

Executive Committee Meeting  
*May 29, 2012*

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes



**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species  
Collaborative Program  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MEETING AGENDA  
Tuesday, May 29, 2012  
9:00 am – 4:00 pm**

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

- |  |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| <b>1. INTRODUCTIONS AND REVIEW OF PROPOSED AGENDA*</b>   | <i>5 minutes</i>  |
| <b>2. <i>DECISION</i> – APPROVAL OF MAY 15 EC ACTIONS AND DECISIONS*</b>                             | <i>10 minutes</i> |
| <b>3. RECLAMATION/SERVICE CONSULTATION UPDATE:</b>   | <i>25 minutes</i> |
| A. <b>Scope of Coverage for Biological Assessment</b> ( <i>M. Hamman/J. Wilber</i> )                 |                   |
| B. <b>Consultation Milestone Schedule</b> ( <i>J. Wilber</i> )                                       |                   |
| C. <b>Biological Opinion</b> ( <i>J. Bair/L. Robertson</i> )   |                   |
| <b>4. RIP MANAGEMENT</b>   | <i>30 minutes</i> |
| A. <b>RIP Management Contracting</b> ( <i>M. Hamman/J. Lewis</i> )                                   |                   |
| B. <b>Option Matrix</b> ( <i>J. Bair/S. Farris/D. Freeman</i> )                                      |                   |
| <b>5. PROGRAM DOCUMENT FOCUS GROUP</b>   | <i>30 minutes</i> |
| A. <b>Revised Document</b> ( <i>H. Brinegar</i> )  |                   |
| B. <b>Revised Proposed Budget Categories/Ranges</b> ( <i>J. Faler</i> )                              |                   |
| C. <b>Draft Interim External Peer Review Process*</b> ( <i>H. Brinegar/Y. McKenna</i> )              |                   |
| D. <b>Comments due June 13</b>   |                   |
| <b>BREAK</b>   | <i>15 minutes</i> |
| <b>6. INTERIM METRICS TO ASSESS SUFFICIENT PROGRESS BRIEF AND DISCUSSION</b> ( <i>M. Oetker/EC</i> ) | <i>45 minutes</i> |
| <b>7. CPUE METRICS AND METHODOLOGIES WORKSHOP</b>  | <i>20 minutes</i> |
| ( <i>R. Billings/J. Brooks/Others</i> )  |                   |
| A. <b>Who? What? Where? When? Why?</b>   |                   |
| B. <b>Funding</b>  |                   |
| <b>LUNCH</b>   | <i>45 minutes</i> |
| <i>12:00 pm – 12:45 pm</i>   |                   |
| <b>8. RIP ACTION PLAN FOCUS GROUP</b> ( <i>R. Schmidt-Peterson/J. Bair</i> )                         | <i>45 minutes</i> |
| A. <b>Revised Action Plan Presentation</b>   |                   |
| B. <b>Revised Document to EC by June 13</b>  |                   |
| C. <b>Comments due July 11</b>   |                   |

**Members**

ABCWUA  
ISC  
NMDA  
Sandia Pueblo  
UNM

APA  
Isleta Pueblo  
NMGF  
Santa Ana Pueblo  
USACE

CABQ  
NMAGO  
MRGCD  
Santo Domingo Tribe  
USFWS  
Reclamation

9. PLACEHOLDER FOR CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF MORNING TOPICS

10. **DECISIONS\*\*** – NECESSARY TO MOVE FORWARD WITH TRANSITION TO A RIP:

- A. Is EC supportive of BOR and USACE pursuing a RIP as a Conservation Measure/RPA?
- B. Will the EC endorse the draft RIP documents for inclusion in BOR's BA in accordance with the proposed timeline?
- C. Does the EC direct an update of the draft LTP?

11. **DECISION** – DOES EC APPROVE THE ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT SOW?

12. MEETING SUMMARY (*R. Fullerton*)

13. PUBLIC COMMENT

14. NEXT SCHEDULED EC MEETING – June 21, 2012 @ Reclamation

**DECISIONS FOR JUNE 21 - RIP MANAGEMENT? ENDORSE REVISED PROGRAM DOCUMENT?**

15. NEXT SCHEDULED EC MEETING – July 19, 2012 @ Reclamation

**DECISIONS FOR JULY 19 – ENDORSE RIP ACTION PLAN? REVISED LTP?**

\* *Denotes read ahead material provided for this topic*

\*\* *Breakout rooms available*

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Tuesday, May 29, 2012**  
**9:00 am – 4:00 pm**

**Actions**

- Ali Saenz will send an email to EC members providing contact information for the workshop planners (Rick Billings is lead) requesting input on objectives for the CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop.
- EC member suggestions on objectives for the CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop should be sent to Rick Billings by June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2012 in order for draft workshop information to be brought back to the EC for decision at the June meeting.

**Decisions**

- The May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012 EC actions and decisions were approved with no changes.
- The EC approved the adaptive management scope of work as amended by EC member provided comments.
- The June 21<sup>st</sup> EC meeting was scheduled for all day from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.
- The July EC meeting was rescheduled to July 20<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.
- The decisions necessary to move forward with transition to a RIP (A. Is EC supportive of BOR and USACE pursuing a RIP as a Conservation Measure/RPA; B. Will the EC endorse the draft RIP documents for inclusion in BOR's BA in accordance with the proposed timeline; and C. Does the EC direct an update of the draft LTP) were postponed until the July 20<sup>th</sup> EC meeting.

**Directives:**

- The CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop planners will provide the EC with a draft agenda for the workshop, the scope of what the peer reviewers will be tasked with, and the goals/objectives of the workshop for review and decision at the June 21<sup>st</sup> EC meeting.

**Upcoming Dates and Deadlines:**

- June 8<sup>th</sup> – input on CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop objectives are due
- June 13<sup>th</sup> – draft Program Document and RIP Action Plan distributed to EC for review
- June 13<sup>th</sup> – Comments and edits to the draft interim external peer review process and revised proposed budget categories/ranges are due
- June 15<sup>th</sup> – Reclamation's cut off for any new information to be potentially included in the next version of the Draft BA; this is not a guarantee that any new information received will be included
- June 30<sup>th</sup> – Dr. Miller's RAMAS PVA functional model due
- July 31<sup>st</sup> – Reclamation's intended submittal date for a complete final BA
- August 15<sup>th</sup> - The Service's cut off for any new information to be potentially included in the initial Draft BO; this is not a guarantee that any new information received will be included
- August – training on RAMAS PVA model
- Last week of August – tentative for Demographic Criteria and CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop
- September 30<sup>th</sup> – Dr. Miller's RAMAS PVA report and documentation due
- October – assumed first Draft BO should be available

**Next Meeting: June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012 from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM at Bureau of Reclamation**

- Tentative agenda items include: 1) presentation/discussion on RIP Program Document; 2) presentation/discussion on RIP Action Plan; 3) discussion on CPUE workshop objectives and decision on CPUE workshop;
- July 20<sup>th</sup> meeting: 1) endorse RIP Program Document; 2) endorse RIP Action Plan; 3) approve explicit process for developing sufficient progress metrics; 4) decision on RIP management;
- June or July Meeting: 1) Mark Brennan presentation to EC on reintroduction location research and top findings;
- Future agenda items: 1) Discussion/decision regarding 10(j) Reintroduction Biologist position;

## Meeting Summary

**Introductions and review of proposed agenda:** Estévan López brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. A quorum was present. The agenda was approved with the addition of an update on the status of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (Corps) consultation and a reordering of the agenda so that agenda items "Program Document Focus Group" and "RIP Action Plan focus Group" would be discussed after agenda item "Decision – Does EC Approve the Adaptive Management SOW" in order to ensure that those agenda items were addressed during today's meeting.

**Decision – Approval of the May 15<sup>th</sup> EC Actions and Decisions:** The May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012 EC Actions and Decisions were approved with no changes.

Non-federal partners then held a closed-session caucus. Notes were not taken for this session.

### **Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) Update:**

- *Scope of coverage for Biological Assessment (BA)-*
  - Meeting attendees were updated that Reclamation has been working with the non-federal partners to include the details for an action-by-action strategy in their BA. The target for the BA to be completed and transmitted to the Service is July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012. The non-federal agencies were thanked for providing the information requested for the consultation. Interstate Stream Commission (ISC) will be submitting their actions to Reclamation in the next couple days; at that time Reclamation will have discussions with ISC to determine how their information can be included in the BA. Because the scope of coverage is based on the actions submitted by the agencies desiring to be covered under the BA, the scope of coverage will not be determined until the discussions with ISC occur. Reclamation still expects to use the Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) and its associated documents (RIP Program Document and RIP Action Plan) as a major conservation measure in their BA. Reclamation would also like to have future discussions on how to include actions for entities that are not initially included in the BA into the RIP for coverage.
    - It was commented that a fundamental issue that still needs to be resolved is how to include the water uses submitted by ISC in addition to ISC's actions in the consultation. It is ISC's expectation that the water uses

- will be characterized in a way that they can be treated as part of the proposed actions and not as a part of the cumulative effects or baseline.
- Concern was expressed that the BA would not include a depletions analysis.
    - It was explained that the BA will be shifting from the overall broad based depletions in the 2003 Biological Opinion (BO) to that of an action-by-action approach. The 2003 BO was an RPA driven process; as long as the flow targets were met and the RPAs were completed then the BO was met. In that scenario the responsibility for meeting the flow targets and the RPAs fell primarily to Reclamation. The BA has now shifted to being an action-by-action approach where if an agency needs direct coverage then it's incumbent on that agency to identify the action that they want an analysis completed for and the depletions would be described in the action.
  - It was asked how groundwater depletions are accounted for in Reclamation's BA. There was concern about responsibility for groundwater depletion impacts to surface water. More specifically, without depletions analysis how is conjunctive use dealt with in a basin acknowledged to be over-appropriated? Does the new BA/BO rely on litigation by right's holders or other to determine groundwater depletions effects?
    - It was explained that for actions to be covered in the BA, the groundwater depletions would need to be included in the proposed action. As far as an overall affects analysis, if an action is not included as a proposed action it will be included under the cumulative effects section. The BA includes sections for proposed actions, interrelated and interdependent actions (the Corps' actions), cumulative effects, and the baseline (other federal activities with a Section 7 Consultation in place).
    - There was concern that in a situation where there is a water shortage, surface water users may be automatically restricted if there has not been an analysis to see where the overuses are.
      - The intention is to design a system that would allow water users to meet their needs in normal water years and utilize different resources to meet needs and targets in dry and critically dry years. The plan is to have a system where enough criteria are built into water management scenarios, and there is enough reserve water in storage to get through the critically dry periods while providing enough water for the Rio Grande silvery minnow (minnow). At this time the effects that groundwater has on the system are not known.
      - It was commented that the discussions on groundwater and surface water usage are important as groundwater uses take a longer period of time to see the effects. If there is a critical water year and surface water is at risk, it's important to determine who will take the hit when there is not enough water.
  - Concern was raised that in previous meetings the RIP had been referred to as *the* conservation measure of the BA and it is now being called *a* conservation measure. Many of the non-federal partners had perceived that the RIP would be the only conservation measure. It was asked if Reclamation anticipates that there will be multiple conservation measures and who would decide if additional conservation measures are added.
    - There may be scenarios in the future where additional conservation measures are needed; for example, if an agency not covered under the

- BA is seeking coverage in the RIP brings in an additional conservation measure, or if the sufficient progress metrics are not being met and it's determined that an additional conservation measure needs to be included. Reclamation and the Service clarified that the *EC* would be the entity that decides if any conservation measures that aren't already part of the RIP would be added.
- An important component of the RIP and RIP Action Plan is to identify tools to cover water shortages and prevent reinitiation. It's important to determine the tools early because in shortage situations the flexibility for meeting goals is tightened.
  - *Biological Opinion* – Attendees were updated that the Service is in the process of assessing the Corps' BA and the partial BA submitted by Reclamation. The Service is requesting that information for consideration in the consultation be submitted to the Service by August 15<sup>th</sup>. Any information received after August 15<sup>th</sup> is not guaranteed to be considered in the consultation but will be considered and incorporated to the extent possible. Reclamation and the Corps will be receiving a draft BO which they can share with the Program as they like. There will be a comment and review period for the draft BO.
    - Reclamation affirmed that they will be sharing the draft BO with the EC.
  - *Corps Consultation Update* – The EC was updated that the Corps is still requesting their own BO. Though the Service has stated that a single BO will be issued to both Reclamation and the Corps, until the decision is official the Corps will continue to seek their own BO. The Corps is fully committed to the RIP but has no intention of front-loading their BA with the RIP as a conservation measure. The Corps does anticipate that the RIP will be included as an RPA if they receive their own BO.

#### **RIP Management:**

- *RIP Management Contracting* – Mike Hamman and Jericho Lewis updated meeting attendees on the potential for utilizing Reclamation's authorities to use 3<sup>rd</sup> party management for the RIP. After discussions with contracting staff and the solicitor it was determined that Reclamation does not have the specific authority to transfer funding to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party organization through a grant. Reclamation could seek authority but it will take some time for Reclamation to obtain the authority and it would take time for the Program to determine how grants and resources could be redistributed to various entities under a 3<sup>rd</sup> party led RIP. If the Program needs to have a rapid transition to a RIP, a Service-led RIP would be better from an authority perspective as Section 4 of the Endangered Species Act authorizes Reclamation to transfer funds directly to the RIP and the Service; this is how the Upper San Juan RIP is managed.
  - The Platte River RIP has specific authority in their legislation for a grant to be transferred to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party organization. One big difference between the Program and the Platte River RIP is that the majority of the property within the purview of the Program is federal property; in the Platte River RIP funds from a trust are used to purchase land for rehabilitation and restoration activities.
  - Another option for utilizing a 3<sup>rd</sup> party organization for management is to utilize a process that Reclamation uses for large projects; in this process a contractor is hired as a project manager. However, since the Program has multiple projects for research and habitat restoration Reclamation may not have the capability to transfer funding to the 3<sup>rd</sup> party organization to transfer to other contractors.
- *Option Matrix* – An attributes matrix developed to compare Service and 3<sup>rd</sup> party RIP management options was distributed to the EC. The matrix documents the discussions and debates that the EC has had regarding the two forms of management.

- It was pointed out that new information on the Virgin River RIP was added to the document. At a previous EC meeting it was reported that the Virgin River RIP was a non-federal led RIP; however after further research it was found that the Virgin River RIP is actually managed by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party organization.

**Decision – Does EC approve the Adaptive Management scope of work (SOW)? :**

- At the May 15<sup>th</sup> meeting, EC members were asked to provide comments on the Adaptive Management SOW and verify that Adaptive Management Plan Appendix C is comprehensive. Comments from the Service, Pueblo of Sandia, and New Mexico Department of Agriculture (NMDA) were received. It was clarified that the purpose of the SOW is to set parameters for this particular contract and is not intended to limit what the EC may want to do under future adaptive management SOWs or limit hypotheses to consider under adaptive management. In this SOW the contractor would work with the Program to prioritize the hypotheses in Appendix C.
- The Corps plans to incorporate all of the comments that have been received so far. The Service, Pueblo of Sandia, and NMDA comments will be posted as part of today's EC meeting record. Meeting attendee's were given a brief overview of the edits and comments.
  - The Pueblo of Sandia provided 3 uncertainties that they wanted to make sure were addressed by adaptive management: A) the condition of the river due to lack of sedimentation and incising of the river bed. Has the river reached critical tipping point? Can habitat (critical to minnow) survive if the river continues to degrade?; B) the availability of water (to the species and habitat) in a system where there is general acknowledgement that the river is over appropriated and there continues to be appropriations of ground water that is connected to the river; and C) the unknown effect of water chemistry on the species.
    - Several of the hypotheses in Appendix C will help address uncertainty A. It's not known at what level uncertainty B can be addressed at this time as there is not a lot of information on groundwater use; however, it may be possible to lay out the framework to address this uncertainty. Uncertainty C can be addressed as there is a large amount of information on the effects of water chemistry on fish and the draft report for Joel Lusk's fish health study is currently being reviewed by the Science Workgroup; the report is expected to be finalized by the end of this summer.
  - The Service's comments did not include any changes to the SOW but included additional hypotheses to be included in Appendix C.
- ISC will also be submitting comments to the Corps. The comments are not expected to be controversial. Some of ISC's comments will be in regard to water management scenarios as Appendix C does not currently include water management scenarios. The major issue now is trying to determine how the Program will have flexibility in water management scenarios so it needs to be ensured that water management is addressed in the activity.
  - It was explained that many of the hypotheses in Appendix C are focused on the effect of water management on the species. Since the water management scenarios aren't provided up front the Program can work backwards from the river drying hypotheses to develop water management activities; any additional water management hypotheses that are provided before the contract is in place can also be addressed in this SOW.
- The EC approved the adaptive management SOW as amended by the EC member provided comments.



**Program Document Focus Group:**

- *Revised Program Document* – The EC was updated that the Program Document focus group is in the process of refining the Program Document. The Program Document focus group has had a couple of joint meetings with the Action Plan focus group and will be incorporating Action Plan elements as they are completed. The revised draft Program Document will be provided on June 13<sup>th</sup> for discussion at the June 21<sup>st</sup> EC meeting.
- *Draft Interim External Peer Review Process* – It's anticipated that the external peer review process will only be used to review major items and peer review is planned to be included in the budget once a year. It's expected that the interim guidance will be revised once the RIP is established. It was noted that in the interim process, once the comment phase of a review is completed, the report will become final unless there is failure to follow the requisite process. It was emphasized that this process is not meant to include internal reviews; this will be drafted and provided to the EC for review at a later date. Comments on the draft interim external peer review process are due June 13<sup>th</sup>.
- *Revised Proposed Budget Categories/Ranges* – The EC was provided with the revised Proposed Budget Categories/Ranges. The revised document has corrections to the budget information for supplemental water and has been slightly modified to include additional categories and some of the categories have been combined. In response to a question of which category water quality falls into it was explained that since the historical funding level is 1% - 2%, water quality could be included into any category; water quality is currently included under the flow protection and management category but if water quality is monitored for the species it could also make sense to include it under the species management category instead.
- *Comments due June 13<sup>th</sup>* - Comments and edits to the draft interim external peer review process and revised proposed budget categories/ranges are due June 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

**Interim Metrics to Assess Sufficient Progress Brief and Discussion:**

- A draft document of metrics that can be used to measure sufficient progress was distributed to meeting attendees. The document includes details on specific metrics that could be used to evaluate the RIP.
  - In response to a question of how the sufficient progress metrics would fit into the recovery criteria, it was explained that the recovery criteria and recovery plan are intended to be used as guidance in reducing threats. In order to delist a species the threats to the species need to be reduced. There are cases where a recovery plan has not been up-to-date on the best available information and a species has been delisted even though the recovery criteria have not been met. In evaluating sufficient progress, the Service will be considering the RIP's activities and not necessarily just looking at which metrics were met.
  - Mike Oetker described the Sufficient Progress Matrix in further detail. It was explained that the RIP annual work plan and the Long Term Plan (LTP) will be used in conjunction with the metrics to show that the RIP is completing activities and making progress. It was explained that though the draft matrix includes specific numbers, the numbers were only provided to give the EC an idea of the level of detail needed and are not final. As new information about the species becomes available the metrics may change.
  - Failing to meet a metric is not considered an automatic failure. If a metric is not being achieved the RIP will need to develop a plan to address the metric to get back to making progress towards the recovery of the species. The RIP can also provide explanation as to why a metric was not met.

- An EC member cautioned that the EC needs the reassurance that the means for correcting any failures will be financially feasible and realistically implementable.
- It was emphasized that the population demographics factor is a critical area as this is how the Service will ultimately decide the status of the species. Catch per Unit Effort (CPUE) is currently included in the matrix; however the appropriate use of CPUE is an area of debate within the Program and this metric will be determined at the CPUE workshop.
- It was asked if the interim sufficient progress metrics will be defined in the BO.
  - The BO would identify the broad categories but the specifics of the metrics will not be included in the BO. This is to retain flexibility for changes if new information becomes available.
- It was asked what the relationship between the sufficient progress metrics and the reinitiation of the consultation is and what role the metrics will play in the consultation.
  - The sufficient progress evaluation will help to determine if the species is improving and if the RIP is moving towards recovery of the species. If year-after-year the RIP is not making progress then the consultation will need to be reinitiated. The metrics that aren't being met and why the metrics aren't being met are considered when determining whether reinitiation is needed. If the Service has concerns that progress is not being made or that a metric may need to change, it is their responsibility to bring the concerns to the RIP's attention so that they can be addressed. There is the possibility that a metric that was thought to have been really important is found to be less important. Through adaptive management the RIP will hone in on the metrics and the EC may decide to make changes over time.
- The EC had previously been told that there are 2 types of metrics: one type is a species response metric where monitoring is completed and the data is compared to the metric; the other type is an implementation metric that is based on the activities implemented by the RIP. It was asked how acceptable these two types of metrics are to the Service and which type of metric is recommended.
  - It's recommended that there a mixture of both types of activities. The species response metrics are important because the goal of the RIP is to improve the species and the implementation activities are important for describing the progress that has been made towards each metric.
- It was pointed out that because of the controversy within the Program over the use of CPUE it may be some period of time before a measure for population demographics is agreed upon. There may need to be some flexibility from the Service to allow time for the EC to reach consensus.
  - The measurement does not need to be decided by the time the new BO is completed but the measurement that will be used in the first year will need to be determined fairly quickly after completion of the BO. Because it may take some time for the EC to reach consensus the current methods may need to be used as an interim metric and then the new metric can be used in the second year.
  - The Service clarified that it will be the *EC* who decides the metrics that the RIP will be measured on.

- It was asked if the factor “Threats – extent to which RIP addresses them” is viewed by the Service as a separate set of potential criteria or if the threats would be addressed by virtue of the other measurements in the matrix.
  - The Service would look at the actions that the RIP took to address or alleviate threats. Did the RIP directly or indirectly relieve stress?

#### **CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop:**

- *Who? What? Where? When? Why?* – The purpose of the CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop is to have discussion between experts (fish biologists and technical staff) to analyze the use of CPUE and discuss ways to modify the current methodologies and also discuss other alternatives for measuring population demographics. The workshop planning group (Rick Billings, Mick Porter, Rich Valdez, and Jim Brooks) has developed a list of potential experts to participate in the workshop.
- Currently the workshop is planned to be a 2-day facilitated workshop during the last week of August 2012 at the Service. The first day of the workshop would consist of a presentation on the current population monitoring that would include the data that’s collected, how the metrics are used, and the issues with the current methods. The second day of the workshop would consist of discussion on how the current methods could be modified and potential alternative methods. Reclamation and the Service have provided funding for experts from other areas to attend the workshop; it’s also planned for peer reviewers to participate in the workshop.
- Meeting attendees discussed how the peer reviewers would be utilized within the workshop and how the recommendations made in the workshop would be used in developing a metric for sufficient progress.
  - It’s planned for 3 outside peer reviewers with knowledge of quantitative fish sampling and experience with small fish to participate in the workshop. The reviewers would be tasked with pre-workshop reading to inform them of the issues that are being addressed. The peer reviewers will also actively participate in the discussions and write up a brief report with their comments after the workshop. The workshop planning team will make an initial pass at selecting the reviewers based on availability and cost.
  - The workshop is not intended to determine the metric for sufficient progress but is meant to provide information to the EC to help facilitate an informed decision. Because the workshop is meant to focus on science and not meant to include policy the workshop attendees may not be appropriate to make decisions on metrics. It’s anticipated that the workshop will produce a list of recommendations, which would include the pros and cons (i.e. the amount/value of the data obtained from each method, costs, etc.) for each recommendation, for the EC to consider as they make a decision on a sufficient progress metric.
- It was asked that Dan Goodman be included in the workshop planning group. The ISC also requested that Rolf Schmidt-Peterson and Grace Haggerty be involved in the planning efforts.
- In order to have enough time to invite experts to participate in the workshop the EC will need to make a decision on the workshop at the June EC meeting. The workshop planners will provide the EC with a draft agenda for the workshop, the scope of what the peer reviewers will be tasked with, and the goals/objectives of the workshop for review and decision at the June 21<sup>st</sup> EC meeting. The planners requested suggestions from the EC on the objectives for the workshop to make sure that the workshop will address the EC needs. Ali Saenz will send an email to EC members providing contact information for the workshop planners (Rick Billings is lead) requesting input on objectives for the

CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop. EC member suggestions on objectives for the CPUE metrics and methodologies workshop should be sent to Rick Billings by June 8<sup>th</sup>, 2012 in order for draft workshop information to be brought back to the EC for decision at the June meeting.

**Decisions – Necessary to move forward with transition to RIP:**

- *Is EC supportive of Reclamation and the Corps pursuing a RIP as a Conservation Measure/RPA? –*
  - Meeting attendees were reminded that Reclamation has a 60-day timeframe to submit their BA to the Service in order to have a new BO in place by the time the current BO expires. An affirmative decision from the EC on this item would mean that Reclamation would continue to pursue working the RIP into their BA under the discussed timeframes.
  - Several EC members voiced that they are supportive of continuing to pursue the RIP as the conservation measure but at this time the RIP has not been fleshed out in enough detail for the EC to commit to transitioning to a RIP.
  - It was voiced that there are 3 “deal breakers” or components of the RIP that need to be fleshed out before the partners can commit to transitioning to a RIP: 1) program management; 2) scope of coverage; 3) and the interim metrics.
    - It was commented that though there are tight deadlines and legal vulnerabilities associated with not meeting those deadlines extending the current BO for a couple months so that the RIP and BO will be well-developed should be considered.
    - It was asked what level of detail on the RIP needs to be included in the BA.
      - The BA needs to include enough information on the RIP for the Service to determine the effects that the RIP will have on the RGSM.
    - It was commented that because there are still placeholders on the scope of coverage and program management in the RIP Action Plan and Program Document, the EC will not be able to make a decision on approving those documents until those areas have been fleshed out. Based on the likely timeline for determining the details on scope of coverage, program management, and the metrics the EC may not be able to have the “deal breakers” addressed until September 2012.
  - Non-federal and federal partners then met in closed-session caucuses. Notes were not taken for these sessions.
  - The non-federal partners voiced the importance for having all 3 of the “deal breakers” detailed in writing and the RIP documents finalized before they can make a decision to commit to a RIP. The non-federal partners proposed that the RIP documents be approved at the July EC meeting; by that time the scope of coverage will have been determined and the EC will have made a decision on RIP management. Though the sufficient progress metrics will not be decided upon by July, the non-federal partners could feel comfortable in making a decision on the RIP if an explicit and binding process for developing the sufficient progress metrics is developed.
- *Does the EC direct an update of the draft LTP –*

- It was suggested that the narrative of the LTP be revised so that it provides an overview of the Program. The RIP Action Plan focus group is also considering making revisions to the LTP so that it is consistent with the RIP Action Plan.
- Grace Haggerty updated meeting attendees on the RIP Action Plan. The Action Plan focus group has been meeting frequently and the timeline for the completion of the draft Action Plan is in line with a July approval of the Action Plan. The Action Plan group is working with a contractor (provided by ISC as cost share) to incorporate the comments to the document and to assist with technical editing. The Action Plan group is now focusing on completing the tables in the document and working to settle issues in the document that need further discussion. A revised draft Action Plan is planned to be distributed to EC members on June 13<sup>th</sup> for discussion at the June EC meeting; it's anticipated that there will be another revision period before the document is approved in July. The Action Plan format has been modified but the premise of focusing on the species has not changed. The Action Plan will mostly address a 5-year time frame and the focus group anticipates that it will be updated on a yearly basis. It was suggested that the LTP be updated every 5 years.
- Comprehensive presentations of the Program Document and Action Plan will be made at the June 21<sup>st</sup> EC meeting.
- Based on the timeframes for completion of the RIP Program Document and Action Plan and the timeframe for determining the details of the 3 “deal breakers” the decisions necessary to move forward with transition to a RIP (A. Is EC supportive of BOR and USACE pursuing a RIP as a Conservation Measure/RPA; B. Will the EC endorse the draft RIP documents for inclusion in BOR’s BA in accordance with the proposed timeline; and C. Does the EC direct an update of the draft LTP) were postponed until the July 20<sup>th</sup> EC meeting.

**Meeting Summary:** Reese Fullerton briefly summarized the events of today’s meeting:

- The EC approved today’s meeting agenda and the May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012 EC actions and decisions.
- It was clarified that the *EC* will be the entity that decides to add new conservation measures.
- The EC approved the adaptive management SOW with the incorporation of the EC provided edits.
- The decision to endorse the RIP Program Document and Action Plan will occur at the July EC meeting.
- The decisions necessary to move forward with the RIP transition have been postponed for the July EC Meeting.
- It was clarified that the *EC* will be deciding the metrics that are used for sufficient progress.
- The EC will provide the metrics workshop planners with proposed objectives and outcomes for the workshop by June 8<sup>th</sup>. The workshop planners will then provide the EC with the goals/objectives for the workshop for approval at the June EC meeting.

**Public Comment:** There was no public comment.

**Next EC Meeting: June 21, 2012 at Reclamation**

- Meeting attendees agreed to schedule a full-day EC session from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM on June 21<sup>st</sup> as they will be having comprehensive presentations on the RIP Program Document and Action Plan.
  - Tentative agenda items include: 1) presentation/discussion on RIP Program Document; 2) presentation/discussion on RIP Action Plan; 3) discussion on CPUE workshop objectives and decision on CPUE workshop;
- The EC rescheduled the July EC meeting to July 20<sup>th</sup> from 9:00 AM to 4:00 PM.
  - July 20<sup>th</sup> tentative agenda items include: 1) endorse RIP Program Document; 2) endorse RIP Action Plan; 3) approve explicit process for developing sufficient progress metrics; 4) decision on RIP management;

**Executive Committee Meeting Attendees  
May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012, 9:00 am to 4:00 pm**

Attendees:

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Seat</i>
Brent Rhees	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Federal co-chair
Estévan López (P)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	ISC, Non-federal co-chair
Michelle Shaughnessy (P)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Service
Steve Farris (P)	NM Attorney General's Office	NMAGO
Subhas Shah (P)	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	MRGCD
Rebecca Houtman (A)	City of Albuquerque	COA
Mike Hamman (P)	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	BOR
Janet Jarratt (P)	Assessment Payers of the MRGCD	APA of the MRGCD
Hilary Brinegar (P)	NM Department of Agriculture	NMDA
Rick Billings (A)	Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority	ABCWUA
Matt Wunder (P)	NM Department of Game and Fish	NMDGF
Frank Chaves (P)	Pueblo of Sandia	Sandia
Sam Hough (A)	Pueblo of Santa Ana	Santa Ana
Kris Schafer (A)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	USACE
Eveli Abeyta (P)	Santo Domingo Tribe	Santo Domingo

*Others*

Yvette McKenna – PM	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Jim Wilber (A)	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Jennifer Faler	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Ali Saenz	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Ann Moore (A)	NM Attorney General's Office
Liz Holmes	NM Department of Agriculture
Christopher Shaw	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Grace Haggerty	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Deb Freeman	for NM Interstate Stream Commission
Susan Bittick	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Danielle Galloway	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Elizabeth Pitrolo	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

---

William DeRagon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Michael Porter	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Brian Gleadle (A)	N.M. Department of Game and Fish
Lori Robertson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Oetker	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jim Brooks	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jen Bachus	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Stacey Kopitsch	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Wally Murphy	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jason Remshardt	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD
David Gensler (A)	MRGCD
Jessica Tracy	Pueblo of Sandia
Mathew Zidovsky	Representative Heinrich's Office
Rick Carpenter	City of Santa Fe/BDD Board
Patrick Redmond	LRPA/MRGCD
Patricia Dominquez	Senator Bingaman's Office
Herman Quintana (A)	Santo Domingo Tribe
Jonathan Garcia (A)	Santo Domingo Tribe
Reese Fullerton	GenQuest (Facilitator)
Christine Sanchez	Tetra Tech (Note Taker)