

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Workshop
May 5th, 2015 – 8:00am to 2:00pm

Bureau of Reclamation
555 Broadway NE, Suite 100
Albuquerque, NM, 87102

Decisions

- The April 2nd, 2015 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.
- With a quorum present and no objections voiced, EC members endorsed the 2015 MAT Recommendations.

Actions

- Reclamation will send a Program-wide email announcement when the Draft Biological Assessment is posted to the database. complete
- Ali Saenz will determine if there is the possibility of including an ASIR monitoring/egg collection presentation for the EC. If yes, this presentation will be added to the CC's recommended presentation list.
- Reclamation will provide a point-of-contact and logistical lead for the Program Document working group. complete
- The Program Document working group will produce a document outlining the advantages/constraints for continuing as a collaborative program versus a formal RIP; the document is due to Ali Saenz no later than Wednesday, June 10th (in order to be a read ahead for the June 18th EC meeting).
- If the Draft BA (to be released next week; refer to Sections 4 and 5) does not provide the requested clarification on performance metrics, Jennifer Faler will distribute the "BO Duration Document" to EC members.
- Any questions/feedback on the Section 7 Consultation or RIP Implementation (presented April 2nd, 2015) should be directed to the appropriate agency (Patrick Redmond for MRGCD; Grace Haggerty or Rolf Schmidt-Petersen for ISC; Leann Towne for Reclamation; Joe Jojola for BIA). If you are unsure who to contact, contact Leann Towne.

Requests/Recommendations

- It was shared that some folks are experiencing issues when trying to print the EC agendas from the database.
- It was requested that an ASIR monitoring/egg collection presentation be added to the CC's recommended EC presentation list.
- It was suggested that the Adaptive Management process consider the following:
 - (1) flexible timing (for monitoring); specifically, what are the potential benefits of monitoring based on runoff/peak flows compared to a "set calendar" date? This flexibility should also be considered in the development of future scopes of work; and
 - (2) Can the Middle Rio Grande (MRG) actually support a self-sustaining minnow population? If yes, the Program can move forward with proposed activities; but if no, the goals of the Program may need to be reassessed - or determine if/what can be done to improve the MRG to eventually get to the place of supporting a self-sustaining minnow population.

- It was requested that the Program Document Subgroup reconvene to formally revisit/revise/update the Program documents (approved July 2013). Specific considerations included (in no particular order):
 - Consideration of Program title (not a formal RIP, so confusion ensues with RIP in the title);
 - Recommend, specifically, how to characterize the recovery aspect (ex. change name, terminology throughout document, etc.);
 - Update benchmarks, milestones, criteria, schedules, etc.;
 - Update, if appropriate, the hydrologic objectives;
 - Revisit the outreach section in the Program document – include gathering and sharing information from/with the public;
 - Goals of the Program, including:
 - Clarification that recovery will be focused on the geographical area of the Middle Rio Grande only;
 - Consider the suggestion to revise goal from “conserve and contribute to recovery” to language specifying “development of a self-sustaining minnow population.”
 - Clarify/define the Service’s definition of a “self-sustaining population.”
 - Any modified goals needs to be approved by the EC and incorporated into Program documents by October, to prevent any delays in the BO process.
- It was requested the Program Document Subgroup also produce a document outlining the advantages/constraints for continuing as a collaborative program versus a formal RIP; the document is due to Ali Saenz no later than Wednesday, June 10th (in order to be a read ahead for the June 18th EC meeting).
 - The group should consider “on-going trends” or “politics” of what projects/programs get funded and which experience more struggles.
- It was recommended that the Program and Science Support (PASS; a.k.a. 3rd Party Management) agency provide expertise/focus on obtaining additional funding. Staff should include experienced grant writers. Additionally, the new Executive Director (and office) should have a focus on public outreach. Future scopes of work and contracts should include public presentations/outreach as a part of the project.
- The EC provided direction that the standing Program groups (including ScW, HRW, and CC) are to continue meeting as a vehicle to staying involved and engaged until the new Program management and Executive Director are operational and able to restructure/reorganize. Agencies and work group members are encouraged to (1) “cross-pollinate” as a way to stay informed about many of the projects/work being accomplished outside of the Program; and (2) work on establishing a public connection.

Announcements

- The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is joining Reclamation and partners in the consultation under Reclamation’s BA.
- Jennifer Faler has accepted the Albuquerque Area Manager position at Reclamation.

Next Meeting: **June 18th, 2015 from 8:00am to 4:00pm at Reclamation;**

- Tentative agenda items: (1) Review/Discuss the *RIP Document Subgroup* document; (2) Decision – move forward as a Formal RIP or “Recovery Collaborative Program” under the existing authorities; (3) Decision - process agreement on addressing/moving forward with Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) Workshop outcomes; (4) Draft BA – discussion? Comments? Concerns?;

Upcoming Dates and Deadlines:

- May 6th – CC meeting, 9:00am to 11:00am at Reclamation (subject to rescheduling)
- 2nd week of May – Reclamation’s Draft BA released
- May 19th – ScW meeting, 10:00am to 12:00pm at ISC Cancelled
- May 19th – HRW meeting, 12:30pm to 3:30pm at ISC Cancelled
- June 18th – EC meeting, 9:00am to 12:00pm at Reclamation
- Late August - Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) 3-day Workshop

Meeting Summary

Introductions and agenda approval: Rick Billings brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. A quorum was confirmed and the agenda was approved with (1) a reordering of the Database Update to occur under the Agency Round Table updates and (2) updates on the Program and Science Support (formally known as 3rd Party Management) contracting to occur in a closed session.

Approval of the April 2nd, 2015 EC Meeting Summary:

- The April 2nd, 2015 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.

Agency Roundtable:

- *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE or the Corps):*
 - The Corps recently completed monitoring at their 10 restoration sites. This is the first year that the Corps has completed a spring sampling. The sampling data reflects the adult (pre-spawning) population before any recruitment – thus the wild minnow sampled were likely recruited from last spring.
 - An award for the Adaptive Management Contract is anticipated this month or next. One of the first tasks will be meeting with the EC. Details on tasks orders, deliverables, and schedules can be provided at a future date after the contract has been awarded.
 - Last week, the Corps distributed letters to signatories asking for prospective members to participate in the Adaptive Management Review Team to inform the updating of the Adaptive Management Plan and related tasks such as prioritizing hypotheses, consideration of additional endangered species, etc.
 - In response to a question regarding any “patterns” observed in the wild minnow, it was responded that there were no real trends or patterns observed. In fact, the minnows were the most widely distributed that has been seen in recent years, with no really high concentrations anywhere.
 - In an update on the Database Management System (DBMS), it was shared that progress is being made. Forms and processes are being revised to allow anyone to request uploads and enable more people to upload documents directly to the DBMS (ex. work group co-chairs). The Corps hopes to be able to continue supporting the DBMS for another 5 years.
- *Litigation Update:*
 - All necessary responses and paperwork were filed before the court by deadline on Thursday. It is now up to the court to rule on the Motions to Dismiss and the case will continue based on the court’s decisions.
 - The Corps could potentially be out of the lawsuit if the court grants the Motion to Dismiss. However, outstanding “issues” means Reclamation’s case will continue even if MRGCD’s Motion to Dismiss is granted.
- *Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation):*
 - Reclamation expects to have the draft Biological Assessment (BA) available next week. Please be advised that this is a draft version and Reclamation reserves the right to amend the document as needed or necessary to address any significant contributions or changes.

The final BA is expected to be submitted to the Service in June. This process allows for transparency and feedback on the initial draft.

- *Hydrology Update:*
 - The recent rains have been much needed, but unfortunately the 2,200 cfs flow out of Ottowi on April 2nd was most likely the spring peak flow. It is possible that this storm may trigger some spawning.
 - Snowpack is mostly depleted. There is no recent streamflow forecast but it is expected to be reduced by 20% since the last prediction.
 - Due to the different accounting methods, the exact amounts of stored water apportionments are currently unknown. Approximately 55,000 ac-ft has been stored in El Vado and it is assumed that Prior and Paramount (P&P) will be around 20,000 ac-ft, Emergency Drought Water will received about 8,400 ac-ft, and the District will have 14,000 to 20,000 ac-ft.
 - More than likely, there will not be a full allocation on the San Juan again. This leaves the Middle Rio Grande (MRG) in a poor starting situation for next year.
- *Fish and Wildlife Service (Service):*
 - The issuance of the Biological Opinion (BO) will be dependent on the completeness of the Final BA. Hopefully, all necessary information will be included and the voluntary conservation will be sufficient – if so, the BO process can be relatively quick. But if the BA is not complete, there could be a longer negotiation process.
- *Species Update:*
 - Attendees briefly discussed the interpretation that the minnow population is in “serious trouble” based on the October census densities of 0 (zero). A “0” value basically means that the minnow population is “below” the detection level. In other words, the population is at a critical point where the numbers are below our ability to detect them during sampling.
 - The augmentation program is thus very currently very critical to the survival of the species.
 - The status of the species is extremely poor but it remains “endangered” since there is no federal designation between “endangered” and “extinct.”
 - The Service believes that implementation of the “4 strategies” can/will improve the status of the species and begin work toward a self-sustaining population.
 - The “4 Strategies” are: (1) conservation storage; (2) fish passage; (3) implementation of the hydrologic objectives; and (4) focused habitat restoration (to accomplish hydrologic objectives with less water).
- *City of Albuquerque (COA or the City):*
 - Along with ABCWUA, the City has constructed several bankline features below Paseo del Norte designed for 1,500 to 2,000 cfs flows. Both agencies are excited to see site response to the recent “higher” flows compared to the designed intent. There has been some minnow presence in some of these features and it will be interesting to see if the fish utilize them again this year.
- *NM Interstate Stream Commission (ISC):*
 - ISC continues diligently working with Reclamation and MRGCD to complete the draft BA while also transitioning and informing new leadership on ESA issues.
 - ISC is coordinating with the Service to get minnow to the Los Lunas Silvery Minnow Refugium (LLSMR).
 - The small flow spike last week apparently precipitated some spawning down in San Marcial (as evidenced by the discovery of some minnow eggs).

Minnow Action Team (MAT) Update

- The MAT met twice in April to discuss forecasts (snow, precipitation, and runoff) and refine the spring and summer recommendations. Given the storage levels, hydrology, and seasonal conditions, there are no real options for creating a spawning pulse this spring. Any rains in May or June could trigger spawning in smaller “batches.” The MAT recommendations for 2015 are (*please refer to the handout for additional details*):
 1. *Seek To Maintain The 2003 BO Flow Targets For Dry Year (Article VII) Conditions.*
 2. *Support Efforts To Collect RGSM Eggs For Captive Propagation Facilities.*
 3. *Seek To Create And Maintain Perennially Wet Refugia In The Isleta And San Acacia Reaches*
- It is recognized that the water management agencies have discretion and that the MAT recommendations are just that – recommendations. After a brief review of past process, attendees agreed that EC endorsement of the recommendations is a positive thing.
 - With a quorum present and no objections voiced, EC members endorsed the 2015 MAT Recommendations.
- In response to a request for clarification, the term “operational jiggle” was loosely defined as a coordinated brief suspension of diversions at MRGCD facilities designed to produce a temporary “doubling” of flow in the river with the aim of hopefully triggering some spawning. It occurs by “shifting” the river from one side to the other and results in a ceasing of diversions for ~12 to 24 hours.
 - It is a relatively “small action” but it can generate a pulse that can actually make quite a difference to the fish in poor water years.
 - A small amount of water can be stored behind the San Acacia Diversion Dam in order to “boost” the small peak downstream.
 - This operation precludes the Albuquerque Reach as too much manipulation would be required and it wouldn’t produce enough change in flow stage. The operation in Isleta and San Acacia is basically to support egg production and collection for the facilities.
 - It was pointed out that in many years, little spikes in flow can result in the production of a lot of minnow eggs, but the recruitment is minimal. Eggs are salvaged to maintain genetic diversity within the facilities.
 - In response to a question regarding the proportion of eggs salvaged compared to the total number of eggs in the river, it was shared that such a calculation is hard to do. It is likely that the total number of eggs could be in the millions but only 10,000 to 20,000 are usually collected.
 - In response to a question on the flexibility of when egg monitoring can begin, it was shared that ASIR usually starts monitoring at the end of April. However, the concern is that late April might be too late for some years. It was responded that the vast majority of eggs aren’t detected until later (mid-May). A faint detection now and then doesn’t reflect when the vast majority of minnows actually spawn. Temperature is a critical condition.
 - The suggestion is to have flexibility within the scope of work to trigger egg monitoring to specific water conditions/flows instead of a set time/assumed date.
 - With the intent being to collect as many eggs as possible, the point is to concentrate efforts when the vast majority is expected. The information collected during monitoring can be useful, but the objective is to collect the eggs for the facilities.

Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) Workshop Update

- The Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee (TPEC) should be convened by the end of May with the expectation of an awarded contract in June. The workshop is on track for completion in August.

Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) Discussion

- Many things have changed and evolved since July 2013. There is an outstanding question of “where are we as a Program?” There is a need for all-inclusive discussions on how things have changed (or remained the same) since July 2013.
- **Program and RIP Documents:**
 - The last date on the draft Program (and RIP) documents is July 2013. The conditions and situations are different now – 5th year of drought, no water in storage, etc. The benchmarks and milestones, as recorded in the Program documents are probably old and outdated.
 - The Program documents need to be formally updated and made current. The Action Plan is most likely no longer accurate nor complete as it doesn’t include everything that is being proposed – it was originally intended as a RIP document and not a 3-partner BA document.
 - Discussion on the Sufficient Progress Metrics is pending the Fish Monitoring Workshop outcomes. The transition process had a 1 to 2 year timeframe to outline and establish the sufficient progress metrics.
 - Some attendees expressed the concern with having to sign on to the RIP before the criteria is well known and agreed to.
- **What does it mean to be a RIP?:**
 - The Service provided a brief description of the formal RIP process that Department of Interior (DOI) has to follow. The members of the RIP have to sign a formal Cooperative Agreement (CA) document that forms the basis of the RIP. (The CA is the legal document that provides the foundation of the RIP.) The RIP will have documents (bylaws, etc.) describing how the program functions, the milestones to achieve, etc.
 - It is necessarily to have high ranking officials sign the agreement and appoint representatives through their agencies (ex. governors of NM, CO; Secretary of the Interior; etc.). At that point, the structure can be flexible – such as having voting members and non-voting members.
 - For the San Juan River RIP, each entity has one vote. So the state has a single vote that is shared between all the state agencies. The majority vote rules decisions.
 - It does take a lot of briefings and negotiations to make sure the appropriate high ranking officials are informed and able/willing to sign for their agencies. However, most participating agencies are pretty keen on getting things moving and established. Once the documents have been internally vetted and approved by the RIP agencies, they don’t usually receive too much additional review/scrutiny. There may be some “legal” review and changes but no real substantive changes are usually expected.
 - A concern was voiced that while the MRG Collaborative Program was operating under the Program’s authorization, it is not really a “boiler-plate” RIP and a formal RIP receives its own authorization.
 - It was shared that it was envisioned that the CA will be the vehicle that is defined under the law but that once signed by the appropriate parties, our specific Program documents would define the operation. Those documents set out the specifics on how we will govern ourselves, the decision-making process, who holds voting seats, etc. All of that remains intact. The CA references and adopts all the Program documents.

- Concern was reiterated that the explicit authority from congress is designated to Reclamation and the Corps for the Collaborative Program EC. Transitioning to a RIP, under RIP authorities, would prohibit the Corps from participating to the level it has.
 - While it could be a nomenclature/language issue, several members were very cautious that 2 years ago it was agreed to pursue recovery under the auspices of the Program’s legislation given the formal definition of a RIP and the fact that we alone cannot actually recover the species due to the geographic location and conditions. Great care was taken during the drafting of the Program documents (database ID: 6058) to address these concerns:
 - *“The Executive Committee (EC) of the Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program (Collaborative Program or Program) has decided to advance the Collaborative Program through the structure of a recovery implementation program (RIP) to further the interests of efficiency and increased emphasis on species recovery and Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance. Hereinafter, the Collaborative Program shall perform its functions through implementation of the RIP.” July 2013.*
 - Some members shared the opinion that the intent was never to move toward a “formal” RIP but instead shift focus to recovery and systemic activities.
 - It was clarified that the RIP would not be responsible for recovering the species throughout its entire range, but to do our part for recovery within the geographic scope we are responsible for - to achieve a self-sustaining population here, in the MRG. It takes several RIPs working together to accomplish full species recovery.
 - Attendees discussed the funding and support issue – becoming a formal RIP opens funding for Reclamation and the Service. The RIP would be a separate line item in the Reclamation budget selected from a larger recovery-funds pool and there is more flexibility given to the use of those funds.
 - The question was put forth if any of this (to RIP or not to RIP) would delay the BO. It was responded that no extra delays would be expected as the Service is not going to be specifically addressing the RIP in contribution to alleviating jeopardy. The timelines for the RIP won’t be specified but the action plan, scheduling, authorities, commitments, etc. will be acknowledged in the conservation proposals.
- The next steps should include: (1) Program Document Subgroup reconvene to formally revisit/revise/update the Program documents and provide a list of Pros/Cons to transitioning to a formal RIP compared to operating under the existing Program authorities; (2) determine the path forward – as a formal RIP or not; and then (3) then move forward on the CA.
- **Positives supporting a formal RIP (as captured during discussion):**
 1. it is unknown if the CA (in and of itself) will provide/open grant opportunities as a funding source;
 2. the dual goals that make these programs successful - moving toward recovery in a cooperative sense and the opportunity of a simplified ESA compliance;
 3. the RIP can be fashioned in such a way to help achieve the BO;

- **Positives supporting a recovery-focused Collaborative Program:**
 1. Reclamation has been fairly successful on stabilizing the Program's budget embedded within the full recovery line item – RIP support/funding might not have a huge effect for Reclamation;
 2. a “Collaborative Program” Cooperative Agreement – is allowable/doable and it might be possible to utilize grants through a Cooperative Agreement for the Program;
 - a. it was clarified, however, that Reclamation cannot use grants as a funding vehicle because of the “public benefit” piece and the authority from congress is basically interpreted as “you are told to save the species.”
 3. concern that the timeline of a formal RIP (federal process) could potentially impact the timeline of the final BO;
 4. a formal RIP would have to have the recovery benchmarks built into the Program documents;
 5. the conservation measures are outlined in the Action Plan and are included in the BA;
- **For Consideration:** it is hard to say which funding opportunity would be most beneficial:
 - (a) it is harder to cut a large Reclamation budget item (like recovery) meaning that funding the pieces should be relatively “stable” but
 - (b) if “in favor” for the time, a RIP could secure larger budgets but may be susceptible to the changes in support.
- ***Broad Coverage:***
 - As mentioned previously, many things have changed significantly since 2003 and even within the last 5 years. There are a number of BOs in the MRG and they all have existing consultations.
 - The state's supplement to the BA includes reference to the existing BOs with mention of what else has to be potentially covered. This leads to the actions from the state. Also, the contemplation of adding additional flow on that effect leads to a streamlined process in the future. If both those “pieces” are in place, then we can say we have broad coverage – everyone could be covered. Some details are very explicit while others are not.
 - EC agencies will have an opportunity to review the Draft BA and determine if everything that needs to be covered is actually covered. Thus, it behooves everyone to closely examine the draft document prior to the final submission to the Service.
- ***Program and Science Support (previously known as 3rd Party Management):***
 - Contractors were excused and in a closed session EC members discussed the draft scope for the Program Science and Support (PASS) contract. Please contact an EC member for details on this discussion.
- ***Sufficient Progress:***
 - A while back, a draft “BO Duration Document” was shared; it included information similar to sufficient progress metrics. It might be a worthwhile exercise to review the various types of performance metrics that could be at play and discuss those.
 - One of the “goals” with the new BO is to set up a consultation in “perpetuity.” With that in mind, there is support for a 15-year “sunset” period divided into 5-year increments of review/milestones. To accomplish this, there is a need for an annual or bi-annual performance evaluation. *It was noted that the biology of the fish will drive operations and adaptive management on an annual timeframe.*

- It was questioned if sufficient progress metrics would be needed if there isn't to be a formal RIP (i.e., not relying on the RIP for compliance). While the sufficient progress terminology is derived from a formal RIP that serves as the mechanism for ESA compliance, the Service would still need assurance(s) that tasks are being completed and progress is being made. The Program would need to prepare periodic reports to the Service on the status of the activities/accomplishments under the Program.
- The RIP isn't ready today to serve in the role of the sole "conservation measure." The Service will have terms and conditions in the BO that will be used as the metrics.
 - Concern was expressed that the development of the sufficient progress metrics – or "the rules by which the Program is evaluated" – has always been understood to be developed by consensus.
 - Additional concerns and questions include: (1) what would be the "standards" or "criteria" that would allow the BO to operate in perpetuity?; (2) if there are Reasonable and Prudent Alternatives (RPAs), then we will have the same expected end results that the Program currently has and how will adaptive management be "worked" into that situation?
 - It was shared that a potential process for development of sufficient progress metrics will be included in the draft BA.
- ***Direction for Current and Future Workgroups:***
 - Reorganization of the Program is scheduled to occur after the establishment of the Executive Director and Science Coordinator. Some of the restructuring is addressed in the Program Document.
 - Currently, there is the opinion that there are too many work groups that need to come under the Adaptive Management Team as "ad hoc" committees when needed for specific tasks or objectives.
 - It was recommended that the existing and function groups (Science work group, Habitat Restoration work group, Coordination Committee) continue as is until more of the pending work (ex. the Fish Population Monitoring Workshop, Final BA and BO) has been completed.
 - This is viewed as one way to keep technical staff engaged and discussions going and address the concerns about losing the expertise and institutional Program knowledge.
 - In addition to regular meetings, it was suggested that agencies and work group members "cross-pollinate" as a way to stay informed about many of the projects/work being accomplished outside of the Program (ex. ISC's habitat restoration work; Reclamation's retooling of the River Maintenance Program; etc.).
- ***Public Awareness and Support:***
 - Attendees briefly discussed roles of new management, including a key component of focusing on and securing additional funding (grants) and public support.
 - There is a need to partner with the public to garner attention and support.
 - It was suggested that public outreach (including public presentations) could be included in future contracts as part of the project and making connections to "the value added." New direction includes being accountable to the tax payers.
- ***The Service's "4 Strategies"***

- The Service believes that implementation of the “4 strategies” can/will improve the status of the species and begin work toward a self-sustaining population.
 - The “4 Strategies” are: (1) conservation storage; (2) fish passage; (3) implementation of the hydrologic objectives; and (4) focused habitat restoration (to accomplish hydrologic objectives with less water).
- Please note that these are not interpreted as BO compliance, but part of the Program’s focus on recovery. They are what this Program should be addressing on the river for the species.

Meeting Summary:

- In a brief summary, Reese Fullerton (facilitator) highlighted key items from today’s meeting:
 - The April 2nd meeting notes were approved for finalization with no changes.
 - Agencies provided updates and information during the Round Table:
 - Reclamation and partners intend to submit a draft BA next week;
 - the DBMS is making progress toward more efficient processes;
 - The litigation is pending the court rulings on Motions to Dismiss;
 - The minnow population trends are concerning. Continued egg collection, increased adaptive management, flexibility, augmentation, and refugial habitat are necessary to the survival and eventual recovery.
 - The forecasted conditions indicate the water situation is poor. MRGCD clarified what is meant by “operational jiggle.” It is one of the only adaptive management options this year.
 - The vast majority of minnow eggs are expected in mid-May even though “faint detections” can occur earlier.
 - The Fish Population Workshop is targeted for August. This is an important milestone as it informs many things in the consultation and RIP – including timelines for goals, descriptions of self-sufficiency, etc.
 - The EC has a future agenda item to address moving forward with the Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) Workshop outcomes and establish an agreed process.
 - The EC discussed the Cooperative Agreement and the process toward establishing a formal RIP versus establishing a recovery-focused program under existing authorities.
 - The Program Document subgroup is asked to (1) review/revisit the Program documents and (2) to outline benefits to a RIP versus a “recovery focused” Collaborative Program. The pros/cons document is to be ready for the June EC meeting.
 - The EC will be kept apprised and involved to the extent possible for the Program and Science Support (PASS; formerly 3rd Party Management) award and Executive Director hiring process.
 - Workgroups will continue to be active – to keep engaged and keep informed about activities within the Program and within individual agencies. When the Executive Director and Science Coordination have been hired and established, then reorganization will occur and groups will be tailored to support the activities in the Action Plan and BO.
 - Public outreach is really critical. The activities of the Program will improve the health of the river system and support will grow.

Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

Next Meeting: June 18th, 2015 from 8:00am to 4:00pm at Reclamation;

- Tentative agenda items: (1) Review/Discuss the *RIP versus Collaborative Program* comparison document (drafted by the Program Document subgroup); (2) Decision – move forward as a Formal RIP or “Recovery Collaborative Program” under the existing authorities; (3) Decision - process agreement on addressing/moving forward with Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) Workshop outcomes; (4) Draft BA – discussion? Comments? Concerns?;

Executive Committee Meeting Attendees - Members					
May 5 th , 2015					
	Name	Affiliation	Seat	Session	
				AM	PM
1	Rick Billings (A)	Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Non-federal co-chair	ABCWUA	✓	✓
2	Brent Rhees	Bureau of Reclamation	---	✓	✓
3	Rolf Schmidt-Petersen (A)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	NMISC	✓	---
4	Grace Haggerty (A)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	NMISC	✓	✓
5	Kris Schafer (A)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	COE	✓	✓
6	Jennifer Faler (P)	Bureau of Reclamation	Reclamation	✓	✓
7	David Gensler (P)	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	MRGCD	✓	---
8	Patrick Redmond (A)	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	MRGCD	✓	✓
9	Wally Murphy (A)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	FWS	✓	✓
10	Janet Jarratt (P)	Assessment Payers Association of the MRGCD	APA	✓	✓
11	Matt Schmader (P)	City of Albuquerque	COA	✓	---
12	Steve Farris (P)	NM Attorney General's Office	NMAGO	✓	---
13	Ryan Ward (P)	NM Department of Agriculture	NMDA	✓	✓
14	Jessica Tracy (A)	Pueblo of Sandia	Sandia	✓	---
15	Matthew Wunder (P)	NM Department of Game and Fish	NMDGF	✓	✓
16	Alan Hatch (P)	Pueblo of Santa Ana	Santa Ana	✓	---
Non-Members and Others					
17	Jim Wilber (A)	Reclamation		✓	✓
18	Ali Saenz	Reclamation (Program Analyst)		✓	---
19	Stacey Stanford	Reclamation		✓	✓
20	Carolyn Donnelly	Reclamation		✓	---
21	Leann Towne	Reclamation		✓	✓
22	Michael Porter	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		✓	✓
23	Susan Bittick	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		✓	✓
24	William DeRagon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		✓	---
25	Beth Pitrolo	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		✓	✓
26	Dave Campbell	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		✓	✓
27	Susan Jacobsen	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		✓	✓
28	Joel Lusk	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		✓	✓
29	Vicky Ryan	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service		✓	✓
30	Joe Jojola	Bureau of Indian Affairs		✓	---
31	Brooke Wyman (A)	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District		✓	✓
32	Rick Carpenter	BBD/City of Santa Fe		✓	✓

33	Kyle Harwood	BBD/City of Santa Fe		✓	---
34	Deb Freeman	for NM Interstate Stream Commission (via phone)		✓	✓
35	Reese Fullerton	GenQuest (Facilitator)		✓	✓
36	Marta Wood	Alliant Environmental (Note Taker)		✓	✓

DRAFT