

**Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
September 17th, 2015 – 9:00am to 12:30pm**

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

Decisions

- The June 18th, 2015 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with a clarification change to the 3rd decision item.
- With a quorum present and no objections voiced, the EC approved the 5 Genetics Peer Review panelists.
- With some concerns voiced, the EC agreed to expand the existing Program Document Subgroup with EC member representation and decision makers in order to address the 4 outstanding issues that need resolution. The meetings will have agendas and meeting notification (invitations) provided. *Note: in abbreviated form, the 4 issues are: (1) Development of metrics & sufficient progress; (2) Oversight Committee; (3) Clarify self-sustaining in terms of Program goals; and (4) two newly listed species*

Actions

- Ali Saenz will post the yellow-billed cuckoo presentation to the Program's website.
- It is requested that any EC members that would like an agency expert/representative to sit at the table during the Fish Population Monitoring workshop to please submit resumes to Rick Billings and Ali Saenz as soon as possible.
- The existing Program Document Subgroup will develop a tentative schedule for the review/updating of the various Program-related documents.
- Jennifer Faler will develop agendas and ensure meeting notification for the Special EC Expanded Subgroup meetings.

Requests/Recommendations

- It was recommended that the existing Program Document Subgroup look at the By-laws for consistency when updating Program documents.
- With the recommendation to postpone the next regular EC meeting until the beginning of the next calendar year, the Special EC Expanded Subgroup will meet October 15th from 9:00am to 4:00pm. The regular Program Document Subgroup will continue to meet as scheduled.

Announcements

- The Fish Population Monitoring Workshop has been scheduled for Tuesday, December 8th through Thursday, December 10th. The facilitator and expert panel have been identified. The agenda is still under development but is expected to be available soon.

Next Meeting: January 14th, 2016@ Reclamation from 9am to 12 noon

With the recommendation to postpone the next regular EC meeting until the beginning of the next calendar year, the Special EC Expanded Subgroup will meet October 15th from 9:00am to 4:00pm. The regular Program Document Subgroup will continue to meet as scheduled.

- Tentative January agenda items: (1) Special EC Expanded Subgroup – updates and recommendations on the 4 Outstanding Issues; (2) Review of the Program Document Subgroup's tentative schedule of document review; (3) Updates/status on BA/BO;

Upcoming Dates and Deadlines:

- October 1 – CC meeting from 9:00am to 11:00am at Reclamation;
- October 16 – HRW Field Trip Friday, time and locations TBD
- October 23 – HRW Field Trip Friday, time and locations TBD

Meeting Summary

Introductions and agenda approval: Brent Rhees brought the meeting to order and introductions were made. A quorum was confirmed and the agenda was approved with minor re-ordering:

- The Biological Assessment (BA) update will be addressed under the Agency Roundtable and the Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) Document Subgroup update will occur before the Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) update.

Approval of the June 18th, 2015 EC Meeting Summary:

- The June 18th, 2015 EC meeting summary was approved for finalization with a clarification change to the 3rd decision item.
 - The 3rd Decision Item bullet will be clarified to "...postponed *the next* meeting..."

Agency Roundtable:

- *Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation):*
 - Jim Wilber has accepted the Albuquerque Area Office Deputy Manager position with Reclamation.
- *Hydrology Update:*
 - After a surprisingly wet spring and early summer, the Rio Grande has dried very rapidly. Approximately 14,000 ac-ft of supplemental water has been released over the last month in attempts to keep the river wet. In one month, Reclamation has released almost all the water that they were able to purchase for the year.
- *Biological Assessment (BA):*
 - The complete draft BA was submitted to the Service at the end of August 2015. Reclamation and partners will continue to work with the Service to get a draft Biological Opinion (BO) issued as soon as possible.
- *Litigation Update:*
 - In a brief review, attendees were provided with a background of the lawsuit. Back in 2014, WildEarth Guardians (WEG) filed a lawsuit alleging the Army Corps of Engineers and Reclamation had/have deficiencies within the Endangered Species Act (ESA). WEG did voluntarily dismiss anything to do with San Juan-Chama water but in June 2015 they filed a new, amended complaint. The parties involved agreed to allow the Motion to be filed as long as the existing Motions remain in place.
 - There have been no changes since the update at the June EC meeting. Currently, there are several Motions to Dismiss (for the Corps and partial for Reclamation) pending a ruling from the judge.
- *Fish and Wildlife Service (Service):*
 - The Service currently has several BAs and active consultations underway. It is expected to take several months for the Service to review Reclamation's Draft BA.
- *Species Update:*
 - *Rio Grande Silvery Minnow (minnow):*
 - Data from the July 2015 Population Monitoring Program (the most recent) provides a density estimate of 5.1 minnow/100m². The majority of the minnow

- were unmarked and young-of-year. This indicates a positive species response to the spring. Estimated catch density at five sites in the Angostura Reach (augmented fish) was 7.6 minnow/100m². The September data is not available at this time.
- From September 14 to September 15, the Service's Conservation Office was salvaging and rescuing minnow in San Acacia and Isleta.
 - *San Acacia*: ~450 minnows were collected over 5.5 miles. The majority of those were young-of-year. 52 minnow died during collection, handling, or transport.
 - *Isleta*: 3.9 miles dried and 379 minnow were collected. Again, the majority were young-of-year. 4 minnow died – 1 counted as incidental take. The 2003 BO limits take to 59. 2015 has 10 minnow counted toward take (17% toward the limit).
 - *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher (flycatcher)*:
 - Overall, flycatcher territories are down slightly this last year (20 less compared to last year). This is not a surprise given the low nest success (lowest in 20 years). In response to a question on the impact of the saltcedar beetle, it was shared that the beetle has not yet been observed in Elephant Butte.
 - *New Mexico Meadow Jumping Mouse (mouse)*:
 - The Bosque del Apache did find 6 mice during the week long survey effort. The colder conditions could be one reason for the fewer mice detected.
 - *Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD or District)*:
 - *Hydrology*: Approximately 110-115 cfs is naturally entering the valley. It is taking storage releases of approximately 610 cfs to reach a total flow of 725 cfs. Consumptive losses on the river are on the order of 120 cfs (riparian) and 20-30 cfs lost to evaporation. This is a typical condition that is seen in 2 out of every 3 years, even given the miraculously wet summer. The river would not be reaching the southern stretches (i.e., extensive drying) without storage releases. The Service is implored to consider this as they proceed through the BA review and BO development.
 - Operationally, the District is attempting to keep as much of the river wet as possible and minimize drying. The District operates under a shortage/sharing policy and not an annual allocation. Overall, it was a decent year.
 - In response to a question on diversions and efficient delivery paths, it was shared that an estimated 200 cfs is lost during the current operations. Concern was expressed that rough calculations indicates that the agricultural community is basically “donating” 400 cfs daily with no compensation. The agencies and water management entities are “paid” whereas the farmers are not in the loop and not credited or compensated. On the other hand, miles of river are remaining wet so the biology (including the minnow) and habitat have not perished. There is a delicate balancing act trying to keep the river wet in any given year and plan/prepare for the following year.
 - *NM Interstate Stream Commission (ISC)*:
 - ISC/OSE has been working on the Gold King Mine spill. While it did not touch the Rio Grande, it has taken time, attention, and effort of a number of state agencies.
 - On the Rio Grande, ISC is monitoring deliveries for compact obligations. Much of the rain in May/June/July occurred above Otowi, so they count toward compact delivery requirements. ISC will continue to monitor river flows throughout the end of the year.

- ISC continues work on several habitat restoration projects – including the Rio Rancho Phase II, San Acacia/Isleta project, including the Sevilleta restoration project.
- In response to a question on the compact obligations and potential situations, it was shared that Article VIII could be invoked next year, but it is unlikely.

Presentation: Yellow-Billed Cuckoo Range wide Status, Distribution, Biology And Threats:

- Vicki Ryan, with the Service, gave a presentation introducing the newly listed Yellow-billed cuckoo (cuckoo). *Please refer to actual presentation for additional details.*
 - *Background:*
 - There are no other birds like the cuckoo on the Rio Grande; although it is in same family as the roadrunner. These birds are about 12 inch long with a white breast, gray back and gray/chestnut wings. The tail feathers have black and white spots.
 - One-hundred years ago, the cuckoo could be found in most of the western and northwestern US (historic breeding range). Its range is now significantly limited to tiny areas in California, Arizona, and New Mexico.
 - The cuckoo is a tropical migrant traveling to South America in the winter. They arrive in the Rio Grande early to mid-June and depart mid- to late-August.
 - *Western Cuckoo listing and Proposed Critical Habitat Timeline*
 - 1998 – petition to list western cuckoo
 - 2001 – 12-month finding; listing warranted but precluded
 - 2013 – proposal to list west cuckoo as threatened October 3rd
 - 2014 – proposal to designate critical habitat August 15th
 - 2014 – cuckoo listed as threatened effective November 3rd
 - 2015 – draft economic analysis for proposed critical habitat and changes to proposed critical habitat
 - 2016 – final rule on critical habitat anticipated
 - ??? – recovery plan
 - *Critical Habitat And Primary Constituent Elements*
 - Critic habitat is all the areas that have the necessary elements for species survival: food, cover, shelter, water, nesting, etc. These areas may not necessarily be occupied at time of listing and could require management/conservation efforts.
 - Cuckoos have larger patches compared to the flycatcher. They eat big bugs considering their size: caterpillars, dragonflies, cicadas, and even tree frogs.
 - They need rivers that meander and scour and create a dynamic system with multiple age classes of vegetation.
 - *Proposed Critical Habitat*
 - For the Middle Rio Grande (MRG), critical habitat is being determined using criteria of (1) at least one occurrence of the cuckoo documented from 1998 to 2012 but (2) would have to be a pair or 2 separate appearances over 2 separate years. From that identified location (based on occurrence), the Service extended the critical habitat until (1) there was no more habitat or (2) the habitat was fragmented by more than ¼ mile.
 - *Cuckoo Habitat Characteristics – Specific To The MRG; (note: varies throughout the range)*
 - Prefers cottonwood/Goodding’s willow overstory with dense understory;
 - The exception(s) could be really tall Russian Olives but they would have to be old/established

- Cottonwoods are a significant component for foraging while nesting in Goodding's willow;
- Establish "territories" in close proximity to water;
 - But territories are huge and the proximity could be a couple miles away
- Canopy is generally 4-15 meters;
- General Rule of Thumb: if it looks like a good picnic spot, they won't be there; but if it's dense and you just don't want to go in, they might be there.
- *Status – Estimated Population Numbers (Breeding Pairs)*
 - Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Nevada, and Western Texas all have less than 10 breeding pairs.
 - California has a "decent" population with 40-50 breeding pairs in 3 areas.
 - New Mexico and Arizona have the most breeding pairs in the US with 100-155 and 170-250, respectively.
- *MRG Cuckoo Population*
 - In 2015, there were 396 total detections. This is a 24% increase when compared to 2014 detections.
 - 301 detections translated into 91 territories for the MRG.
 - *Territories versus detection:*
 - Detection: a biologist finds indication of the bird usually by vocalization, not visual. The biologist estimates where the vocalization came from and post processing is used to line up the indicator with habitat. Protocol for distinguishing the territories is based on those detections.
 - The cuckoo occupies huge territories – they can travel 1 mile daily and up to 2 miles in seasonal movements.
 - Some areas don't warrant surveys (ex. closer to urban Albuquerque). However, patches determined to be potentially suitable (might require consultation) could be examined in the future.
- *Determining Population Numbers*
 - The cuckoo is newly listed and the utilization of habitat is still being worked through: how big are the territories?; what is the overlap?; etc.
 - Telemetry data collection is very hard as these birds are smart and quick.
- *Past and On-going Threats to Habitat*
 - Water management (regulation, diversion, pumping, dams, channelization) leads to loss of river function (lack of scouring floods) and altered hydrology that favors non-native vegetation
 - Conversion of floodplains for agricultural activities (crops, overgrazing)
 - Drought and Climate change
 - Wildfire
 - Leaf Beetle
 - Pesticides
- *Cuckoo Facts About Cuckoos*
 - They feed on larger insects than any other insectivorous bird
 - They develop from egg laying to fledglings in only 17 days (rapid development for relatively large birds)
 - "Helper" males are somewhat common – juvenile male learning the "ropes" and helping young forage
 - Nests have been found between 3 and 50 feet high

- *Questions*
 - In response to a question regarding the proposed critical habitat and the difficulty obtaining information in large areas, it was shared that critical habitat may not necessarily be areas that are occupied but (1) may be important for foraging or (2) considered for management/conservation opportunities or (3) may be suitable for occupation in the future. Areas of detection signify habitat use. The Service is considering land ownership issues when determining critical habitat designations.

Introduction of the Adaptive Management Contractor:

- GeoSystems Analysis (GSA) is the newly contracted Adaptive Management Contractors. Todd Caplan and Steven Courtney were introduced. GSA will develop the operational plan, identify critical hypotheses, and develop the corresponding effectiveness monitoring plan(s).
- Over the last month, GSA has been convening assessments, meeting with many of the agencies, and gathering information on areas of agreement and disagreements. They will develop a work plan for the Corps and submit it by early October. The work plan will identify the critical hypotheses, establish schedules and timeframes, and is intended to be the blue print for the next year's work.

Fish Population Monitoring Workshop Update:

- The Fish Population Monitoring Workshop has been scheduled for Tuesday, December 8 through Thursday, December 10, 2015.
- The facilitator (Wayne Huber) and expert panel have been identified. The agenda is still under development but is expected to be available soon.
- The tentative structure is to have the expert panel seated at a U-shaped table to facilitate open discussions.
 - It is requested that any EC members that would like an agency expert/representative to sit at the table during the Fish Population Monitoring workshop to please submit resumes or biographies to Rick Billings and Ali Saenz as soon as possible so that the size of the group can be determined.
 - It was suggested that agencies consider sending experts who have background and familiarity with Catch Per Unit Effort (CPUE) processes and protocols and/or fisheries persons with experience in statistics. Others can still attend the workshop as observers.
 - Please be advised that all expert participants are expected to be available for the full 3 days.

Genetics Peer Review:

- The Genetics Peer Review contract has just been awarded; this will be a full peer review. The Science Workgroup (ScW) developed the draft Statement of Work (SOW) which was approved by the EC in 2012. An existing Service IDIQ was used to hire the contractor. AMEC was awarded the task order last week. The intent is to finish the peer review by the summer of 2016 (8 months to complete). The first task was to select 5 peer review panelists for consideration. Their resumes have been provided as a read ahead to today's meeting.
- With a quorum present and no objections voiced, the EC approved the 5 Genetics Peer Review panelists.
- It was cautioned as critical that the peer review process follow the draft Peer Review Protocols approved by EC. It was shared that the SOW incorporated those protocols into the contract.

RIP Document Subgroup Update:

- At the June meeting, the EC directed the RIP Document Subgroup to address several identified tasks. Please refer the Progress Table that was supplied as a read ahead. The left column contains Subgroup recommended program document edits and the right column highlights concerns and outstanding areas that need resolution.
- The consensus recommendations (left column) were briefly reviewed:
 - 1. *Refine RIP Agreement*
 - Also known as the Cooperative Agreement (CA), concerns were raised over the notice that CAs can only be entered into among governmental entities. Given that CAs can also be at risk for confusion with other agreements, the Subgroup recommends taking “cooperative” out of the title. Please refer to the actual red-line edits in the revised document. The subgroup also tightened up the language on page 3 that the RIP will be implemented pursuant to the Program Document protocols on governance and decision making.
 - With this approach (changing the title), there is no longer a constraint on any EC member’s ability to sign. Please note that the revisions have not yet been reviewed by attorneys.
 - 2. *RIP Oversight Committee*
 - This is one of the issues identified by the Service that needs resolution.
 - 3. *RIP Goals*
 - The Program goals are another outstanding issue that needs further discussion and decisions.
 - 4. *Update BA Reference*
 - The subgroup has worked with Reclamation to make sure the program’s documents correctly describe the BA as amended. Proposed language is found as red-line edits in the revised documents.
 - 5. *Update Program Area Footnote*
 - The subgroup consensus recommendation is to delete the footnote on page 6.
 - 6. *Update Proposed Action section of the Program Document with reference to the BA and BO*
 - This section described water use and management actions. The intent was to identify the actions that are the subjects of the consultation. In light of the lengthy BA, it is suggested this section be removed and replaced with reference to the actual document to best avoid errors.
 - 7. *Update the ESA Compliance section (section VI of the Program Document)*
 - There is a small suggested edit on page 19. The text was updated to reflect the “phased” approach for the RIP as discussed at the EC.
 - The Agreement will be signed following the issuance of the BO, thus establishing the RIP at that time. The RIP will be implemented pursuant to milestones in the RIP Implementation Schedule (3 year process) followed by formation of the sufficient progress metrics.
 - The sections on ESA compliance protocols have been shortened and streamlined but intent remains the same: ESA compliance will be available for actions that rely on the RIP as a conservation measures pursuant to this BO or future BOs. If there are individual actions within the categories covered, those individual actions can obtain coverage through their agency.

- 8. *Reference to the Hydrologic Objective*
 - The Service requested the Program Document(s) acknowledge and reference the hydrologic objectives. Suggested language has been included on page 26 in the Adaptive Management section.
- 9. *Update to Adaptive Management section*
 - The Corps has supplied a new paragraph characterizing the Adaptive management contract and process.
- 10. *Update Funding section of Program Document*
 - The subgroup recommends removing the funding section (page 31) from the Program Document. The original intent was to inform a program manager, but the information can be made available making it unnecessary in the document itself.
- 11. *Incorporate RIP Outreach*
 - At the direction of the EC, the subgroup bolstered language about RIP outreach. Proposed language can be found on page 12.
- 12. *Update and clarify Interim Program Management*
 - There is need to be clear about “interim program management” versus the actual Program and Science Support Management. Updated terminology was used through the document to make this point clearer (see pages 12-13).
- There remain 4 key issues that need to be addressed before a comprehensive version of the Program Document is ready for endorsement. In abbreviated form, the 4 issues are: (1) Development of metrics & sufficient progress; (2) Oversight Committee; (3) Clarify self-sustaining in terms of Program goals; and (4) two newly listed species.
 - In response to a question on the feedback and communication process with the Service, it was shared that the subgroup meetings have been consistently attended including a Service representative who is able to raise concerns at the subgroup level. However, there haven't been a lot of back-and-forth discussions on the outstanding issues yet.

Fish and Wildlife Service Concerns:

- The 4 identified outstanding issues are of significant concern for the Service. As such, the Service recommends a group of higher management (decision makers) of the EC to work through these issues.
 - The BA review process is likely to take months. It is probable that other concerns may arise. It was cautioned that additional conservation measures may be needed for the BO to move forward and those might need to be included in the Program/RIP documents.
- The Service is responsible for putting together an opinion of the BA and there has to be reasonable certainty in order to move forward – certainty that conservation measures will be implemented through governance (structure; ex. Oversight Committee), sufficient progress, etc. The standard has to be a Recovery Standard to be a Recovery Implementation Program.
- Sufficient progress is the Service's regulatory authority that can't be delegated.
- *Additional Species Issue:*
 - In the end, the Service has to include all the impacts to be addressed and Reclamation will have to address them. It is the Service's opinion that the best way is through the RIP; but ultimately, the impact on every endangered species has to be included, somehow, somewhere. No species can be left out. Reclamation will be responsible for all 4 species regardless if they are included in the RIP or not.

- *Sufficient Progress Issue:*
 - The Service has a separation of duties. Until the threats analysis is available, much is unknown. The jeopardy analysis is needed to identify problems, determine solutions, and to identify sufficient progress.
 - It was pointed out that there is a path forward for developing the sufficient metrics subsequent to the BO. As mapped out in the Program Document, once the RIP is established after the issuance of the BO, there is a tight timeframe for the Service to sit at the table and be satisfied with the sufficient metrics.
- *Suggested High-Level Subgroup:*
 - In response to a question regarding the specific identification of participating agencies to discuss the outstanding issues, it was brainstormed that the subgroup would consist of the Service, Reclamation, the Corps, ISC, MRGCD, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA).
 - Concern was voiced at the suggestion to have a small “subcommittee” of decision makers address the outstanding issues without larger EC representation.
 - One opinion shared was if this small group is to make the decisions or reach resolution in isolation, there really is no reason for other entities to participate in the EC. Either this is a Collaborative Program, as outlined in the Authorizing Legislation, or it isn’t. The concern is based on the opinion that with less people involved there really won’t be consensus resolution. To address this concern, it was suggested that the full EC meet to discuss the outstanding issues.
 - Any interested EC signatory can attend the subgroup meeting(s). The subgroup will report back to the full EC. This process allows for note taking (to record process, recommendations, and decisions) and progresses through the existing EC structure.
 - In terms of the suggested “Oversight Committee,” it was pointed out that the By-Laws already contain direction/process to avoid impasse.
- At the conclusion of the discussion, but with some concerns voiced, the EC agreed to expand the existing Program Document Subgroup with broader EC member representation and decision makers in order to address the 4 outstanding issues that need resolution. The meetings will have agendas and meeting notification (invitations) provided.

Meeting Summary:

- A quorum was present for today’s meeting. The agenda was approved with minor re-ordering and the June meeting notes were approved for finalization with a correction to the 3rd decision item.
- Agencies presented updates and announcements during the Agency Roundtable.
 - After a miraculously wet spring, the summer dried quite rapidly resulting in release of ~14,000 ac-ft of supplement water over the last month.
 - The BA was submitted to the Service at the end of August; partners and agencies are continuing to work diligently to get a BO issued as soon as possible but there is no timeframe estimate.
 - Minnow population numbers indicated a positive response to the spring flows this year. Rescue and salvage efforts are underway in drying areas.
- Vicki Ryan provided an introductory presentation on the yellow-billed cuckoo.
- GeoSystems Analysis was introduced as the adaptive management contractor that will oversee the Phase II of the Adaptive Management plan development.
- The Fish Population Monitoring workshop has been scheduled for December 8th, 9th, and 10th. The facilitator and expert panel have been identified. The agenda is still under development but should be available soon.
- Last week, AMEC was awarded the Genetics Peer Review task order.

- The RIP document subgroup provided an informational update on the recommended edits and language for the program documents. There are 4 open issues, identified in the read ahead chart, which will need to be addressed before a comprehensive version is available for endorsement.
- With some concerns voiced, the EC agreed to expand the existing Program Document subgroup with broader EC representation and decision makers to address the 4 outstanding issues (bullet points) that need resolution; meetings will have agenda's and notice/invitations provided.

Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

Next Meeting: January 14th, 2016@ Reclamation from 9am to 12 noon

With the recommendation to postpone the next regular EC meeting until the beginning of the next calendar year, the Special EC Expanded Subgroup will meet October 15th from 9:00am to 4:00pm. The regular Program Document Subgroup will continue to meet as scheduled.

- Tentative January agenda items: (1) Special EC Expanded Subgroup – updates and recommendations on the 4 Outstanding Issues; (2) Review of the Program Document Subgroup's tentative schedule of document review; (3) Updates/status on BA/BO;

Executive Committee Meeting Attendees September 17th, 2015

Attendees:*Representative*

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Seat</i>
Rick Billings (A)	Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority	Non-federal co-chair
Brent Rhees	Bureau of Reclamation	Federal co-chair
Grace Haggerty (A)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	NMISC
LTC Patrick Dagon	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
Matthew Wunder (P)	NM Department of Game and Fish	NMDGF
Alan Hatch (P)	Pueblo of Santa Ana	Santa Ana
Joe Jojola (P)	Bureau of Indian Affairs	BIA
Bill Grantham (A)	NM Attorney General's Office	NMAGO

Others

Jim Wilber (A)	Bureau of Reclamation
Ali Saenz	Bureau of Reclamation
Ann Demint	Bureau of Reclamation
Beth Pitrolo	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
William DeRagon	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Susan Bittick (A)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Michael Porter	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Ryan Gronewold	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Ashley Tellier	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Dave Campbell	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Vicki Ryan	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Wally Murphy	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Joel Lusk	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Johanna Roy	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Kevin Cobble	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service/BdA
Grace Haggerty (A)	NM Interstate Stream Commission
Chris Shaw	for NM Interstate Stream Commission
Deb Freeman	for NM Interstate Stream Commission
Rich Valdez	SWCA/ISC
Kyle Harwood	BBD/City of Santa Fe
Rick Carpenter	BBD/City of Santa Fe
Patrick Redmond (A)	for MRGCD
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD
Maria O'Brien	ABCWUA
Rick Shean	ABCWUA
Jessica Tracy (A)	Pueblo of Sandia
Todd Caplan	GeoSystems Analysis
Steven Courtney	with GeoSystems Analysis
Marta Wood	Alliant Environmental (note taker)