

Executive Committee Meeting  
*December 20, 2012*

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes



**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species  
Collaborative Program  
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
MEETING AGENDA  
Thursday, December 20, 2012  
9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

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

1. **INTRODUCTIONS AND REVIEW OF PROPOSED AGENDA\*** *5 minutes*
2. ***DECISION* – APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 29 EC MEETING SUMMARY\*** *10 minutes*
3. **PATH FORWARD AS RELATED TO EXPIRATION OF THE 2003 BO** *45 minutes*
  - A. **Action Agency Supplements** (*BOR/USACE*)
  - B. **Water Management Planning** (*BOR*)
  - C. **2003 BO Extension** (*FWS*)
4. **DISCUSSION AND RESOLUTION OF COMMENTS RECEIVED TO DATE** *15 minutes*
  - A. **Program Document** (*D. Freeman*)
  - B. **RIP Action Plan** (*G. Haggerty*)
  - C. **Cooperative Agreement/Principles of ESA Consultation** (*L. Robertson*)
5. **REVIEW REVISED RIP DOCUMENT AND ACTIVITY SCHEDULE\*** *15 minutes*
- BREAK** *15 minutes*
6. **RIP 3<sup>rd</sup> PARTY SUBCOMMITTEE MANAGEMENT FEEDBACK ON  
Draft Cooperative Agreement for Financial Management Entity and SOW\*** *20 minutes*  
(*S. Farris/Y. McKenna/R. Graham*)
7. **UPDATE ON CONTRACTING** (*J. Lewis/Y. McKenna*) *10 minutes*
8. **PLATTE RIVER RIP ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN –  
STATE OF THE PLATTE** (*D. Freeman*) *10 minutes*
9. **MEETING SUMMARY**
10. **PUBLIC COMMENT**
11. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**
  - A. **Database Management System (DBMS) Available to Public**
12. ***DECISION* - NEXT SCHEDULED EC MEETING January 17, 2013, 9:00 am – 1:00 pm**

*\*denotes read ahead*

**Members**

ABCWUA  
ISC  
NMDA  
Sandia Pueblo  
UNM

APA  
Isleta Pueblo  
NMGF  
Santa Ana Pueblo  
USACE

CABQ  
NMAGO  
MRGCD  
Santo Domingo Tribe  
USFWS  
Reclamation

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Thursday, December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2012**  
**9:00 am – 12:00 pm**

**Actions**

- Michelle Shaughnessy committed to reviewing the Service's comments pertaining to the oversight of Sufficient Progress Metrics to clarify, if needed, the intent that the metrics will be developed collaboratively with all signatories but annual confirmation of progress is analyzed by the Service, separately from the RIP.
- Any additional comments on the Final Draft RIP Action Plan are due to Grace Haggerty by January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013. Remember, feedback can also be provided through your RIP Action Plan Team members.
- Reclamation's contracting office comments and feedback on suggested edits to the Draft FME Cooperative Agreement are due to the Program Management Subcommittee no later than January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013.
- Yvette McKenna will update the RIP Document and Activity Schedule with dates and changes discussed today. The revised schedule will be sent to EC members.
- Any water management issues or matters for consideration for the Engineers Advisors (in anticipation of the March 21<sup>st</sup> Rio Grande Compact Commission meeting) should be sent to Rolf Schmidt-Petersen before their January 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.

**Decisions**

- The November 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.

**Requests/Recommendations**

- It was requested that the FAR clauses and contracting responses (from Reclamation's contracting office) on the Draft FME Cooperative Agreement be provided to the Program Management Subcommittee no later than January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013. This would give the Program Management Subcommittee 3 days to address the responses and post the revised document on January 10<sup>th</sup> as a read ahead for the January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013 EC meeting. The Program Management Subcommittee was open to addressing contracting comments via email (and tracked changes) for any members who would be unavailable to attend a January 7<sup>th</sup> Program Management Subcommittee meeting on January 7<sup>th</sup> at 2:00pm at MRGCD.
- With no objections, there was general agreement from EC participants for the Program Management Subcommittee to continue on the current path of a phased approach to the implementation of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party RIP management.
- It was requested that the RIP Action Plan focus group include tasks within the Action Plan that address the phased approach for the RIP 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Management. The group could consider the cost and scheduling of these tasks as well.

**Next Meeting: January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2012 from 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM at Bureau of Reclamation**

- Tentative agenda items include: (1) Updates on BA submittals; SAR workgroup report out
- Tentative February/March 2013 Agenda Item: (1) Presentation of Minnow Action Team Recommendations
- Future Agenda Items: (1) Updated 10(j) population schedule and report out on FWS Regional Office approval to proceed; (2) Updates/continued discussion on the acquisition of past mesohabitat data;

**Upcoming Dates and Deadlines:**

- January 7<sup>th</sup> – Reclamation's contracting comments on Draft FME Cooperative Agreement and Executive Director Scope of Work due to Program Management Subcommittee
- January 7<sup>th</sup> - Program Management Subcommittee meeting 2:00pm at MRGCD

- January 10<sup>th</sup> – read aheads for January 17<sup>th</sup> EC meeting posted
- January 15<sup>th</sup> – Corps submittal of Draft BA to the Service and Reclamation's intended submittal of Final Draft BA to the Service
- January 17<sup>th</sup> – EC meeting
- January 23<sup>rd</sup> – tentative CC meeting
- January 22<sup>nd</sup> – Engineer's Advisory meeting (in preparation for the RGCC meeting)
- February 28<sup>th</sup> – expiration of 2003 BO; formal consultation must be reinitiated prior to the expiration of this BO to ensure continued compliance with sections 7 and 9 of the ESA
- March 21<sup>st</sup> – Rio Grande Compact Commission meeting
- March 28<sup>th</sup> – EC meeting (delayed one week due to conflicts with the March 21<sup>st</sup> RGCC meeting)
- end of March 2013 – CPUE workshop

## Meeting Summary

**Introductions and review agenda:** Brent Rhees brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. The agenda was approved with no changes.

**Decision – Approval of the November 29<sup>th</sup> EC meeting summary:** The November 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.

### Path Forward as Related to Expiration of the 2003 BO

- *Reclamation Supplements:* Reclamation had intended to include the Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) as a conservation measure in the Final Draft Biological Assessment (BA) supplement. However, Reclamation is unable to include the RIP until the Executive Committee (EC) endorses the RIP documents. Reclamation intends to finalize the Draft BA based on the conservation measures and other activities identified in the current Draft BA. Any references to the RIP as the conservation measure will be removed as the current Collaborative Program will continue to provide the federal nexus and ESA coverage through the transition process. The intent is to submit the Final BA supplement early in January 2013. A cover memo will be provided with the submittal that explains the intent to diligently work with the EC to get the RIP documents endorsed for inclusion in the Final Biological Opinion (BO).
- *USACE Supplements:* The Corps submitted a draft BA to the Service and received a response letter with feedback and concerns that need to be addressed. The Corps is in the process of reviewing and replying to those comments. The intent is to submit a revised packet by January 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013 and hopefully have formal consultation initiated.
- *Water Management Plan (WMP):*
  - The Water Management Planning is continuing in the form of 2 groups: reservoir operations and infrastructure. Josh Mann, with Reclamation, is the lead coordinator. The groups have been making progress identifying activities and next steps. However, a lot of the activities identified in the WMP are also components of the RIP Action Plan. The groups will reconvene in the New Year. It is anticipated that the finalization of the WMP will be a key component of the suite of documents that will constitute the RIP going forward.
    - The WMP development is not as far along as the other RIP documents. The suite of water management tools and what is needed to achieve them are being looked at with the intention of refining them until everyone is comfortable. Getting the WMP completed depends in part on how quickly the work can be resolved and agreed to.
  - In terms of completing the RIP documents, the general perception is that most of them are close to a final state. However, some of the unknowns (such as the biological needs of the fish) need to be better understood, as does how all the pieces are going to fit together.

- One member raised the concern that while understanding the biological needs is important, it needs to be understood in the context of the whole opinion. In response, it was clarified that the BO is really contingent on the BAs which have not yet been sufficient to initiate formal consultation. It is a phased process. The BAs will provide the description of the projects and who is covered. The Service will evaluate those in the context of the species' biological needs. How the species needs will "mesh" with the proposed documents and activities needs to be determined.
  - In response to a concern that the Service will redescribe or summarize the information in the BAs into the BO, it was shared that the original documents will probably be included as appendices. Also, the Program will have a chance to provide reviews and corrections if a summary is done.
  - Reclamation reiterated its commitment to share the draft BO with the EC.
  - In a brief outline of the Draft BO schedule, it was shared that once the BAs are accepted and formal consultation is initiated, there is a 135 day period in which the Draft BO will be issued.
- *2003 BO Extension:* There is language on page 110 of the current 2003 BO that states "Consultation must be reinstated prior to the expiration of this biological opinion to ensure continued compliance with sections 7 and 9 of the ESA." The Service is interpreting this to mean that as long as formal consultation has been initiated prior to February 28<sup>th</sup>, there will be an automatic extension of the 2003 BO until the next BO is completed. This interpretation needs to be confirmed through agency solicitors, but it is language in the 2003 BO and that document has been through several legal reviews and has been implemented for 10 years now.

### **Discussion and Resolution of Comments Received to Date**

- *Program Document:* The recent changes from the November 21<sup>st</sup> version of the Program Document were reviewed at the last EC meeting. As the framework document with general descriptions on the RIP structure, the Program Document explains the linkages between the Long-term Plan (LTP), annual work plans, action plans, etc. It also addresses how each would operate and be updated. Two sets of comments were received during the last round. The Program Document focus group will be meeting this afternoon to address those comments. The intent is to work through the issues and have a refined final draft document posted on January 10<sup>th</sup> as a read ahead for the January 17<sup>th</sup> EC meeting.
  - As mentioned previously, there are a number of appendices to the Program Document that are not yet complete; but the Program Document itself should be in fairly complete shape.
  - One member raised the concern that the recent Service comments on the documents appear to diverge from the agreements reached this past summer. More specifically, the concern relates to the agreement that the compliance metrics would be developed collaboratively with all signatories. The perception is that the Service is now taking the position of "yes, but the Service will have to do its own thing, separate from the RIP."
    - It was responded that the intent has always been for the compliance metrics to be developed *by the EC* as a group but the Service has a regulatory responsibility to oversee the sufficient progress and has to confirm that there is not a jeopardy situation every year *based on the application of those metrics*. That analysis has to be done completely separate from the RIP.
  - Another member raised the concern (or need for clarification) regarding the Service's comment on the verification procedure for Section 7 compliance that "... [this may] result in the need for additional consultation apart from the programmatic BO." The Program Document recognizes that actions that are part of the proposed action would be covered and if in the future, one of those actions needs confirmation, it would be covered by the BO.
    - It was responded that if an action has been analyzed, proposed take has been issued, and it has been consulted over, there should be no reason to reconsult. It is assumed that comment might have been in reference to ensuring clarity with what is proposed in the action.

- *RIP Action Plan:* Two sets of comments were received on the last round of review for the RIP Action Plan. The focus group has not yet met to review those new comments. There are still a lot of placeholders in the RIP Action Plan as far as commitments, approvals, and water management matters. The Action Plan is basically a subset of the LTP in that it considers all the actions and activities that could be addressed in the near term (5 years). The next step is for the group to work on costs and schedules for the Action Plan. Even though they haven't met recently, the team has assignments so the work is continuing. Patrick Redmond and Deb Freeman have drafted sufficient progress metrics recommendations that correspond to the identified actions in the Action Plan. These have not yet been reviewed by the focus group yet. The focus group will continue and it is assumed that the RIP Action Plan will be in a final draft state in January, once the latest round of comments has been addressed.
  - Attendees were informed that there is also a Minnow Action Team that is looking at the water situation, habitat situation, species situation, etc. in an effort to plan for next spring. This year is a critical time and a successful spawning and recruitment is essential. The Minnow Action Team has somewhat superseded the Action Plan development but it is recognized that this is a critical period for the minnow and the planning has to be in place before spring.
  - It was requested that the Minnow Action Team provide a presentation to the EC on its recommendations early next year. The team is considering a number of options but until the runoff forecast is available it will be challenging to determine the specifics on what has to be done and how.
  - It was also requested that the Minnow Action Team develop a set of contingencies "if A, then B" or a "do-loop" describing the range of options that might be possible. It was responded that the team is already working on such a flow chart but more information is needed on the biological needs and the expected hydrology.
  - It was commented that there are a "lot of moving parts" and having a process in place is necessary. But it needs to be understood that the water supply scenarios are "low" and choices will have to be made. It may take getting really creative. It was pointed out that how water is used in the early part of year could impact availability in the later part of the year.
- *Cooperative Agreement/Principles of ESA Consultation:* It was clarified that there are 2 Cooperative Agreements. One is the agreement with the Service that establishes the RIP. The other is Reclamation's contracting document to secure a Financial Management Entity (FME).
  - In response to a question on the financial presentation at the November EC meeting and any attempt to "close the loop on the apples to oranges", it was shared that the next steps or path forward has not been discussed. Although some of the issues might be worked out as the 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Management is brought on board. Reclamation has also committed to sharing their records.
    - In response to the request that the Corps provide similar information, it was shared that the Corps' authority precludes them from providing funds to any kind of 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Management support. Their authority covers the types of participation that the Corps has historically taken part in.

#### **Review Revised RIP Document and Activity Schedule**

- Yvette McKenna briefly highlighted the minor changes to the RIP Document and Activity Schedule since November 30<sup>th</sup>.
- *Additional Changes Discussed During the Meeting:*
  - The Corps will be added to the BA supplemental submittal row with their intended date of January 15<sup>th</sup>.
  - The Service will have "T + 30" days to issue a letter of response to the submitted BAs. Hopefully the letter will initiate formal consultation which starts the 135 day "clock" for consultation. However, the content of the Service's letter will be based on the sufficiency of the BAs.
  - The February 28<sup>th</sup> expiration for the 2003 BO will be added.

- The Minnow Action Team presentation of recommendations to the EC will be scheduled for the February/March timeframe.
- A row will be added indicating that the April 1<sup>st</sup> runoff forecast might impact the Minnow Action Team's recommendations.
- *Changes and Upcoming Deadlines for the RIP Document Schedule*
  - Receipt of the Service's Draft Minnow Biology Needs "white paper" is a key "trigger" for moving forward.
  - The proposed Final Draft Program Document will be posted online January 10<sup>th</sup> as a read ahead for the January 17<sup>th</sup> EC meeting.
  - Comments on the RIP Action Plan are due no later than January 7<sup>th</sup> in order for the Final Draft Action Plan to be posted online by January 10<sup>th</sup>.

### **RIP 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Subcommittee Management Feedback on Draft Cooperative Agreement for Financial Management Entity and SOW**

- The Program Management Subcommittee (PMSub) was tasked with reviewing Reclamation's Draft Cooperative Agreement. It was clarified that there are 2 Cooperative Agreements. One is the agreement with the Service that establishes the RIP. The other is Reclamation's contracting document to secure a Financial Management Entity (FME). This discussion pertains to the latter.
  - The intent with the review was to determine if the Cooperative Agreement was in concert with how the RIP was to be managed. If there were discrepancies, the group was to make suggested edits for consistency.
  - At the December 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, the PMSub had begun making extensive changes to the Cooperative Agreement because the document only discussed the first year instead of covering the full transition to a RIP. Reclamation's representative at that meeting clarified that Reclamation can only put out bids for money that is currently "in hand" and cannot include future steps or future monies. The current Cooperative Agreement (at \$225,000) is limited to providing for the securing of the FME, Executive Director, Science Coordinator, and a secretary.
    - Reclamation suggested that a preamble or objectives statement be included to explain the intended "phased implementation" of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Management. Those phases are:
      - (1) Capacity Building – hiring the entities and positions in FY13;
      - (2) Transition to an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Management in FY14 – training period for hired positions and beginning to take over the management of the Program;
      - (3) Full implementation (of 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Management) in FY15 –
        - This phased approach provides time for the Program and Reclamation to figure out how the money will be transferred to the FME.
        - Solicitors have expressed concerns over the potential "dangling the bait" of promised future work and more budget. To address this concern and make sure that the intended approach is clear, it had been suggested that a preamble or objectives statement explain that this specific Cooperative Agreement is limited to Phase I; any details on Phase II and Phase III are informational only and not a binding agreement or inducement of future work.
- The PMSub is seeking guidance (not a formal decision) to continue on the outlined phased approach to the FME Cooperative Agreement and transition.
  - In response to a question on authorizing legislation, the EC discussed that Reclamation believes they have sufficient authority through existing legislation to do the Phase I Cooperative Agreement to hire the Executive Director; however, they do not believe they have authority at this point (with existing legislation) for the Secretary of the Interior to transfer money for on-the-ground projects to the FME to implement the annual plans.

- Existing legislation most likely covers Phase I and Phase II but not Phase III, according to Reclamation's current understanding. However, other agencies think the existing legislation might actually cover Phase III as well. These details will have to be worked out either through internal agreement and/or through Congress.
  - Reclamation clarified that the concern is not with the language for the funding of the Program, but with the contractual authorities and federal acquisition regulations that would need to be "tweaked" in order for Reclamation to transfer the funds to a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party FME. Reclamation does not have the agreements to release the money to a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party management.
    - In the San Juan program, the parties reach agreement and provide Reclamation with the direction – then Reclamation implements the procurements.
    - In the Platte program, each entity providing funds uses their own contracting mechanism. The funding is pooled, but the contracting isn't pooled.
    - One member suggested reviewing the 638 Tribal Authorizations for other contracting options or contributions.
- The PMSub would like to know if the EC is in agreement with the committee continuing on the current path even with the potential risks to eventually implementing Phase III. The PMSub recommendation is to move forward with the phased approach by initiating the capacity building phase this year and trust that there will be resolution (one way or another) by Phase III.
  - It was requested that the FAR clauses and contracting responses (from Reclamation's contracting office) on the Draft FME Cooperative Agreement be provided to the PMSub no later than January 7<sup>th</sup>, 2013. This would give the PMSub 3 days to address the responses and post the revised document on January 10<sup>th</sup> as a read ahead for the January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013 EC meeting. The PMSub was open to addressing contracting comments via email (and tracked changes) for any members who would be unavailable to attend a January 7<sup>th</sup> PMSub meeting on January 7<sup>th</sup> at 2:00pm at MRGCD.
  - With no objections, there was general agreement from EC participants for the PMSub to continue on the current path of a phased approach to the implementation of a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party RIP management.

### Update on Contracting

- The EC was reminded that Reclamation has encountered a contracting "bottleneck" as a result of audit findings and response implemented.
  - *Genetic Studies*: The genetics monitoring will be issued as a grant for one additional year. The RFP should be out soon. It was prevalidated and scheduled for a 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter award.
  - *Population Monitoring*: The population monitoring has been assigned a contracting specialist and there should be no gap in monitoring.
  - *Administration and Technical Support*: As of December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2013 there will no longer be any GenQuest or Tetra Tech support services. This includes note taking and facilitation. The acquisition package has been put together and sent to the contracting officer. Reclamation is aware of the urgency. Non-federal agencies and others are being asked to provide interim/temporary note taking support for any January (and maybe February) meetings. The work group meetings have been scaled back so that hopefully the note taking can be covered in the interim.
  - *The Service's Interagency Agreements (IAs)*: Reclamation and the Service are working to consolidate all the Service's work into two IAs. There will be one for Ecological Services and one for the Fisheries activities. Both draft proposals have been received and preliminary comments on the ES proposal have been submitted to the Service.



- *Spawning Monitoring and Egg Monitoring in Canals:* The Fisheries Office declined the Egg Monitoring in Canals project so it has been combined with the Spawning Monitoring for FY13. The draft scope has been submitted to the Science (ScW) work group for comments.

### **Platte River RIP Adaptive Management Plan – State of the Platte**

- The Platte River RIP has recently received an adaptive management report at their December 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting. This report highlights how adaptive management is effectively implemented and being used in other programs.
  - In a brief background, it was shared that the Platte program was negotiated during a time when the species needs and best management were hotly contested. There were contests to the federal permitting and interstate litigation. It was evident that they were not going to be able to solve some key issues as a condition of the program. They recognized that if they wanted a program, they would have to put it together notwithstanding the disagreements. They took the approach that all at the table were to reserve thinking and positions on the scientific and technical disputes and to identify the key questions that would need to be solved as they moved forward. Together, they identified 10 significant questions related to potential management activities, potential species response, and allocation of program resources.
    - In framing these questions, they took the time to have them formulated by their technical advisory committee who reached consensus on the phrasing. The questions were then sent to their independent science advisory committee and finally approved by their governance committee. This process gets buy-in on the results because there has been agreement at each level within the program.
    - These questions are being analyzed through the adaptive management approach.
- In a brief review of the report, it was pointed out that one question has been answered conclusively; 4 questions remain totally unanswered; and others are trending positively or negatively based on current information. The effective understanding of management takes time – this explains one of the reasons why there are not more conclusive answers yet. This report reflects the first 5 years of implementing the program.
- The purpose in sharing this report was to provide an example of how decisions are being documented and how information is being synthesized and utilized in other programs.

### **Meeting Summary**

- In a brief meeting summary, Reese Fullerton (facilitator) reviewed the highlights from today's meeting.
  - The revised schedule was reviewed and updated. Yvette McKenna will send out the updated version.
  - The November meeting minutes were approved with no change.
  - The Final Draft Program Document will be available for EC decision at the January meeting. The Final Draft RIP Action Plan may also be available.
    - Comments on the revised Final Draft RIP Action Plan are due by January 7<sup>th</sup>.
  - The Minnow Action Team was asked to provide an “if/then” type flow chart; the Minnow Action Team will be on the February EC agenda for a presentation of recommendations.
  - Any water management issues or matters for consideration for the Engineers Advisors (in anticipation of the March 21<sup>st</sup> Rio Grande Compact Commission meeting) should be sent to Rolf Schmidt-Petersen before their January 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.
  - Reclamation will continue working with their regional office to determine what “tweaks” can be made to their procurement to allow for release of funds to a 3<sup>rd</sup> Party FME.
  - Reclamation's contracting office comments on the Phase I (capacity building) Cooperative Agreement are due no later than January 7<sup>th</sup>.
  - The PMSub will continue moving forward on a phased approach to the transition to a RIP, starting with the capacity building Phase I and hiring of Executive Director and FME.

- The RIP Action Plan focus group will incorporate tasks within the Action Plan that address the phased approach for the RIP 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Management. The group could consider the cost and scheduling of these tasks as well.
- It's been a busy year; but a lot of progress has been made. The end is in sight.

### Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

### Announcements

- Database Management System (DBMS) will soon be available to the public. The Public Information and Outreach (PIO) work group is drafting a press release for after the holidays. The press release will be sent to the EC co-chairs for approval to announce.

### Next Scheduled EC Meeting – January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013 from 9:00am to 1:00pm at Reclamation

- Following the normal scheduling, the March 21<sup>st</sup> meeting would conflict with the Rio Grande Compact Commission meeting that same day. The March EC meeting was scheduled for March 28<sup>th</sup>.

### Executive Committee Meeting Attendees December 20<sup>th</sup>, 2012, 9:00 am to 12:00 pm

#### Attendees:

#### *Representative*

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Seat</i>
Brent Rhees	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	Federal co-chair
Estevan López (P)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	ISC
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
Mike Hamman (P)	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation	BOR
Rick Billings (A)	Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority	ABCWUA
LTC. Gant (P)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	USACE
Matthew Wunder (P)	NM Department of Game and Fish	NMDGF
Frank Chaves (P)	Pueblo of Sandia	Sandia
Matt Schmader (P)	City of Albuquerque	COA
Cody Walker (P)	Isleta Pueblo	Isleta
Eveli Abeyta (P)	Santo Domingo Tribe	Santo Domingo

#### *Others*

Yvette McKenna (PM)	Bureau of Reclamation
Ali Saenz	Bureau of Reclamation
Mary Carlson	Bureau of Reclamation
LeAnn Towne	Bureau of Reclamation
Rhea Graham	Bureau of Reclamation
Jennifer Faler	Bureau of Reclamation
Josh Mann	Bureau of Reclamation
Chris Shaw	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Grace Haggerty	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Rolf Schmidt-Peterson (A) (via phone)	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Amy Haas	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Deb Freeman (via phone)	for NM Interstate Stream Commission

Ann Moore (A)	NM Attorney General's Office
Susan Bittick	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Danielle Galloway	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Michelle Mann	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
William DeRagon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Ryan Gronewald	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Kris Shafer (A)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Beth Pitrolo	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Benjamin Tuggle	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Lori Robertson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jennifer Bachus	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Oetker	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Janet Bair	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jessica Tracy	Pueblo of Sandia
David Gensler	MRGCD
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD
Patrick Redmond	for MRGCD
Kyle Harwood	City of Santa Fe/BBD
Herman Quintana	Santo Domingo Tribe
John Fleck	Albuquerque Journal
Mark Lawler	UNM Geography
Reese Fullerton	GenQuest (Facilitator)
Marta Wood	Tetra Tech (Note Taker)