

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Habitat Restoration Workgroup Meeting
20 March 2012, Tuesday
12:30-3:30 pm at Interstate Stream Commission**

Actions

- Jason Casuga will find out if the shapefiles from Reclamation's flycatcher suitability monitoring can be provided to the Habitat Restoration Workgroup (HRW) (*Ongoing 12/13/11*).
- Jill Wick will forward the USGS beetle monitoring proposal to the HRW.
- Jill Wick will check with Hira Walker about scheduling beetle identification training for the workgroup during May 2012.
- Ondrea Hummel will contact the Tamarisk Coalition to get information on scheduling beetle monitoring training.
- Jason Casuga will follow up with the Reclamation CO and the project's COTR to get official notice sent to the contractor to proceed with the RM 83 Feasibility Study.
- Jill Wick will distribute the matrix of habitat criteria developed by the MPT to the HRW. Any edits or suggested additions can be sent to Jill.

Decision

- The February 21st, 2012 HRW meeting notes were approved with no changes

Meeting Summary

- Gina Dello Russo brought the meeting to order. A brief update on the River Mile (RM) 83 Feasibility Study was added to the agenda.
- The February 21st, 2012 HRW meeting notes were approved with no changes.
- Meeting attendees performed an action item review. All action items are complete with the exception of "Robert Padilla will find out if the shapefiles from Reclamation's flycatcher suitability monitoring can be provided to the HRW". Jason Casuga will follow up on the action item to find out if the shapefiles can be provided to the HRW.
- Meeting attendees discussed nominating a new HRW Co-Chair as Rick Billings is now the Coordination Committee (CC) Co-chair. Rick is willing to remain as HRW Co-Chair until his term ends in October 2012; at that time it is expected that there will be non-federal or federal interest in the HRW Co-Chair position.
- Ondrea Hummel gave an update on the 2012 South Western Willow Flycatcher (flycatcher) Monitoring and Diorhabda (beetle) monitoring and mapping.
 - The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) will be funding the 2012 Reclamation flycatcher monitoring. The monitoring will include all of the same sites that were previously monitored and will also include additional monitoring at Corps' project sites; monitoring at these sites will be funded separately through the Corps. The SOW for the monitoring has been modified to include weekly updates on beetle sightings.
 - Attendees were notified that USGS has a proposal to monitor for the beetle in the Rio Grande area and all of western New Mexico. The N. M. Department of Game and Fish may be able to provide a small amount of funding to USGS for

confirming sightings and mapping the spread of the beetle. Jill Wick will forward the USGS beetle monitoring proposal to the HRW.

- It was shared that Hira Walker and Deb Hill have arranged beetle identification training during the flycatcher survey training on May 15th, 2012. It may be possible for the HRW to have beetle identification training on May 14th or 16th. Jill Wick will check with Hira Walker about scheduling beetle identification training for the workgroup during May 2012. The HRW may reschedule their May meeting to coincide with the training. Attendees also discussed receiving beetle monitoring training from the Tamarisk Coalition. Ondrea Hummel will contact the Tamarisk Coalition to get information on scheduling the training (i.e. costs, when training could take place).
- Attendees were given an update on the possible Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) transition. The RIP Program Document and Action Plan will be presented to the Executive Committee (EC) at their meeting on March 28th, 2012. The EC will be making a decision on becoming a RIP at their April 2012 meeting. The structure of the RIP is still being considered and there are several proposed structures; the proposed structures are available under the EC section of the Program website.
- Meeting attendees discussed the products that the HRW can provide as transition to possible new structure moves forward. Meeting attendees agreed to focus on the process of evaluating reaches and looking at priorities for habitat restoration based on the best scientific information they have. The group would also like to focus on developing a first draft attempt at how they would evaluate completed habitat restoration projects in terms of quality. The workgroup would also like to report on projects that have been completed in the last 10 years (whether techniques were functional, lessons learned). It was suggested that the workgroup develop a timeline for completing these tasks at their next meeting.
- In an update on the RM 83 Feasibility Study attendees were notified that the contractor is waiting for official notice from the Reclamation Contracting Officer (CO) before moving forward with the project. Concern was expressed that the workgroup had given the contractor the “go ahead” to move forward with the project in fall of 2011 but the contractor has not yet received official notification from Reclamation. HRW Co-Chairs are developing an official notice from the work group for the contractor to move forward. The HRW was advised to have the notification sent through the CO or the project’s Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR). Meeting attendees expressed concern as inquiries regarding official notification have gone unanswered. Jason Casuga will follow up with the Reclamation CO and the project’s COTR to get official notice sent to the contractor to proceed with the RM 83 Feasibility Study.
- Meeting attendees discussed the next steps for reach mapping. Meeting attendees agreed to hold the April HRW meeting at the Corps in order to view the GIS products from the San Acacia Reach mapping. The next step for the SAR mapping is for workgroup members to develop questions for the contractor to create queries from to help the workgroup pinpoint areas of interest in that reach. Meeting attendees discussed which reach to map next and agreed to focus on the Isleta reach because there has not been much restoration in that reach as compared to other reaches and having the reach

mapping information would be helpful in answering infrastructure and continuity questions in that reach.

- In a Program update attendees were notified that the Database Management System (DBMS) will be fully functional in June 2012. Attendees were given a URL to access a set of standardized definitions for data sets that is used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (www.fws.gov/stand/); the standardized definitions may be useful in developing SOWs and templates for data collection.
- Attendees discussed developing criteria to evaluate completed habitat restoration projects. It was shared that there is a matrix of criteria that was developed for the monitoring plan that includes some criteria for evaluating habitat. The matrix was developed from a joint meeting between the Science workgroup (ScW), the Monitoring Plan Team (MPT), and the HRW. Attendees agreed that the matrix would be a good starting point in developing criteria to evaluate restored habitat. Jill Wick will distribute the matrix of habitat criteria developed by the MPT to the HRW. Any edits or suggested additions can be sent to Jill. HRW members were also asked to also flag the criteria and characteristics that they do not believe are strongly supported by the science as a strong measurement of quality.

Next Meeting: April 17th, 2012 from 12:30 PM to 3:30 PM at the Corps

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Manipulating the San Acacia Reach GIS products to start reach review and evaluation; (2) Discuss criteria to evaluate restored habitat; (3) Develop timeline for workgroup tasks (reach mapping, restored habitat evaluation);

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Habitat Restoration Workgroup (HRW) Meeting
20 March 2012, Tuesday
12:30-3:30 pm at Interstate Stream Commission**

Meeting Notes

Introductions/Agenda Approval

- Gina Dello Russo brought the meeting to order.
- A brief update on the River Mile (RM) 83 Feasibility Study was added to the agenda.

Announcements

- There were no announcements.

Approve February 21st, 2012 HR meeting minutes

- The February 21st, 2012 HRW meeting notes were approved with no changes

February Action Item Review

- **HRW member comments on the San Acacia Reach (SAR) maps are due to Ondrea Hummel by Friday, March 2nd, 2012.**
 - Complete. The comments that were received were forwarded to the contractor and have been incorporated into the final SAR maps.
- **Robert Padilla will find out if the shapefiles from Reclamation's flycatcher suitability monitoring can be provided to the HRW (Ongoing 12/13/11).**
 - Incomplete; as Robert had been temporarily reassigned he was unable to complete the action item. Jason Casuga volunteered to follow up on the action item to find out if the shapefiles can be provided to the HRW.

Action: Jason Casuga will find out if the shapefiles from Reclamation's flycatcher suitability monitoring can be provided to the Habitat Restoration Workgroup (HRW) (Ongoing 12/13/11).

- **Gina Dello Russo, Rick Billings, and/or Danielle Galloway will follow up with Yvette McKenna regarding the HR Construction SOW and letter to Federal Government land managers.**
 - Complete. Gina Dello Russo shared an email from Yvette that explains that federal funding is provided via an Interagency Agreement (IA) and is not a competitive process. It was explained that the workgroup's intention was to develop a letter that would invite federal land managers to propose projects at the same time that similar proposals were being evaluated from a Request for Proposal (RFP); the idea is to have all projects evaluated at the same time.
 - Attendees discussed that it may be beneficial to identify land owners as the workgroup uses the reach maps to identify potential project areas. The workgroup can then determine the best way, either through an IA or RFP, to complete restoration in those areas.

- Because different contracting vehicles are used depending on whether a land owner is a federal agency or a private land owner it may not be possible to evaluate proposals on non-federal lands at the same time as proposals on federal lands. Given the state of the budget it's not likely that there will be funding available for habitat restoration in the next couple of years.
 - It was pointed out that though there is not currently any funding budgeted for habitat restoration this year it is a good idea to have projects ready.
- One opinion was that it would be appropriate for the HRW to at least solicit interest from federal agencies when an RFP is released. There was agreement that there needs to be some sort of priority system when implementing projects. It was suggested that the workgroup should consider sending out an informal Request for Interest (RFI) to federal land managers when RFPs are released. Attendees discussed whether the RFI should come from the HRW, Coordination Committee (CC), or Executive Committee (EC).
 - It was suggested that the HRW make a request to the CC that when an RFP is issued for non-federal lands that information also be provided to federal land managers so that the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) Contracting Officer (CO) can work with the HRW to attempt to consider all projects together. It may be possible for this request to be added to the next CC meeting agenda.

Co-Chair Nominations

- As Rick Billings is now the CC Co-Chair meeting attendees discussed alleviating some of Rick's workload by electing a new HRW Co-Chair. As no one present at the meeting is able to take over Co-Chair duties at this time Rick expressed that he is willing to remain as HRW Co-Chair until his term ends in October 2012. At that time it is expected that there will be interest in the Co-Chair position; though it is preferred that there be one non-federal and one federal co-chair it is not required.

2012 Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (flycatcher) Monitoring/Diorhabda (beetle) monitoring & mapping

- *2012 Flycatcher Monitoring* -
 - The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) will be funding the 2012 Reclamation flycatcher monitoring. The monitoring will include all of the same sites that were previously monitored and will also include additional monitoring at Corps' project sites; monitoring at these sites will be funded separately through the Corps. The Scope of Work (SOW) for the monitoring has been modified to include weekly updates on beetle sightings.
- *Beetle monitoring and mapping* -

- The Tamarisk Coalition will be monitoring the beetle in the four corners area and has been looking for partners to monitor in other areas.
 - Ondrea Hummel and Gina Dello Russo shared that they have discussed the Program being the receptacle for information on beetle sightings in the Middle Rio Grande (MRG). If there is a point location for a sighting nearby it may be possible to send staff to verify beetle presence or monitor. There is also the potential for some monitoring to be done through an existing IDIQ.
 - It was commented that monitoring will be important as this is the first full season that the beetle will be in the MRG.
 - Attendees were updated that Hira Walker, ornithologist at N.M. Department of Game and Fish (NMDGF) has been involved with beetle surveying in other areas but there is no planned formal monitoring for the beetle in the MRG for this year.
 - U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) in Arizona has submitted a proposal for monitoring beetles in the Rio Grande area and all of western New Mexico to Reclamation and NMDGF. Hira has indicated that NMDGF may be able to provide a small amount of funding for USGS to confirm sightings and map the spread of the beetle.

Action: Jill Wick will forward the USGS beetle monitoring proposal to the HRW.

- Jerry Michaels of Texas A&M Research will be monitoring the beetle near the Pecos and Canadian Rivers. He may also be available to verify beetle presence in other areas of New Mexico especially near flycatcher territories; however, funding for travel will need to be provided.
- Hira and Deb Hill have arranged with Matt Johnson (USGS) for beetle identification training during the flycatcher survey training on May 15th. Matt Johnson may be available on May 14th or 16th to provide the identification training to the HRW. As the May HRW regularly scheduled meeting will be on May 15th, the HRW may decide to reschedule their May meeting to accommodate the training.

Action: Jill Wick will check with Hira Walker about scheduling beetle identification training for the HRW on May 14th or 15th.

- The Tamarisk Coalition also offers training on their monitoring methods. It was not known if there are any fees associated with the Tamarisk Coalition training.

Action: Ondrea Hummel will contact the Tamarisk Coalition to get information on scheduling the training (i.e. costs, when training could take place).

Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) Transition

- *RIP Schedule and Document Schedule* - Attendees were given an update on the possible RIP transition.
 - The RIP Program Document and Action Plan will be presented to the EC at their next meeting on March 28th, 2012. The EC will be making a decision on becoming a RIP at their April 2012 meeting.

- The structure of the RIP is still being considered and there are several proposed structures; the proposed structures are available under the EC section of the Program website.
 - All of the proposed structures still include the workgroups in some form or another; however it's anticipated that the workgroups will be more task driven than in the current structure.
 - Some of the proposed structures include a "Senior Scientist" position; the details of the position and where it will fit into the structure are still being considered.
 - The new structure is expected to implement adaptive management though there may not be a separate workgroup or committee to address adaptive management.
 - It was commented that adaptive management will be needed in order to recover the species. The Program will need to "learn as we go" to see how water management, habitat, and other factors affect the species.
 - The document focus groups have also discussed having an advisory team, or "A Team", that would look at each year's hydrologic conditions and determine the type of restoration, research, and monitoring that would best utilize the resources available each year. A big element of the RIP will be interaction between the "A Team", scientists, managers, and the "Senior Scientist" and staff.
 - The "A Team" would look at the year-to-year progress with the EC and the "Senior Scientist" tracking overall progress towards recovery.
 - The Program is also considering having an external science panel to provide an independent review of projects and to provide advice to the EC and scientists.
 - It was commented that the MRG is a dynamic system with many different entities managing components of the river and it will be a challenge to pull all of these aspects together to meet long term goals. The principle theme of the RIP is to look at operations and utilization of resources from a holistic perspective.
 - The EC and RIP document focus groups are still considered how the RIP will be managed and how RIP funding will be managed.
- The RIP Action Plan is currently based on Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (minnow) needs and has been separated into spawning and post spawning activities/research to follow the BO and Minnow Recovery Plan elements.
- In response to a question of how soon a RIP could actually be implemented it was explained that Reclamation plans for the RIP and the RIP documents to be conservation measures in the new Biological Opinion (BO). For the RIP to be a part of the BO it will need to be in a complete enough form by June 2012 for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (the Service) to consider the proposed actions and complete an effects analysis; however, the RIP may not need to be fully implemented at that time

- One of the challenges being faced is getting buy-in from all the Program agencies that transitioning to a RIP is the appropriate path to take.
- Though it's not known if/when the transition will occur or how the RIP will be structured workgroup members were encouraged to continue to meet to plan projects and have SOWs ready if needed.
- In response to a question on whether the EC has discussed the Great Outdoor Initiative it was said that the EC has discussed the initiative and the general opinion of the EC is to focus on the RIP and the BO at this time.
 - It was explained that the Great Outdoor Initiative is focused more holistically in terms of humans and the landscape and is looking at recreation, conservation, and education. Part of the goal of the initiative is to increase knowledge about the environment and encourage people to enjoy the environment. The Committee formed by the Department of the Interior Secretary will be developing a general plan to address recreation, conservation, and education on the MRG. The Committee will be hosting several public meetings in the coming months; it's believed that information on the meetings will be provided on the Committee's website which can be accessed from the Program website.
- *What products the HRW can provide as transition to possible new structure moves forward -*
 - It was suggested that the HRW focus on the process of utilizing the reach maps to evaluate reaches and identify priority areas. The HRW should also focus on developing habitat criteria for evaluating completed habitat restoration and identifying priority areas for restoration work. The workgroup should also develop a report that outlines the types of monitoring and projects that were completed in last 10 years. The report would evaluate the existing habitat restoration projects and provide feedback on which techniques worked and if/how the project would be done differently.
 - It was suggested that the workgroup develop a timeline for completing these tasks at their next meeting to ensure the workgroup is making timely progress. The timeline could also be shared with the Program Management Team (PMT) to see if it ties into other Program activities.
 - It was asked if there are new efforts for analysis and recommendation (A&R) type reports or planning documents.
 - All of the A&Rs have been completed except for Cochiti. The reach mapping that the HRW has been working on is taking the place of A&Rs and is intended to be used in planning habitat restoration projects. The HRW plans to eventually complete mapping for each reach in the MRG.
 - It was suggested that the workgroup also consult with agencies doing river maintenance as they identify areas for restoration so that habitat improvements will be integrative with river maintenance work.
 - The Reclamation BA has a good summary of the river maintenance work that has been done over the last 10 years and includes lessons learned and the accomplishments. This information will be available for the HRW to use. As part of the Reclamation BA

there will be some level of restoration as a part of river maintenance projects.

- It was pointed out that river maintenance work, even without including restoration, can be evaluated as restoration as it will likely be affecting the species in some way.

RM 83 Feasibility Study Update

- In an update on the RM 83 Feasibility Study attendees were notified that the contractor is waiting for official notice before moving forward with the project. Attendees were reminded that in fall of 2011 the contractor presented their proposal for a 4th alternative for the project. At that time the HRW gave the contractor the “go ahead” to proceed with the project with some suggested modifications. After discussion with the Reclamation CO the HRW agreed to let the contractor move forward with the project as they see fit based on their professional opinion. Though the workgroup had indicated to the CO that the contractor can move forward with the project, the contractor has yet to receive official notification from the CO to move forward with the project.
 - As the CO has not sent official notice to the contractor and inquiries regarding official notification have not been answered the HRW Co-Chairs shared that they are developing an email to give the contractor permission to move forward with the project. The CO would also receive the email notice.
 - The HRW was advised to have the notification sent through the CO or the project’s Contracting Officer’s Technical Representative (COTR) as it is Reclamation protocol for communication to contractors to be through the CO or project COTR.
 - Meeting attendees expressed concern as the workgroup had sent notification on their decision to move forward with the project to the CO in fall of 2011 and notification has not been sent to the contractor.
 - The Co-Chairs agreed to send the email to the project CO and COTR before it is sent to the contractor.

Action: Jason Casuga agreed to follow up with Reclamation CO and the project’s COTR to get official notice sent to the contractor to proceed with the RM 83 Feasibility Study.

Review SAR mapping products and discussion on next steps

- Attendees were updated that the contractor has completed the final version of the SAR maps. The contractor has provided several hard copies of the print maps and 3 hard drives with digital copies of the reach maps and the GIS files for completed and ongoing habitat restoration projects; vegetation mapping; inundation mapping; and historic geomorphology. Meeting attendees agreed to have the next HRW at the Corps so that all the needed resources will be available to view the imagery and GIS files to begin the reach review and evaluation.
- Next steps – There Corps has some funding available to move forward with the next steps for the SAR maps and to begin mapping another reach.
 - The next steps for the SAR maps are to do more detailed analyses to evaluate the reach and identify areas of interest for future HR projects.

- The workgroup can use queries to help identify areas of interest as opposed to manually looking at the entire 40 miles. The workgroup can develop questions that they want to have answered and the contractor will develop queries to answer those questions (Example questions: Where is there overlap of flycatcher territories and areas with lots of salt cedar; where there is connectivity between the floodplain and the channel; and what is the similarity between existing habitat and the habitat that flycatchers are currently using?). Attendees agreed to being developing their questions over email in preparation for the next HRW meeting.
- Meeting attendees also voiced that it would be beneficial to also have the flycatcher surveys and the riparian groundwater modeling when evaluating the SAR.
- Meeting attendees discussed potential reaches to map next.
 - Albuquerque Reach
 - The Albuquerque Reach likely has the most information available out of all the reaches so it may be one of the easier reaches to map.
 - While the reach does not inundate as much as other reaches it has better connectivity.
 - The Albuquerque reach is historically more altered. There are artificial situations in the reach that the group may benefit from having a better understanding of.
 - It was pointed out that there are not many potential areas for restoration in the Albuquerque Reach.
 - It would be beneficial to have a large resident population of minnow in the upper area of the MRG.
 - Isleta Reach
 - There have been lots of changes that have occurred recently in the Isleta reach and it would benefit the workgroup to have an understanding of what is going on in that reach.
 - Flycatcher surveys, Flo-2D modeling, and LIDAR are available for the Isleta reach.
 - Not as much habitat restoration has occurred in the Isleta reach as the other reaches.
 - Reach maps of Isleta would be helpful in answering questions on infrastructure, drying, sediment disposition, and continuity.
 - San Marcial Reach.
 - It might be beneficial for the HRW to see a presentation from Reclamation on what they see as the long-term needs in that reach and what types of river maintenance for the San Marcial Reach may be planned in the future. It would also be helpful for Reclamation to discuss the technical issues and the state of the river in the San Marcial Reach.

- Robert Padilla indicated that it would be possible for Reclamation to discuss the San Marcial Reach with the HRW.
- The San Marcial reach is adjacent to existing flycatcher habitat. The habitat available above the reservoir pool is not the highest quality habitat.
- There are also minnow and flycatcher surveys in the San Marcial reach.
- Attendees agreed that Isleta may be the most beneficial reach to focus on mapping next as there has not been much restoration in that reach as compared to other reaches and having the reach mapping information would be helpful in answering infrastructure and continuity questions.
- Attendees discussed developing criteria to evaluate completed habitat restoration projects and prioritize future habitat restoration projects.
 - Attendees agreed to begin to compile suggestions on the basic criteria via email to discuss at the next HRW meeting.
 - Some potential criteria include:
 - Inundation – cfs, timing, duration of flow
 - Channel plan form – stability, lack of stability, channel dynamics
 - Vegetation structure
 - Patch size
 - Closest neighbor
 - Age class
 - It was suggested that the HRW should also be prepared to defend the criteria.
 - There are areas where there is agreement on which criteria are a good indication of habitat quality and there are areas where there is disagreement or not enough information is known. The workgroup will need to indicate which criteria are supported by literature and professional experience. The workgroup will also need to acknowledge that there will not be time complete research to verify if some of the techniques are the best route to take and will need to make some assumptions in order to move forward. In those cases the workgroup should state the assumptions and flag them as areas where more research is needed.
 - It was shared that there is a matrix of criteria that was developed for the monitoring plan that includes some criteria for evaluating habitat. The matrix was developed based on notes from joint sessions between the Science Workgroup (ScW), the MPT, and the HRW. Attendees agreed that the matrix would be a good starting point in developing criteria to evaluate restored habitat.

Action Item: Jill Wick will distribute the matrix of habitat criteria developed by the MPT to the HRW. Any edits or suggested additions can be sent to Jill.

- HRW members were also asked to flag the criteria and characteristics that they are unsure of or do not believe are strongly supported by the science as a strong measurement of quality. Those areas can then be flagged for

further discussion. HRW members should also indicate which criteria they see as critical and which they see as being secondary.

- It was briefly discussed that traditionally inundation has been seen as good for adult minnow for spawning but in the life history of the minnow and the flycatcher low flow habitat is also critical. Though inundation is good for adult minnow for spawning, the survivorship of juveniles in those conditions is not known. There are also questions regarding what types of habitat will support juveniles. These are issues the HRW will need to discuss to have a more complete understanding of how habitat supports the species.
 - Dissolved oxygen, water temperatures, and other components also need to be looked at as there are components other than flow rate that have an effect on the species.
 - Water management has a direct tie to quality habitat for both the minnow and the flycatcher. Flows are a legal and resource issue and it's difficult to determine what flows will be allowed to come down the MRG.

Program Update

- The Database Management System (DBMS) will be fully functional in June 2012. There will be two training sessions on using the system.
- Attendees were given a URL to access a set of standardized definitions for data sets that is used by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (www.fws.gov/stand/). The standardized definitions may be useful in developing SOWs and templates for data collection.

Next Meeting: April 17th, 2012 from 12:30 PM to 3:30 PM at the Corps

Habitat Restoration Work Group Meeting
March 20th, 2012 Meeting Attendees

NAME	POSITION	AFFILIATION	PHONE NUMBER	EMAIL ADDRESS	P/A/O
Rick Billings	HR Member Co-Chair	ABCWUA	796-2527	rbillings@abcwua.org	P
Ondrea Hummel	HR Member	USACE	342-3375	ondrea.c.hummel@usace.army.mil	P
Jill Wick	HR Member	NMDGF	476-8091	jill.wick@state.nm.us	P
Danielle Galloway	HR Member Co-Chair	COE	342-3661	danielle.a.galloway@usace.army.mil	A
Gina Dello Russo	HR Member Co-Chair	USFWS	575-835-1828	gina_dellorusso@fws.gov	P
Grace Haggerty	HR Member	ISC	383-4042	grace.haggerty@state.nm.us	P
Peter Wilkinson	HR Member	ISC	827-5801	peter.wilkinson@state.nm.us	A
Michelle Mann	PMT Member	USACE	342-3426	michelle.n.mann@usace.army.mil	O
Mark Brennan	HR Member	FWS	761-4756	mark_brennan@fws.gov	P
Jason Casuga	HR Member	Reclamation	462-3631	jcasuga@usbr.gov	A
Robert Padilla	HR Member	Reclamation	462-3626	rpadilla@usbr.gov	P
Brooke Wyman	HR Member	MRGCD	247-0234	brooke@mrgcd.us	A
Christine Sanchez	Admin support	Tetra Tech	881-3283	christine.sanchez@tetrattech.com	O