes going on in these reaches, including modeling, monitoring, in channel habitat, and terrestrial habitat. We need to look at Program as a whole and at HR as a whole. A lot of this data is available but has not been analyzed. Maybe the HRW can find out what other tools besides the PVA models are available to look at habitat

restoration as a whole. PVA and the adaptive management process will facilitate bringing work groups together.

- It was asked if the PVA will include flycatchers.
  - Dr. Goodman has requested flycatcher information and has asked that flycatcher experts attend a meeting.

#### **Contracting Update:**

- Jericho is currently working on the Request for Proposals (RFP) for Habitat Restoration Construction. He has received the evaluation criteria and the funding opportunity announcement should be out before the end of next week.
- Reclamation is working with technical staff from Denver on the Los Lunas Habitat Monitoring. Attendees were reminded that the funding for this project is provided through an IA with USACE.
- It was shared that Reclamation has recently had a meeting on water acquisition. It's expected that most of this year's water funds will be used to purchase water.
- Stacey Kopitsch updated attendees that all of the comments on the Food Availability Study SOO have been addressed. The SOO was reviewed by the MPT, HRW, and ScW but because of the substantial comments received the work groups may need to review the SOO again. Meeting attendees were in agreement that because of the significant comments made that the SOO should be redistributed to the ScW, MPT, and HRW before it is submitted to Jericho. Stacey Kopitsch will coordinate with Jericho, ScW, HRW, and MPT to have the Food Availability Study reviewed again after the current comments/edits have been incorporated.
- The PVA work group is reviewing the SOO for a RAMAS model developer; their comments are due June 3<sup>rd</sup>. It was explained that one of the goals of the contract is to have the RAMAS model available as a Program model and to have training to use and apply the model built into the contract.
  - MRGCD has put in the costs of the FORTRAN model as cost share so it will be available for the PVA but it will be up to MRGCD to determine if the model will be available to the Program outside of the PVA.
- In response to a question regarding note taking Jericho verified that meeting minutes should not be voice recorded. Jericho is working with GenQuest to resolve the recent note taking issues.

#### **Next Meeting: June 29th 12:30 to 4:00 PM**

- Tentative agenda items include: Review/discussion on the *Peer Review Process* document.

**Coordination Committee Working Meeting  
01 June 2011 Meeting Attendees**

NAME	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	PRIMARY (P) ALTERNATE (A) OTHERS (O)	EMAIL ADDRESS
Yvette McKenna	Reclamation	462-3555	O	yrmkenna@usbr.gov
Ann Moore	NMAGO	222-9024	P	amoore@nmag.gov
Nathan Schroeder	Pueblo of Santa Ana	771-6719	P	nathan.schroeder@santaana-nsn.gov
Terina Perez	Reclamation/PMT	462-3614	O	tlperez@usbr.gov
Susan Bittick	USACE	342-3397	P – Chair	Susan.m.bittick@usace.army.mil
Hector Garcia	Reclamation	462-3550	A	<a href="mailto:hgarcia@usbr.gov">hgarcia@usbr.gov</a>
Stacey Kopitsch (for Lori Roberston)	FWS	761-4737	P	stacey_kopitsch@fws.gov
Rick Billings	ABCWUA	796-2527	P	rbillings@abcwua.org
Brian Gleadle	NMDGF	222-4700	P	brian.gleadle@state.nm.us
Jericho Lewis	Reclamation	462-3622	O	jlewis@usbr.gov
Grace Haggerty	NMISC	383-4042	P	Grace.haggerty@state.nm.us
Julie Alcon	USACE	342-3281	A	Julie.a.alcon@usace.army.mil
Gina Dello Russo (by phone)	FWS	575-835-1828	O	gina_dellorusso@fws.gov
Ali Saenz	Reclamation/Admin Assist	462-3600	O	asaenz@ucbr.gov
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech	881-3188 ext. 139	O	christine.sanchez@ttemi.com