

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
June 18th, 2015 – 9:00am to 11:30am

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

Decisions

- The May 5th, 2015 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.
- With a quorum present and no objections voiced, the EC opted to not include additional species in the RIP at this time.
- With a quorum present and no objections voiced, the EC postponed the next meeting until September 17th, 2015.

Actions

- Signatories are encouraged to email Mick Porter with agency representatives (and contact information) for participation in the Adaptive Management meetings (expected to start in August).
- Signatories are encouraged to read/review the Draft BA, the previous monthly meeting notes, Program Documents, etc. in preparation for upcoming discussions and decision items pertaining to the transition to a RIP.

Requests/Recommendations

- The EC approved the Program Document Subgroup (PDS) to proceed with several tasks:
 - *Cooperative Agreement*: the PDS will revise/update the language in the Draft Cooperative Agreement to include (1) clarification of the signatory issues (government entities only) and (2) clarify (specify) the Cooperative Agreement's commitment to implementation pursuant to the Program Document;
 - It was requested that the Cooperative Agreement be written as simply/minimally as possible with the goal of making it as non-prescriptive as possible.
 - *Phasing of the RIP Establishment/Implementation*: The PDS will review and update all program documents to address the scheduling/phased approach – the expectation that the Cooperative Agreement will be signed within 1 year of the issuance of the Final Biological Opinion and tasks on RIP process and implementation, including working through sufficient progress, will be accomplished within 3 years.
 - *Interim Program Management*: the PDS will (1) update/revise all program documents with clarified terminology referring to “Interim Program Management” (while preserving the desire to transfer to authentic 3rd Party Management) to describe the current process and to (2) clarify that the Executive Director will be dedicated exclusively to the Program Management; and (3) draft language specifying a formalized feedback EC loop that includes, at a minimum, quarterly review of the Executive Director/Program Office.
 - *Additional Species*: There will be no action on the inclusion of additional species at this time. Additional species can be added at the direction/discretion of the EC at any time. This topic could be revisited at the September EC meeting, if needed.
 - *Budget/Oversight Committee*: The PDS will refer to today's EC discussion to consider the comments and concerns regarding the suggestion to form an Oversight Committee and the roles/responsibilities of the Budget Committee. The PDS will particularly focus on the organizational structure (top down?) and provide recommendations on this topic at the next EC meeting.

- *RIP Goals:* The PDS will wrestle with the suggestions to revise the RIP goals (suggested to be more recovery-focused by including language on self-sustaining populations) and will provide recommendations/suggestions.
- *Remaining Items:* The PDS will provide red-line suggestions for the EC to consider on any remaining items that may need updating/revisions. The language of the Draft BA will be referred to while drafting any suggested changes (particularly for the hydrologic objectives).

Announcements

- It was shared that the USGS Mesohabitat Investigation Report is out and available on the USGS website (at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2015/5025/> or search by title: *Physical Characteristics and Fish Assemblage Composition at Site and Mesohabitat Scales over a Range of Streamflows in the Middle Rio Grande, New Mexico, Winter 2011–12, Summer 2012*).
- A “courtesy” draft BA was posted to the Collaborative Program database website yesterday. You must be logged in to access the document. The Draft BA is available as a courtesy copy to the EC – formal comments are not being solicited at this time.

Next Meeting: **September 17th, 2015 from 9:00am to 1:00pm at Reclamation;**

- There are many pending activities that should be completed/resolved over the next several months. And there are many activities that will require additional agency time – submittal of the Final BA, draft BO process, Adaptive Management meetings, hopefully the Fish Monitoring Workshop, etc. With this in mind, the next EC meeting is scheduled for September.
- Tentative agenda items: (1) Updates/status on BA/BO; (2) Report out on the Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) workshop – if completed in August; (3) review of Program Document Subgroup revisions/updates to (a) the Cooperative Agreement; (b) Program Documents; (c) Oversight and Budget Committee recommendations; (d) recommendations on RIP goals; (e) etc.

Upcoming Dates and Deadlines:

- July 1st – CC meeting, 9:00am to 11:00am at Reclamation
- July 7th – PDS meeting, 1:00pm to 4:00pm at Reclamation
- July 14th – ScW meeting (HRW members to be invited), 9:00am to 12:00pm at ISC
- July 15th – PDS meeting, 9:00am to 12:00pm at Reclamation
- July 16th – PDS meeting, 9:00am to 12:00pm at Reclamation
- July 28th – PDS meeting, 1:00pm to 4:00pm at Reclamation
- ~~July 14th – HRW meeting; CANCELLED~~
- ~~July 16th – EC meeting; CANCELLED~~
- August - Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) 3-day Workshop
- August – Adaptive Management kick-off meeting

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 no changes.

Approval of the May 5th, 2015 EC Workshop Meeting Summary:

- The May 5th, 2015 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with no changes.

Agency Roundtable:

- *Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation):*
 - Contracts are progressing through the process – the Genetics Peer Review and the Fish Monitoring (CPUE) Workshop are both on track to awards. The Program and Science Support (PASS, previously 3rd Party Management) is targeted for award early next year.
- *Hydrology Update:*
 - El Nino is predicted to continue through the year – hopefully resulting in continued rain and a strong monsoon season.
 - The San Juan Project is at a 50% allocation. Flows from Colorado are holding steady; a June allocation could be possible if the rains continue.
 - Article VII is back in effect so all water is being passed out of El Vado. During the period that Article VII was not in effect, a full amount was stored for the District. This was twice as much water as predicted. The District is in full operations and is expected to continue normal operations through the season.
 - Snow melt is all gone. The stream forecasts at 60-70% have exceeded all expectations.
- *U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE or the Corps):*
 - The USGS Mesohabitat Investigation Report is out and available on the USGS website at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/sir/2015/5025/> (or search by title: *Physical Characteristics and Fish Assemblage Composition at Site and Mesohabitat Scales over a Range of Streamflows in the Middle Rio Grande, New Mexico, Winter 2011–12, Summer 2012*).
 - The Adaptive Management contract was awarded to GeoSystem Analysis, Inc. This competitive contract was awarded as best technical/best price value.
 - Several agencies (and their specific representatives) have been identified for participation in the Adaptive Management meetings. If your agency is interested and has not yet done so, please email Mick Porter with agency representatives (and contact information).
 - The meetings are expected to start in August.
 - In response to a question on the assumed time requirements for Adaptive Management meetings, it was shared that this is a 2-year contract and the intent is to have several all-day meetings for the first ~6 months. Meetings are expected to decrease after that. However, it will be up to the contractor to determine the needs and oversee the process.
 - The Corps will continue monitoring habitat sites over the next few weeks of expected higher flows. Recently, 33 silvery minnow were detected: 6 marked, 27 unmarked.
 - Once flows subside, the in-channel monitoring will resume.
- *NM Interstate Stream Commission (ISC):*
 - ISC has also been monitoring sites but the data is still preliminary. Roughly, about half of the fish have been wild so hopefully those will be identified as last year's fish.
 - The potential strength of this El Nino is being predicted to possibly match that of the 1940s - which is the strongest on record (floods of 1941-42 wiped out the middle valley).
 - There has been a lot of continued effort to get the Draft Biological Assessment (BA) out. On June 9th, ISC made a number of commitments toward the BA; those have been attached to the Draft BA.
 - The Commission was asked to commit to continuing priorities for a 15-year period, subject to appropriations. They approved; this is a huge step in terms of committing that far into the future.

- *Species Update:*
 - *Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (minnow) Density:*
 - In April 2015, the estimated density of minnow (overall in the Middle Rio Grande [MRG]) was 0.2 minnow/100 m² and in May, the estimated density of minnow (overall) was 0.1 minnow/100 m² (per ASIR).
 - Catch density at five sites in the Angostura Reach, in April was ~ 0.2 minnow/100 m² (or ~18 fish per acre) and in May was ~0.5 minnow/100 m² (~ 8 fish per acre; per Austring).
 - *Minnow Eggs:*
 - Between April 20 and June 15, 2015, a total of 13,049 RGSM eggs were caught and reported to the RGSMegg listserv: <https://www.fws.gov/lists/listinfo/rgsmegg>.
 - Broken out by reach:
 - Angostura: ~ 1% of the total egg catch (71 eggs)
 - Isleta: ~ 4% of the total egg catch (543 eggs)
 - San Acacia: ~ 95% of the total egg catch (12,435 eggs)
 - 70% of the eggs (in each reach) were caught between May 6th and May 21st.
 - *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (flycatcher):*
 - Protocol training for flycatchers occurred May 13th and 14th. Several flycatchers were observed during the field portion of the training.
 - Surveys began May 15th and the second survey period has now started and will continue until June 24th.
 - Preliminary detection numbers from Reclamation's monitoring effort so far this summer are generally looking better than they did in both 2014 and 2013 at approximately the same time of year.
 - The third survey period will be from June 25th – July 17th.
 - Please note that the data shared in the handout are preliminary numbers only.
 - *Yellow-billed Cuckoo (cuckoo):*
 - The first cuckoo training was held June 9th and 10th. The second training session will be held June 24th and 25th. The next training session is full with a waiting list. If anyone can no longer attend, please contact vicky_ryan@fws.gov as soon as possible.
 - Surveys for cuckoos began June 15th and will continue to August 15th.
 - The draft Economic Analysis for proposed cuckoo Critical Habitat (and additional changes) is anticipated in September 2015, with a final rule anticipated December 2015.
 - *New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse (mouse):*
 - Surveys at the beginning of the month found 6 mice on the Bosque del Apache NWR.
 - *Tamarisk Beetle (beetle):*
 - The northern beetle (moving south) can be found at the confluence of the Rio Puerco and Rio Grande.
 - The southern beetle (moving north) can be found near Leasberg Dam (Rincon area).
 - Even though the salt cedar in Albuquerque looks very green, the beetle is still present there.
 - In response to a question on the hybridization between the 2 beetles, it was shared that some hybridization has been observed in Texas. There have also been

some observations that they are starting to feed on “avail” plants which are in the salt cedar family.

- *Litigation Update:*
 - About 1 month ago, WildEarth Guardians (WEG) filed a 3rd amended complaint. The draft complaint contained changes that included one added paragraph, one revised paragraph, and other areas with clarification. The federal defendants and others were concerned with the potential for delay to the pending Motions to Dismiss. The federal defendants consented to the amended complaint with the condition that it would not cause additional delay. WEG agreed and filed notice that the amendments would not delay the court addressing the Motions to Dismiss.
- *Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD or District)*
 - The year is turning out better than expected. The District was able to store almost twice the amount of water originally hoped for. With all the rain, the demand has been lighter as well.
 - There is still the chance that drying will occur this summer but the District is optimistic that they will be able to continue normal operations through the season.
 - The Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Drain Outfall monitoring project will be out early next week. Hopefully, there will be an award by early July in order to beginning monitoring by mid- to late July.

Draft Biological Assessment (BA) Update:

- A “courtesy” draft BA was posted to the Collaborative Program database website yesterday. You must be logged in to access the document. Please note that this Draft BA is available as a courtesy copy to the EC – formal comments are not being solicited at this time.
- Partners include the District, ISC, and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). Partner commitments have grown recently.
 - Please note that Part 2 of the Draft BA has not been posted yet. It will be posted upon completion, hopefully no later than June 26th.
- The Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) has been included in the Draft BA. Reclamation and partners are making the timeline suggestion that (1) the Cooperative Agreement be signed within 1 year after the Final Biological Opinion (BO) has been released and (2) the RIP process and implementation (including documents revised and in place, annual processes, and sufficient metrics) be completed within 3 years.
 - Compared to the presentation given at the April EC meeting, all the information is still intact although the commitments have grown since then.
- Regarding the BO Duration Document, the separate file version is out-of-date and no longer aligned with the current Draft BA document. The updated Duration Document can be found in Part 5 of the Draft BA.

Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) Workshop Update:

- It is anticipated that the workshop contractor will begin work by the end of June. The intent remains the same: hosting the 3-day workshop in late August. The timing of the workshop will be dependent on the availability of the experts participating on the panel.
 - Concern was expressed that if the experts are unable to make the August timeframe, then it could be likely that the workshop would have to be delayed until fall (to accommodate any professors).

Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) Discussion:

- At the direction of the EC, the Program Document Subgroup (PDS) has met several times since the last EC meeting. Consistent participation has marked very productive sessions. Agencies participating include: Reclamation, MRGCD, the Corps, the Service, and the state.
- *RIP Transition and Implementation: Advantages and Constraints*
 - A) Advantages:
 - *Consistency:* consistency with the direction from the EC and the investment of effort dating from August 2009;
 - *New Direction:* the EC wanted to mark a new direction of advancing efforts toward species recovery; and doing so with a sound, scientific foundation;
 - *Mechanism for ESA compliance:* ESA compliance that can garner the support and involvement in species recovery efforts by the broad group of water managers and stakeholders; and
 - *Expanding the forum for participation:* providing the forum for increased participation and contributions for folks that may or may not need the ESA compliance (ex. Corps).
 - B) Constraints (issues that need to be resolved and addressed as part of the RIP moving forward):
 - *BI. Cooperative Agreement (CA):* the Department of the Interior (DOI) has instructed that the CA needed to establish the RIP can only be entered into by governmental agencies (ESA Section 4).
 - This will require a change in the signatories to the Cooperative Agreement that will establish the RIP, but will not limit participation in the RIP. Participation in the RIP can be comprised of signatories to the CA, EC representatives, and other participants.
 - The CA establishes the RIP but doesn't impact how it conducts its business which is done through the Program documents.
 - The CA entered into by governmental entities would establish the RIP pursuant to the Program Document that specifies the governance protocols and operations.
 - "Governmental entities" refer to "...an agency, instrumentality, or other entity of Federal, State, or local government (including multijurisdictional agencies, instrumentalities, and entities)."
 - Based on this definition several current signatories would be excluded from signing the CA but could retain EC membership through the Program Document (examples include Bosque Ecosystem Monitoring Program [BEMP], Assessment Payers Association [APA], University of NM [UNM], NM Department of Agriculture [NMDA], NM Department of Game and Fish [NMDGF], and other Non-Governmental Organizations [NGOs]).
 - Subdivisions include agencies that have elected office/officials - ISC may or may not be a political subdivision of the State; MRGCD is unquestionably a subdivision as are the municipalities.
 - The NM governor would have to sign the CA for all the State agencies (ISC, NMDA, NM Attorney General's Office [NMAGO] are under that governorship).
 - The no objections voiced, the EC directed the PDS to revise/update the language in the Draft Cooperative Agreement to include (1) clarification of the signatory

issues (government entities only) and (2) clarify (specify) the Cooperative Agreement's commitment to implementation pursuant to the Program Document.

- It was requested that the Cooperative Agreement be written as simply/minimally as possible with the goal of making it as non-prescriptive as possible.
 - It was clarified that additional Memorandums of Agreement (MOA) or Memorandums of Understanding (MOU) will not be needed under this process (see notes from 2011). The CA establishes the RIP and the Program Documents explain how the RIP is to be governed including participation and signatories.
- *B2. Phased Approach For RIP Establishment And Implementation*
- It is anticipated that the RIP will be identified as an ESA compliance vehicle in the upcoming BO [pending] for Reclamation's consultation. Reclamation and partners are recommending the RIP be formally established by the signing of the Cooperative Agreement within one year following issuance of the BO, and that steps needed to fully transition to the RIP as specified in a RIP Implementation Schedule be implemented within three years following issuance of the BO.
 - Steps to full implementation include (but are not limited to):
 - Hiring of Executive Direction and Science Coordinator; establishing the Adaptive Management Team under the RIP and establishing other essential implementation teams as needed; refining the Action Plan as appropriate; updating and implementing the annual Work Plans; Annual reporting; etc.
 - With no objections voiced, the EC directed the PDS to review and update all program documents to address the scheduling/phased approach (signing of the CA within 1 year of the issuance of the Final BO and tasks on RIP implementation, including working through sufficient progress, will be accomplished within 3 years).
- *B3. Independent Program Management Issue(s)*
- Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 37.104 prohibits federal funding to be used for personal services, such as program management and contract execution, by a non-Federal management entity or employee unless specifically authorized by statute to do so.
 - Reclamation's Collaborative Program authorization does not include language to this effect. Therefore, Reclamation is unable to contract for program management activities with direct oversight by the EC at this time. *This interpretation comes from the highest level of acquisition staff in Reclamation.*
 - The recommended approach is that Program Support Services will initially be contracted by Reclamation with Contracting Officer (CO) oversight. The position would not be under direct supervision by the EC but EC directives and feedback would be a part of the process, it just has to go through the CO.
 - New authorizing legislation (or potentially a different interpretation of current authorizations) could result in the ability to manage the RIP 3rd Party Management structure

- through an independent financial management entity in the future.
- Nevertheless, the running of the RIP will be done pursuant to the process and protocols specified in the Program Document including input from the EC.
 - Concern was expressed over potential staff turn-over with the CO position. In response, it was shared that the CO does not do the “day to day” work, but a Contracting Officer Representative (COR) would be the “hands-on” individual. The intent is to have a primary and alternate COR who is very familiar with the Program. The Executive Director will have to work closely with the COR(s) and they would work with the CO to take action on any issues.
 - It was suggested that the EC consider terminology changes to avoid confusion over the management (not truly a 3rd Party) of the Program: Interim Program Management.
 - A concern was expressed that the Executive Director’s job description be clearly specified as restricted to the Program Management (and not able to be pulled off to do other Reclamation work).
 - Additionally, the Program Documents will need to be revised to clarify the EC’s role/ability to provide the Executive Director tasks and directions.
 - At the request of EC members, draft language specifying a formalized feedback EC loop that includes, at a minimum, quarterly review of the Executive Director/Program Office will be included in the Program Documents. This is one way to provide Reclamation with necessary input on the implementation of the Program and enhance the accountability without violating the current governmental process.
 - It was noted that EC input/feedback can occur at any time, but a formal process avoids possible “inundation” by individual EC members and provides the vehicle to express expectations to the Executive Director.
 - With no objections expressed, the PDS will (1) update/revise all program documents with clarified terminology referring to “Interim Program Management” (while preserving the desire to transfer to authentic 3rd Party Management) to describe the current process and to (2) clarify that the Executive Director will be dedicated exclusively to the Program Management; and (3) draft language specifying a formalized feedback EC loop that includes, at a minimum, quarterly review of the Executive Director/Program Office.
 - *B4. Newly Listed Species*
 - Neither the mouse nor cuckoo was addressed in the Program Documents endorsed in 2013. Reclamation’s BA addresses these species in full; and the BO will be addressing them.
 - The current recommendation is that the RIP also be revised to include those species.
 - Adding these additional species would require document revisions to the Long-Term Plan, Annual Work Plans, etc.

- It was clarified that as long as RIP activities do not impact these species, then there is no real concern with not including them at this time; however, it will be case-by-case basis that depends on the particular overlapping activities.
 - The EC can always amend this decision in the future. The Program Document, as currently written, specifies that the EC can include additional species if/when it chooses to.
- Concern was voiced that neither species has a recovery plan at this time. Similarly, addition of new species at this time could potentially result in a shift of focus and energies.
- It was suggested the EC postpone action until the recovery plans are available. Committing now, to the unknown, is not advised.
- *Updates to RIP Program Documents*
 - On the last page of the read ahead, 10 points of potential updates to the Program Document were identified by the Program Document Subgroup.
 - *RIP Oversight Committee*
 - A “Budget Subcommittee” is described in the existing Program Document – designed to serve in an oversight function on funding contributions to meet the goals of the RIP.
 - The Service and Reclamation have suggested that the description of the group be adjust by (1) renaming the group as an “Oversight Committee” and (2) to extend the role in which it operates by specifying that if the EC has an unresolvable issue, that issue gets elevated to the Oversight Committee for resolution (decision(s) would be final). The recommendation is that the group would function per the existing membership – Reclamation, the Corps, the Service, the state, and MRGCD.
 - Concerns shared, included (but are not limited to):
 - The Oversight Committee would be small, and not inclusive;
 - It appears to operate very much like the existing CC, which is tasked with consensus but offers all members a chance to participate;
 - As necessary, the EC already has options to create ad hoc groups for specific issues and can exercise specific control over participation (collaboration) based on the specific issue;
 - Defaulting to the “Big 5”, could result in less reason for folks to participate in the EC;
 - Reverting to this option could likely result in more conflict;
 - What is the hierarchy in terms of Program structure? Who would be answering to whom? Doesn’t this supplant/undermine the EC’s authority as the decision making body?
 - The by-laws already address this concern; the true issue is making sure the EC follows this process, should the need arise;

- The by-laws contain outline the specific process about timelines and voting procedures in order to avoid creating an exclusionary decision body;
 - It would also require a new set of by-laws to include the new committee and possible committee charter;
 - The purpose of the Budget Subcommittee was to be the mechanism to ensure the Program adheres to activities that contribute to the science-base (instead of funding science that is not being used for decisions);
 - The Science Coordinator was to fill this role but remains within the existing governance as this individual will be answerable to the EC;
 - Responses to concerns included (but are not limited to):
 - This type of structure exists in other programs, but is really implemented;
 - There are cases of NGOs and other hired to keep boards and decision bodies “on track”;
 - The purpose is to have the process in place and clearly defined if/when the EC gets “hung up” or “stuck”;
 - The by-laws could be carefully reviewed to address any DOI concerns (ex. the state has 4 voting entities);
 - The understanding is there should be a process in place should the EC ever have a point of “paralysis” – where they have exhausted their protocols, so at their request, a specified group takes the issue; this is not to be in lieu of the EC.
 - *RIP Goals*
 - Issues/concerns with the existing RIP goals were discussed by the EC at the May meeting. The Service has made a request that the RIP goals be revised to put a greater emphasis on achieving self-sustaining populations in the MRG. This has the potential to be a harder issue than it might first appear.
 - Those goals were negotiated a while ago, prior to the endorsement of the documents. Self-sustainability might be integral to recovery but it is not the leading articulation of the goals – which is a general move toward recovery.
 - A concern was voiced regarding how self-sustainability is measured, how it is defined, and what it means specifically?
 - With no objections voice, the EC tasked the PDS with “wrestling” with the suggestions to revise the RIP goals (to be more recovery-focused by including language on self-sustaining populations) and they will provide recommendations/suggestions
 - *Other Identified Potential Updates*
 - Please review the other identified areas in need of potential updates. Unless the EC provides the instruction to “hold off”, the PDS will proceed to develop red-line edits to the identified documents.

- The language of the Draft BA will be referred to while drafting any suggested changes (particularly for the hydrologic objectives).
- The PDS did not address the concerns on the potential Program name/title. The concern is that “RIP” has a very specific meaning to the Service and there are implications for the Corps’ authorization.
 - The PDS and EC spent a lot of time characterizing the Program transition and new title. It is captioned to show this is still the Collaborative Program and the RIP is the *structure* through which it will function.
 - DOI has expressed concerns about what will be different about the RIP – not necessarily the name itself, but what are we going to be doing differently? Will the pace/energy really change? How will the effectiveness of the Program be addressed?

Meeting Summary:

- In a brief summary, Deb Freeman reviewed the meeting decisions and assignments:
 - With no objections, the PDS was tasked with revising the language in the CA, RIP Phased Implementation, and RIP management.
 - Regarding the CA – red-line changes will be made to address the governmental entity signatory issue and “tighten up” the CA’s commitment to implementing the RIP per the Program Documents;
 - Regarding the Program Management, the PDS will (1) suggest clear terminology such as references to the “Interim Program Management” to describe where the Program is at now; (2) to address how the management will be dedicated exclusively to the Program; and (3) build in a formalized feedback EC loop (review of expectations) with a quarterly review;
 - Regarding the Phasing of the RIP, the PDS will address the recommendation/expectation that the CA be signed within 1 year (from the issuance of the final BO) and that the tasks on implementation schedule will be accomplished within 3 years. This includes tasks to work through sufficient progress;
 - Regarding Additional Species, there will be no action at this time. This can be revisited as needed;
 - Regarding the suggestion to form an Oversight Committee, the PDS will refer to today’s EC discussion to consider the comments and concerns regarding the suggestion to form an Oversight Committee and the roles/responsibilities of the Budget Committee. The PDS will particularly focus on the organizational structure and provide recommendations on this topic at the next EC meeting;
 - Regarding the RIP Goals, the PDS will “wrestle” with the suggestions to revise the RIP goals (to be more recovery-focused by including language on self-sustaining populations) and will provide recommendations/suggestions;
 - Regarding the remaining items, the PDS will provide red-line suggestions for the EC to consider.

Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

Next Meeting: September 17th, 2015 from 9:00am to 1:00pm at Reclamation;

- There are many pending activities that should be completed/resolved over the next several months. And there are many activities that will require additional agency time – submittal of the Final BA, draft BO process, Adaptive Management meetings, hopefully the Fish Monitoring Workshop, etc. With this in mind, the next EC meeting is scheduled for September.
- Tentative agenda items: (1) Updates/status on BA/BO; (2) Report out on the Fish Population Monitoring (CPUE) workshop – if completed in August; (3) review of Program Document Subgroup revisions/updates to (a) the Cooperative Agreement; (b) Program Documents; (c) Oversight and Budget Committee recommendations; (d) recommendations on RIP goals; (e) etc.

Executive Committee Meeting Attendees
June 18th, 2015

Attendees:

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Seat</i>
Rick Billings (A)	Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority	Non-federal co-chair
Rolf Schmidt-Petersen (A)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	NMISC
Kris Schafer (A)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Corps
Jennifer Faler (P)	Bureau of Reclamation	Reclamation
David Gensler (P)	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	MRGCD
Michelle Shaughnessy (P)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	FWS
Janet Jarratt (P)	Assessment Payers Association of the MRGCD	APA
Matt Schmader (P)	City of Albuquerque	COA
Kim Eichhorst (P)	Bosque Ecosystem Monitoring Program	BEMP
Frank Chaves (P)	Pueblo of Sandia	Sandia
Tom Turner	University of New Mexico	UNM
Bill ?	NM Attorney General's Office	NMAGO

Others

Jim Wilber (A)	Bureau of Reclamation
Ali Saenz	Bureau of Reclamation
Leann Towne	Bureau of Reclamation
Susan Bittick (A)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Michael Porter	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Dave Campbell	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Vicki Ryan	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Joel Lusk	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Steward Jacks	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Kevin Cobble	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/BdA
Grace Haggerty (A)	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Michael Springstead	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Chris Shaw	for NM Interstate Stream Commission
Deb Freeman	for NM Interstate Stream Commission
Kyle Harwood	BBD/City of Santa Fe
Rick Carpenter	BBD/City of Santa Fe
David Williams	Senator Tom Udall's Office
Jessica Tracy (A)	Pueblo of Sandia
Anne Marken	MRGCD
Patrick Redmond (A)	for MRGCD
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD
Marta Wood	Alliant Environmental (note taker)