

Executive Committee Meeting
May 19, 2016

Meeting Materials:

Meeting Agenda

Meeting Minutes



Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA
Thursday, May 19, 2016
9:00am – 5:00pm
Conference Call information:
Phone 1-800-621-8611 Passcode 3137719
Location: Reclamation, 555 Broadway NE, Albuquerque, NM 87102

- | | |
|---|-------------------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF PROPOSED AGENDA* | <i>10 minutes</i> |
| 2. DECISION – APPROVAL OF April 21, 2016 EC MEETING SUMMARY* | <i>10 minutes</i> |
| 3. AGENCY ROUNDTABLE (<i>Litigation updates, Hydrologic update, Species Update, etc.</i>) | <i>20 minutes</i> |
| 4. PROGRAM AND SCIENCE SUPPORT (PASS) CONTRACT UPDATE (<i>J. Durant</i>) | <i>10 minutes</i> |
| 5. CC UPDATES (<i>R. Billings</i>) | <i>10 minutes</i> |
| 6. MAT RECOMMENDATIONS* | <i>10 minutes</i> |
| 7. POPULATION MONITORING WORKSHOP REPORT PRESENTATION
(<i>ATKINS & Hubert</i>) | <i>60 minutes</i> |
| A. DECISION – Request for Task 2 * (<i>R. Billings</i>) | |
| BREAK | <i>30 minutes</i> |
| 8. UPDATES AND RECOMMENDATIONS – RIP DOCUMENT* | <i>4 hours</i> |
| A. History (<i>J. Jarratt</i>) | |
| B. Role of the RIP in the Consultation (<i>P. Redmond & D. Freeman</i>) | |
| C. Program document report out on consensus edits | |
| D. Entity specific comments on Program Document | |
| - MRGCD | |
| - USACE | |
| - ISC | |
| - Reclamation | |
| - FWS | |
| E. RIP Milestone Schedule | |
| 9. MEETING SUMMARY | |
| 10. PUBLIC COMMENT | |
| 11. ANNOUNCEMENTS | |
| 12. DECISION – NEXT PROPOSED EC MEETING: June 16, 2016 from 9am to 12pm @ Reclamation | |

Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Collaborative Program
Executive Committee Meeting
May 19th, 2016 – 9:00am to 4:35pm
Bureau of Reclamation

Decisions

- The April 21st meeting summary was approved for finalization with acceptance of the proposed edits including a bullet format correction. One proposed edit was further revised with clarifying language that the statement was an assertion of a particular agency.
- With no objections voiced, the EC approved the Population Monitoring Workgroup to begin work on Task 2, including consideration of the feedback provided during today's meeting.
- With no objections voiced, the EC endorsed the 2016 MAT Recommendations.
- With no objections voiced, the EC agreed to change the standing (regular) meeting days to the 4th Thursday of each month, beginning in August 2016.

Actions

- Ali Saenz will provide the EC with a copy of the PASS solicitation for their convenience.
- The Population Monitoring Workgroup will meet in July to discuss and refine the approach, objectives, and actions for Task 2 (including potential inclusion of analysis of existing data).
- Ann Demint will confirm if the data purchased (Data Acquisition contract) will be provided in parts as they are completed or all at once upon the completion of the contract.
- Janet Jarratt and Patrick Redmond were recommended for participation on the PASS evaluation committee. If an alternate is needed, please contact Rick Billings to schedule a replacement. Participants were asked to plan for 2 to 3 days (depends on the number of proposals received) in late June or early July. Details will be provided as they become available.
- The Program Document Subgroup was asked to consider discussions and concerns from today's discussion as they review and update the Program Document. Key discussions and points included:
 - *Section C. Principles - new red line edit, page 2:*
 - There was general agreement that the first added sentence (*It is recognized that the RIP does not and is not intended to abrogate any legal or statutory responsibility of the members.*) was acceptable and sufficient to address the concerns previously identified regarding regulatory authorities and undelegable responsibilities.
 - Some attendees expressed the opinion that the added statement was enough to warrant the removal of the subsequent explanatory paragraphs. However, other attendees expressed the desire to have the differences and expectations with "offsetting" measures and "conservation" measures clearly identified. Discussions included roles and expectations around ESA Sections 7.A.1 and 7.A.2, and Section 4.
 - It was agreed that the paragraph marked for potential removal undergo legal review prior to retaining or omission. The paragraph in question was revised with the replacement of the first sentence with: "*The RIP, in and of itself, is not a compliance vehicle.*"
 - Concerns were expressed that the RIP could be "tied to the consultation" making it mandatory (no longer voluntary) and introducing issues for

- those agencies that are not part of the Reclamation's current consultation.
- It was noted that this discussion relates to the sufficient progress metrics/determinations and how the RIP progress is to be measured. One opinion is that only the offsetting measures should be subject to sufficient progress evaluations, not the "above and beyond" actions (conservation measures).
 - After in-depth clarification and discussion, attendees reached agreement that this issue cannot be resolved until the Draft BO, with the Service's opinion on jeopardy and offsetting measures, is available.
 - Issues of concern: Section 7.A.1 versus 7.A.2 versus Section 4; the RIP as a "voluntary" program versus "mandatory" with Section 7 implications and requirements – especially pertaining to sufficient progress determinations; the role of the RIP in the current consultation and prospectively for potential other uses (future actions, broad coverage);
- *Additional, Non-Substantive Edits:*
 - Attendees began reviewing the individual consensus edits and accepted several of the editorial corrections.
 - *Agency Comments:*
 - Attendees began review of the individual agency comments submitted and of which consensus agreement by the subgroup had not been previously achieved.
 - During review of the MRGCD suggested edit to clarify roles and duties of the Science Coordinator, several attendees expressed concern with the language regarding the "designation" of best available scientific information.
 - During review of Reclamation's suggested edit regarding the potential "decision-making" role for the Budget Subcommittee, several attendees expressed concerns that the RIP document, Bylaws, and other Program documents already very specifically capture that no one agency can be made to spend funds/contributions in any way contrary to their procedures, regulations, or against their will. Similarly, the Bylaws already outline the process to be followed to avoid impasse.
 - It was clarified that the intention of these revisions and the decision-making duties for the Budget Subcommittee is to cover any future and unforeseen "what ifs" in terms of decision delays. The opinion is that just because a specific, historic example cannot be given does not mean it wouldn't be prudent to establish an agreed-to process for the future, especially considering the long-term (many years) and science-based intentions of the Program. Outlining the process now supports the "spirit" of transparency.
 - It was also clarified that (1) this proposal on governance is really limited to the Annual Workplan (which triggers spending); all other governance remains unchanged; and (2) the default "action agencies" would be more accurately described as "funding agencies" – ISC, Corps, MRGCD, Reclamation, any agency funding activity in the Program.
 - Concern was expressed that the Program Document is very "silent" in terms of budgeting and funding. The proposed edits could introduce a disconnect without other explanations of how the RIP is expected to be funded.

Requests/Recommendations

- Following the discussion regarding the Bylaws and signatory attendance, agencies that have missed 2 consecutive meetings will be sent a Letter of Notice clarifying the attendance policy outlined in the Bylaws and indication of the next meeting. It was also recommended that the Attendance Policy in the Bylaws be reviewed and potentially updated, if determined appropriate, to address participation concerns and possible exceptions (ex. tribes).
- Regarding the Population Monitoring Workshop recommendations, some attendees requested that the 2 potential areas of identified bias (zeros from dry sites and less used mesohabitats) be discussed and possibly addressed, to the extent possible, right away – in both upcoming monitoring activities and through existing monitoring contracts (to the extent feasible and appropriate) in an attempt to get more refined information this year.

Announcements

- The Program and Science Support (PASS) solicitation was posted last night and will close Wednesday, June 22nd. Proposal evaluations can be expected within approximately 1 month from date of issuance. Reclamation will work with the EC to have 2 non-voting participants. The solicitation can be found at: www.fedbizops.gov or www.fbo.gov, solicitation number: R15PS00594
- There is a 2016 Water Summit scheduled for tomorrow, May 20th, at UNM. The \$25 registration fee covers a provided box lunch.
- During their meeting this week, ABCWUA voted to not add fluoride to the City's water.

Next Meeting: **July 14th, 2016 from 9:00am to 1:00pm, location TBD**

- The EC determined to not attempt to meet in June, prior to the issuance of the Draft BO. Continuing work on the Program Document, resolution of concerns, and legal reviews can be addressed via email or conference calls, if needed/necessary.
- Tentative July agenda items: (1) Revised RIP Program Document Updates; (2) Review Draft BO – presentation from the Service?; (3) Update on PASS Contract;
- Tentative future agenda items: (1) EC Attendance Policy in the Bylaws – address possible exceptions and/or changes; (2) Discussion/Updates on Recent and Upcoming Reports (Adaptive Management Documents; Genetics Peer Review Draft Report);

Upcoming Dates and Deadlines

- June 1st – CC meeting, 9:00am to 11:0am, location TBD
- June 21st – ScW (and HRW) meeting, 10:00am to 12:00pm, location TBD
- June 22nd – PASS solicitation closes
- End of June – Draft BO available
- July 14th – EC meeting, 9:00am to 1:00pm, location TBD

Meeting Summary

Introductions and agenda approval: Brent Esplin brought the meeting to order. Introductions were made and a quorum was confirmed. The agenda was reviewed and approved with the clarification that the intent is to reach a decision on the Revised Program Document.

Approval of the April 21st EC Meeting Summary:

- The April 21st meeting summary was approved for finalization with acceptance of the proposed edits including a bullet format correction. One proposed edit was further revised with clarifying language that the statement was an assertion of a particular agency.
 - The proposed edits submitted by MRGCD were projected and reviewed. The typo-corrections and non-substantive/clarification edits were all accepted.
 - Disagreement was expressed with the suggested revision on page 12 regarding the sufficient progress determination. The bullet in question will be revised to: *“The Service asserts that Sufficient Progress is an ESA requirement and in the regulatory authority for the Service to establish.”*
 - Other edits include:
 - On page 5, under the Hydrology Update, the streamflow bullet will be reformatted (tabbed back) as it is not part of the 2016 Resolution discussion.
 - For the purpose of the minutes, these edits were accepted.

Agency Roundtable:

- *Litigation Update:*
 - The Administrative Record was filed in December and the case is still on a Continuation. WildEarth Guardians (WEG) has requested more time to review the Administrative Record. Any objections to the Record will be received soon. The next court filing is not scheduled until July.
- *Hydrology Update:*
 - Updates from the recent storms are not available at this time. The current expectation is for a 90% allocation of the San Juan/Chama.
 - The water in El Vado has not yet been “tagged.” This usually occurs in May but will be done by June.
 - 14,500 ac-ft of Prior and Paramount (P&P) has been stored; it is the District’s storage that has not yet been worked out.
 - Storage of the 2016 Resolution Water began May 2. The expectation is for 35,000 to 40,000 ac-ft of water that can be used for environmental releases and management actions to generate a spring pulse flow.
 - The official spring pulse has not occurred yet, so the main stem is being carefully observed for signs of the natural peak. The hope is to meet the Minnow Action Team (MAT) Recommendations.
 - After a dire March, the stream forecasts have “held steady” since April and into May. The timing of natural contributions is temperature-dependent.
 - Many of the north-facing slopes in higher elevations still have a lot of snow.
- *Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD or the District):*
 - The District completed storage as of May 1. Any additional water that comes in can be managed as needed for the fish.
 - There is optimism that there could be some significant water out of the mountains for the next couple of weeks. This would be in addition to the 35,000+ ac-ft 2016 Resolution water and could result in “decent flows” that surpass expectation.

- The District will continue operating to meet demand during the spring pulse. This is not expected to create any issues or conflict with the intent to hold flows at 2,000 to 2,500 cfs (in Albuquerque) for 12 days. This would translate into flows of 1,000 to 1,500 cfs in the San Acacia reach.
- *U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation):*
 - The Program and Science Support (PASS) solicitation was issued last night. Come the beginning of June, there will be no Program support positions until the PASS contract is in place and the Executive Director is hired. The proposal evaluations will take place about 1 month from the posting. As previously mentioned, 2 EC members will be able to be non-voting participants during the evaluations.
 - The EC was notified that 2 members have missed 2 consecutive EC meetings (in March and April). According to the Bylaws, the agencies are now to receive a Letter of Notification with details on the next meeting.
 - For the record, it was clarified that Santa Domino and Isleta Pueblos are the signatories who have not attended recently. Attendees discussed concerns regarding the attendance expectations, especially for pueblos.
 - The pueblos are sovereign nations with different roles and levels of involvement.
 - During future discussions and review of the Bylaws, the EC may determine revisions are warranted – such as possible exceptions for the pueblos. Some members expressed the opinion that changing of the Bylaws needs the full action of the EC and therefore should not be delegated to a subgroup.
 - Attendees agreed with sending the Letters of Notification.
 - Signatory designations (primary and alternate representatives) also need to be updated and adhered to.

Program and Science Support (PASS) Contract Update:

- James Durant, contacting expert, shared the path forward to getting the PASS contract awarded.
 - The PASS solicitation was issued last night. It closes on Wednesday, June 22nd. Reclamation will then assess received proposals for compliance and appropriateness. As this is considered a Commercial Solicitation, there will not be a formal Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee (TPEC). An evaluation committee of technical federal employees, with consideration from non-federals, will review them. At the same time, Reclamation's contracting office will be appraising the proposals for responsiveness to the 5 criterion: approach, key personnel, schedule, price, and past performance.
 - Reclamation will also have to complete 2 additional reviews - legal and policy - to ensure evaluations are compliant before moving to award. The full process usually takes up to a month but depends on the number of proposals received.
 - A sole proprietor could bid if they meet all the criteria in the Statement of Work and successfully demonstrate how they would provide all the requirements. The selected agency will have 4 months to hire an Executive Director.
 - In response to a question on the location for the evaluation committee meetings, it was shared that this particular committee will be held in Albuquerque.
 - Potential evaluation committee participants were encouraged to plan for 2 to 3 days. The intent is to have evaluations completed in 1 day, but it could take several days depending on the number and quality of the proposals received.
 - In response to a question regarding who would be making the final selection decision (given that the evaluation committee will not be ranking the proposals), it was shared that the evaluation process may or may not lead to some form of ranking. But the "best value"

will be determined on the first 4 criteria and the contracting officer will rule in on the price considerations.

Population Monitoring Workshop Report Presentation:

- Wayne Hubert, with Atkins, presented the *Summary of Findings by the External Expert Panelists: Rio Grande Silvery Minnow Population Monitoring Workshop, December 8-10, 2015*. This is a briefing on the outcome of the workshop held in December 2015.
- After a brief introduction and explanation of qualifications of the 3 expert panelists and administrative support, Mr. Hubert presented the workshop background, processes, and outcomes.
- *Focus*
 - The minnow was listed as endangered in 1994;
 - The Middle Rio Grande Endangered Species Program (Program) was created and has evolved over the years;
 - A minnow population monitoring program has been in place since 1993; it has also evolved over the years;
 - Evaluation of the current monitoring program: (1) does it meet the needs of the Program?; (2) first step – workshop.
- *Purpose of the Workshop*
 - To discuss and resolve outstanding questions
 - Gain external opinions on population monitoring issues identified by the Program.
 - Receive external recommendations on current methods and indices
- *General and Preparation Process*
 - A population monitoring workshop planning group, consisting of Program representatives, identified:
 - External experts and facilitator candidates;
 - 4 primary questions and associated sub-questions;
 - Relevant documents, publications, spreadsheets;
 - The facilitator prepared ground rules that were approved by the workgroup;
 - Technical participants included: Program representatives and ASIR (American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers, the monitoring program contractors)
 - Atkins was contracted to address workshop logistics, recording, project management, etc.
- *4 Primary Questions*
 1. Is the CPUE (catch per unit effort) index appropriate for monitoring the minnow in the Middle Rio Grande (MRG)?
 2. Are the monitoring plan and sampling design appropriate for tracking the status and trends of the minnow in the MRG?
 - 3A. Are the statistical analyses used in the monitoring program appropriate and in line with data distributions and characteristics?
 - 3B. Are there additional analytical techniques that could be used to improve the use of CPUE?
 4. What revision(s) can be made to the sampling design to improve accuracy, precision, and power to detect change in minnow abundance?
- *Workshop Process*
 - Days 1 and 2: technical participants and external experts discussed pertinent information
 - End of Day 2: external experts summarized preliminary thoughts
 - Morning Day 3: external experts presented preliminary thoughts to technical participants and interested parties

- Afternoon Day 3: external experts, technical participants, and interested parties held open discussion
- *Ground Rules*
 - Facilitator roles:
 - Chairperson – recognized speakers, timekeeper, followed agenda, etc.
 - Interpreter – guided participants to achieve understanding of points and assure accurate recording;
 - Unbiased workshop oversight
 - Recorder:
 - Summarized pertinent points made by speakers, projected on screen
 - Real time edits on statements, approved by speaker
 - All:
 - No opinions regarding abilities, backgrounds, or policies of individuals, groups, or agencies;
 - Address only scientific aspects of questions and maintain professional atmosphere;
 - Speakers identify themselves by name and address the facilitator;
 - When a technical participant was recognized and their point recorded, they were not recognized again until all others had opportunity to speak;
 - All communication devices were turned off;
 - No audio or visual recordings.
- *Report and Documentation Process*
 - External experts and Atkins drafted a workshop report;
 - Report circulated to workgroup for review and comment;
 - Comments organized into a matrix;
 - External experts addressed each comment:
 - Responses recorded in comment matrix
 - Modifications of draft report when deemed appropriate
 - Teleconference with workgroup;
 - External experts and Atkins completed final report and comments matrix;
 - Draft report, final comments matrix, and notes from teleconference are part of the administrative record.
- *Review Of Current Monitoring Program Design And Methods*
 - Area of concern: Angostura Diversion Dam to Elephant Butte Reservoir inflow (about 140 miles; 220 km or 220,000 m)
 - There are 20 fixed sampling sites, 200-m-long (20 of 1, 100 200-m-long reaches, 1.8% - this is restrictive and small in comparison to total)
 - Sites chosen based on spatial distribution, site accessibility, relative permanence of flow, and presence of adequate instream habitat (not a random sample; but selecting some of the better sites having flow and fish potential to begin with)
 - Sampling fish with 2 kinds of seines:
 - Small-mesh (larger fish):
 - 3.1 m long, 1.8 m wide, 5-mm mesh
 - Selective for larger fish
 - Sampling occurs in February, April-October, December
 - 18-20 seine hauls at each site among different mesohabitat types:
 - Runs (4), shoreline pools (4), backwaters (2), pools (2), riffles (2), when available, remainder in shoreline runs

- Efforts: pooled seine hauls; length (m) of all seine hauls x 2.5 m = area sampled (m²)
 - CPUE: number of minnow collected/area samples (i.e., number/ m²); resulting in 1 number per site
 - Fine-mesh (smaller fish):
 - 1 m long, 1 m wide, 1.5 mm mesh
 - Selective for larval fish
 - Sampling occurs in April through October
 - 2 seine hauls in low-velocity mesohabitats at each site
 - Effort: pooled seine hauls; length (m) of all seine hauls x 0.25m = area sampled (m²)
 - CPUE: number of minnow collected/area samples (i.e., number/m²)
 - Trend Assessments: CPUE metric used when assessing trends:
 - Total density of minnow captured with both types of seines at each site
 - Only October data used for annual trend assessments
- *Findings*
 - Question #1. Is the CPUE index appropriate for monitoring the minnow in the MRG?
 - General conclusion: CPUE indices are appropriate, but the indices can be improved.
 - Recommendations:
 - Compute CPUE for small-mesh and fine-mesh seines separately. The data exists since at least 2006.
 - Compute CPUE for individual age or length classes separately. Focus on the size of fish to assess trends.
 - Small-mesh seine:
 - Focus CPUE analyses on the most recent cohort of minnow. Large fish are rare and the most recent cohort is most common: spawned in the spring and caught in August. They can be followed through the entire year to get stronger trend data.
 - Fine-mesh seine:
 - Compute CPUE for only larval minnow as they are not adding information on the breeding fish
 - Mesohabitat biases to consider:
 - Area of each mesohabitat type
 - Selectivity of minnow for each mesohabitat type
 - Sampling efficiency (catchability) of minnow in each mesohabitat type (ex. they can't get away in backwaters)
 - Analyze historic data using more specific CPUE indices computed from individual seine hauls and considering variation among mesohabitat types - don't pool into one index, but index obtained with each seine haul.
 - Question #2. Are the monitoring plan and sampling design appropriate for tracking the status and trends of the minnow in the MRG?
 - General conclusions:
 - Small-mesh seine: CPUE data for the most recent cohort of minnow are appropriate, except when sampling sites are observed to be dry. Which is instead making an observation that habitat is not there for fish, and not actually sampling fish.

- Fine-mesh seine: CPUE data for larval minnow are appropriate, except when sampling sites are observed to be dry.
- Observation of dry sampling sites and recording of the observation as a zero (“0”) CPUE in analyses of CPUE data should be avoided. It is not scientifically correct to extrapolate this data into the population information.
- When dry sites are observed, there are no longer 20 sites sampled from which inference can be made from CPUE data.
- Recommendations:
 - When dry sites are observed among the 20 fixed sampling sites, apply an ancillary, random-sampling design.
- Question #3A. Are the statistical analyses used in the monitoring program appropriate and in line with data distributions and characteristics??
 - General conclusions:
 - Mixture modeling is appropriate, but:
 - More specific CPUE indices should be used (Q1 recommendations)
 - Observations of dry sampling sites should not be included as zero CPUE data in analyses
 - Recommendations:
 - Discontinue application of mixture models to sampling periods when dry sampling sites are observed
 - Fully define the assumptions of mixture models and assess the effects of violation of the assumptions (how violations might affect outcomes)
 - Better definition of environmental and hydrologic variables used in assessment of effects of environmental factors on CPUE
- Question #3B. Are there additional analytical techniques that could be used to improve the use of CPUE?
 - General conclusions:
 - Additional analytical techniques may be explored, but it is unclear if such approaches would improve precision of CPUE estimates or enhance ability to assess covariates.
 - Recommendations:
 - Compare the outcomes of alternative analytical approaches to those obtained with mixture models.
- Question #4. What revisions can be made to the sample design to improve accuracy, precision, and power to detect change in the minnow abundance?
 - General Conclusion #1
 - Additional sampling sites and longer sampling sites would improve precision of CPUE estimates
 - Recommendations
 - Randomly selecting additional sample sites
 - If estimates are desired for each of the 3 geomorphic reaches increase the number of sampling sites to >20 within each reach (>60 sites total)
 - Discontinue sampling in mesohabitats in which minnow rarely occur (i.e., riffles)

- General Conclusion #2
 - When dry sites are observed among the 20 fixed sampling sites, apply an ancillary, random-sampling design
- Recommendations
 - Assess the entire length of the MRG to identify segments that are dry or with water
 - Randomly select sites with fish and water
- *Additional Material In Report*
 - Future research recommendations
 - Observations beyond the scope of the population monitoring workshop
 - The report identifies separate sections to be used as desired.
- *Questions*
 - *Question:* Regarding the potential bias from sampling of dry sites and less used mesohabitats (riffles), is there utility to going back to existing, previous data and distinguishing those numbers?
 - *Response:* It would be possible to sort out the data starting back in 2006. But the analysis cannot just “plug” into the mixture model. Further analysis of existing data sets could be useful but the information cannot be extrapolated to reach-wide.
 - *Question:* Is it possible to put together a Quality Assurance Plan?
 - *Response:* Yes, it is possible but that is not a task for this contract. A Quality Assurance plan should be a formal part of any monitoring plan.
 - *Question:* Is it “normal” to sum each of the sampled mesohabitats?
 - *Response:* No; averaging multiple passes of each seine is more common. But not lumping everything into a single number.
 - *Question:* Did the expert panel give any thought to the use of the October CPUE as the focal point of fish trends, specifically considering the drying and zeros and averaging? Some sites that are wet in October were dry just week before.
 - *Response:* The history of what happens [to a site] immediately prior is important and needs to be considered. [But how should such information be brought into the program?] It would require more analytical effort, but would make sense (ex. use more indices than just October, but say August and September). Also, hydrologic variables are not very sensitive as used. The history of flow immediately preceding sampling impacts the numbers of abundance and needs to be incorporated for greater understanding.
 - *Question:* How far did the experts “dig into” the subquestions (which are important for management framework)? And can we use existing data/monitoring program to indicate (1) the benefits of the spring actions and (2) determine how to do things differently to get a better response from the fish?
 - *Response:* The subquestions were used as a way of directing discussion, but they were not addressed specifically. It is estimated that 90 to 95% of the subquestions are addressed in some fashion within the report but specific sections or specific lines cannot be referred to.
 - The population monitoring program, as it exists today, is really not that bad. Remember, the monitoring program was set up back when there was more water, on an annual index, etc. It will take more effort to really understand what is happening and get to true trend information.

- *Question:* The 20 sampling sites have history, would you recommend looking at each site individually?
 - *Response:* There could be benefit to understanding what each site represents: dries the same way, same year after year? is drying intermediate? Predictable? If wet, is it the result of outflow? It could be worth looking into, to help interpret the data.
- *Question:* There are recommendations and analyses that can be addressed, if adopted by the Program. But how would you “grade” the current monitoring program? Would incorporation of the recommendations achieve an “A?”
 - *Response:* As a professor, I would call it a “first draft” and not give it a grade but return it with instruction that it needs work.
 - Some attendees commented that if a grade cannot be assigned, it would appear to be “below grade-level” which is an “F” and could thus be considered a failing grade at this stage.
- *Question:* Did the experts discuss ideas on how to sample (detect) other age classes?
 - *Response:* The panel did consider other sampling techniques for larger fish, but did not think there were any really good techniques. Trapping might select for bigger fish but it is very time/effort consuming and would it really provide enough data to answer anything?
- *Comment:* Another metric that we need to keep track of is the “return-for-money-expended.” Fine-tuning the monitoring program could provide more information for the same amount of money. How could new sampling designs affect comparison between data sets (new and existing)? How much money might be required to advance or modify the monitoring and implement recommendations?
 - *Response:* At one point, there is sampling occurring 9 months of the year (for the large mesh). The larval sampling occurs during 7 months. Is that amount of sampling necessary? This question wasn’t really addressed, but maybe honing in on when sampling is needed could help cut back on cost? (Ex. is larval sampling in October really needed?)
- *Comment:* It comes down to what we want to use the data for. There is the potential for reproduction and monthly mortality throughout the summer (for all kinds of reasons). This results in a certain population in October. The population information is used to (1) track progress on the recovery goals and (2) determine whether or not to augment the population. Why do we need more information if those are the only 2 uses for the monitoring program?

Population Monitoring Task 2 Decisions

- Back in 2012, the EC approved 3 tasks associated with the evaluation of the population monitoring program:
 - Task 1: the workshop to address technical questions concerning use of CPUE in the current monitoring program – *completed December 2015*
 - Task 2: using workshop report recommendations, review the current monitoring program including temporal and spatial aspects of sampling design, data collection protocols, and data analyses – *approval requested/pending*
 - Task 3: development of a formal Fish Monitoring Plan with details of sampling design (e.g., number and location of samples, frequency of sampling, gear types, etc.), data collection protocols (e.g., data to be collected, manner of storage, etc.), and analytical methods (e.g., CPUE computation, relationship of CPUE to population estimates, use in PVA models, etc.).

- The workgroup is requesting the EC approve Task 2 in order for the group to move forward on the next steps including budget considerations. The workgroup members feel the existing Task 2 goals, objectives, and actions are appropriate but could be refined as needed.
 - It was commented that the Population Monitoring Workshop Report lists 24 recommendations; many of which call for additional analyses to better inform the monitoring program and how it can be used to inform decisions by the EC and the Program. A general “focus” of Task 2 is to take the recommendations from the report and follow through on some of those ideas on how to improve the monitoring program. Completing Task 2 is imperative – it gives better understanding of the data, looking at questions of “zeros,” mesohabitat behavior and associated impacts the data, etc.
 - *Questions:* Regarding timelines and “fixing” the monitoring, is there any opportunity to adjust the program/activities this year? Especially in terms of addressing dry site (zeros) and mesohabitat considerations? Is there benefit to addressing the potential biases now, with recent data, for more accurate population understanding and going forward with compliance criteria?
 - *Response:* Those are important questions, but it will take time to address everything. The workgroup is requesting approval to move forward on Task 2 which is a first step.
 - However, there is no foreseen reason why changes for this year cannot at least be discussed and possibly addressed.
 - It was suggested that a fairly “easy” comparison would be to remove dry sites and see the analysis impact. But adding sites (to replace dry sites) would be a completely different thing.
 - Some attendees requested that any analysis of existing data or adjustments to the monitoring program for this year be captured in writing.
 - Concern was expressed that the Program will be tasked with compliance requirements before there is a well-constructed monitoring program in place. It could be very important to address potential biases that might have been projected into the population information as early as possible (and before the compliance is being judged).
 - Attendees briefly discussed the overlap of Task 2 with the Adaptive Management (AM) Program, including establishing a long-term fish monitoring program (not just making the current one better for the time being), identifying other data needs to support other management questions or studies (what other monitoring needs to be performed in conjunction with fish monitoring?), what are the management questions that Program would like to have answered? What monitoring is needed to address those? Budgets?
 - The AM work currently being done may not answer every single question, but it will identify a number of questions and hypotheses as well as develop plans for those.
- With no objections voiced, the EC approved the Population Monitoring Workgroup to begin work on Task 2, including consideration of the feedback provided during today’s meeting.

Coordination Committee (CC) Updates:

- As reported last meeting, the CC is currently working on the FY2017 workplan and budget. The workgroups will begin working on project scopes at their June meetings.

Minnow Action Team (MAT) Recommendations:

- The MAT met in April to review the hydrology forecasts and species status. As usual, the hydrologic discussions framed what was viewed as opportunity for this spring and summer. The MAT recommendations to the EC for 2016 Operations were provided as a read ahead.

- In general, the 2016 Recommendations focus on survival and spawning objectives for this year while maintaining compliance with the 2003 Biological Opinion (BO). There is optimism that recruitment can be supported as well.
 - A lot of work and collaboration went into the 2016 Resolution. There is, at present, approximately 35,000 ac-ft stored in El Vado with more expected this week. This water will augment the natural peak in an attempt to maintain a high discharge (anywhere from 2,000 to 3,000 cfs) for 12 days.
 - The MAT also encourages a coordinated monitoring effort in the river for this spring and summer. ISC is supporting efforts to compile all the monitoring data and produce a report. Any agency that might complete monitoring work is encouraged to provide that information to ISC for inclusion. (*It was clarified that the spring and summer monitoring is not associated with the population monitoring efforts.*)
- MRGCD has no plan to suspend operations during the spring pulse since the magnitude of the flows outweighs the magnitude of diversions. The past low-flow diversion actions have been in response to very poor water years and the need to support egg production and collection.
- With no objections voiced, the EC endorsed the 2016 MAT Recommendations.

Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) Documents Updates and Recommendations

- *Role of the RIP in the Consultation:*
 - Purpose of this discussion is to frame some of the issues the Program Document subgroup (subgroup) has been addressing. There appears to be some confusion regarding the role of the Recovery Implementation Program (RIP) in the consultation and the vestige of some specific language in the documents.
 - In 2013, it was very important to the EC that the RIP be characterized as *the* conservation measure - meaning that for purposes of the Biological Assessment (BA), as it then existed, the RIP was the vehicle to enable all interested entities to participate in measures that put the species on a recovery trajectory (instead of year to year jeopardy avoidance) and to serve as the Section 7 compliance mechanism. The RIP thus held a dual role at that time. This was the structure and framework for the RIP as it existed when the EC last endorsed the documents.
 - Many things have changed since then. In November 2013, the Corps withdrew their BA. And about a year and a half ago, the BA partners initiated rigorous and disciplined reframing of the BA. The most significant change in the BA was to differentiate the proposed offsetting measures (those actions meant to “offset” the proposed actions; jeopardy avoiding measures; required or necessary actions) from the conservation measures (those actions that are “above and beyond”; designed to address river conditions, baseline conditions, and promote recovery of the species; voluntary actions). In this framework, the conservation measures are described as outside Section 7 compliance ramifications. *Tables 4-1 and 4-2 were projected as examples of how the offsetting and conservation measures, respectively, are described in Part 4 of the BA.*
 - As indicated in Table 4-2, the RIP establishment and implementation is presented in the BA as a *conservation measure*, not an offsetting measure; and indicates the intention of the BA partners to support beneficial activities for the species but are not tied to specific proposed actions.
- *Discussion*
 - Offsetting measures are recognized as coming under Section 7 regulation and addressing the impacts of proposed actions to avoid jeopardy. However, the concern is focused on the perspective that conservation measures are viewed by many signatories as the “voluntary” or “above and beyond” activities that are not necessarily governed by Section 7 and therefore not subject to compliance metrics. They are the activities

- willingly undertaken by BA partners to provide a “safety net” for the species and to prevent a “bad year” from endangering compliance.
- Disagreement was expressed with the statement that “there is no standard within Section 7 that specifies agencies have to *promote recovery*.” There is provision within Section 7.a.1 that all federal agencies promote the recovery of those species, to the extent of that agency’s authorities, as a proactive measure. It could be argued that Section 7.a.1 does cover those conservation measures. Section 7.a.2 addresses the federal agencies having to consult to ensure there is no jeopardy.
 - In a brief review of recent history, attendees were reminded that these issues are not new but were discussed back in the 2009 Taos Retreat. In general, the EC determined the following: (1) the EC governance would be continued with voting and decision making abilities; (2) the Long-Term Plan (LTP) would illustrate the forward plans for broad-term coverage, tracking/recording and certification of compliance; etc. The intent was to move away from the year-to-year “reactionary” status and focus on making progress; (3) an acknowledgement of trust issues; and (4) it was also acknowledged that Adaptive Management (AM) is key to avoiding repetition of the “same things over and over.” AM needs to be addressed (built into) in the LTP.
 - Identified “trust” areas included:
 - Putting specific commitments in the LTP and BA;
 - That issues would be brought to the EC as soon as possible for expedient resolution;
 - The Program Manager having divided loyalties.
 - Getting agreement on the science and methods; including updating the Recovery Plans based on updated science;
 - Concerns about how the Service would evaluate the Program; including the need to have things in writing.
 - The idea was that the LTP was to inform the BO, instead of the BO driving the Program. AM is currently under development and the Program has recently completed several science-based reviews. But the trust issues remain “stumbling blocks” and need to be addressed. How do we build that trust?
 - *Program Document Report Out on Consensus Edits*
 - At the last EC meeting, a number of issues were identified for the subgroup to address and individual agency/members were provided time to submit comments. Consensus edits have been accepted and the EC will be presented with opportunity to review non-consensus changes including individual agency comments/edits.
 - *Part 1. Consensus Recommendations from Last EC meeting*
 - The previous red-line edits that had consensus support from the subgroup have been adopted into the document (and are no longer red-lined).
 - *In a brief working session, the EC were presented a few examples of the consensus-recommended edits and how they have been accepted into the document.*
 - *Part 2: New Consensus Revisions (new red lines)*
 - *Significant Edit #1: Page 2 – Sect. 1 Statement of Purposes and Objectives C. Principles:*
 - A new first sentence has been added: “*It is recognized that the RIP does not and is not intended to abrogate any legal or statutory responsibility of the members.*”
 - Language has also been added to the 4th paragraph down: “*The Service retains responsibility for administering the ESA and, in particular,*

ensuring compliance with ESA Sections 7 and 9, which provide for federal agency consultation with the Service on proposed actions that may adversely affect listed species and reinitiation of consultation under certain circumstances. To the extent that specific activities to be undertaken by the RIP appear in any applicable Biological Opinion as conditions for continued compliance with the Biological Opinion through its description of a “reasonable and prudent alternative” or the terms and conditions for its Incidental Take Statement, the Service retains the authority to identify those activities in the context of its sufficient progress evaluation or other processes evaluating RIP sufficiency in maintaining compliance with the ESA. The Service also retains the ability to recommend, through its participation as a Collaborative Program EC member, that the RIP undertake additional activities, should the RIP’s scientific information and Adaptive Management processes, as described herein, indicate, based on the best available scientific information, that these additional activities are necessary for the RIP to continue to serve as an effective offsetting or conservation measure to avoid jeopardy to listed species or adverse modification of critical habitat as a result of the effects of proposed actions identified in any agency Biological Assessment or a Service Biological Opinion”

- Reasoning: this language was inserted in the attempt to address the concerns regarding the Service’s (1) regulatory responsibilities and (2) request for affirmative vote. The attempt was to recognize the Service’s non-delegable responsibilities and avoid duplicated discussion elsewhere in the document.
- Clarification: the intent was to document that unless a particular RIP activity identifies in the BA as a Reasonable and Prudent Activity (RPA), there is no generalized prerogative on the part of the Service in terms of having Section 7 implications. In other words, the Service cannot draw Section 7 implications from the RIP voluntary or self-obliged actions or activities.
- *Discussion Points*
 - Some attendees expressed the opinion that the first sentence added was enough to warrant the removal of the subsequent explanatory paragraphs. However, other attendees expressed the desire to have the differences and expectations with “offsetting” measures and “conservation” measures clearly identified.
 - It is acknowledged that many participating agencies have specific authorities and regulations – there is concern that if paragraphs on regulatory authority are included for one entity, then it will have to be done for all. The added first sentence is strong and covers the general intent.
 - Other attendees would support removal of the paragraph as long as the ESA authority discussion and concepts are adequately captured elsewhere in the document. The intent was to clarify Section 4, Section 7, and the RIP interactions.
 - There appears to be confusion regarding differences of Section 4, Section 7.a.1, and Section 7.a.2 and potential impacts on those

- agencies participating in the consultation (through Reclamation) versus agencies that are EC signatories but not consulting.
- Concerns remain with the RIP's role for "broad coverage" and future "expedited" consultations.
 - It was expressed that a very high percentage of agency actions are not requirements – but are done by the agencies anyway. One reason is that through agreement to "do better things upfront" there can be an expedited process in the future.
 - In response, the opinion that this is already built into the process now was shared.
 - Is a BO necessary to drive the RIP? Are sufficient progress evaluations tied to the RIP? There is disagreement with the interpretation of the ESA that would imply that sufficient progress to recovery is necessary to maintain compliance under Section 7.
 - There is concern that the "proactive" 7.a.1 conservation measures in the BO will be "judged" under Section 7.a.2 (jeopardy) criteria. How does 7.a.1 apply to non-federal agencies under a Section 7 consultation?
 - It was pointed out that "jeopardy" *is* related to the survival and recovery of a species; recovery *is* mentioned in the jeopardy definition.
 - It was clarified that no one is saying they do not want to "embrace the RIP with the goals the Service has asked for." But what is the role of that recovery-oriented vehicle in Section 7.a.2 where the evolution of the consultation is dramatically different than originally conceived?
 - One perspective is that if conservation measures are not accomplished, the Program is not inherently out of compliance with Section 7.a.2 metrics.
 - An opinion was shared that insofar as the RIP is exclusively "above and beyond" (i.e., conservation measure) and not a necessarily an offsetting measure, to that extent, the sufficient progress determination has nothing to do with Section 7.a.2. The Service's authority and ability and obligations to undertake that evaluation arise exclusively under Section 4.f.
 - There was disagreement on whether or not this discussion should occur before or after the issuance of the Draft BO. Some attendees felt the discussion was premature while others expressed the desire to have the conceptual issues acknowledged and the principles clearly articulated in the Program Document.
 - Concern was expressed with the idea that the Service might indicate the implementation of the RIP is a requirement for certainty on the status of the species. If the RIP becomes a requirement of the BO, it would no longer be a voluntary program.
 - Many agencies expressed the struggle with understanding the ESA compliance for the BO versus how the RIP should function in order to move to recovery. This is of particular importance for those agencies that aren't part of the formal consultation.

- Those agencies expressed the desire to keep the language in the Program Document generic enough so as to not be tied to anyone's specific BO in order for the RIP to be use in the future if so desired.
 - The position the RIP occupies needs to be described in the Program Document.
 - Concern was expressed with the potential bias in the population monitoring and how that impacts/influences the species status (population information) that the Service will be using in its jeopardy analysis.
 - It was responded that the Service uses the best, currently available science. Information is being provided to the Service by other agencies for consideration, but no new analyses will be completed as part of the BO process.
- *Next Steps*
 - The sufficient progress metrics have not been developed and some attendees expressed the opinion that this discussion therefore seems to be premature.
 - It is the responsibility of the Service to complete the jeopardy analysis which includes many factors - not just the proposed actions but species status, climate change, baselines, etc. The Service may determine that offsetting measures are inadequate and thus actions originally considered "above and beyond" in the BA are needed and necessary for offset – and thus become a requirement. This will remain unknown until the Draft BO is available.
 - The current (red-lined version) Revised Program Document cannot be endorsed at this time as many signatories are not comfortable with some of proposed changes/language.
 - The inclusion of the proposed Principles will take processing and legal review. Incorporating the concepts will take time and cannot be accomplished today.
- *Conclusion*
 - It was suggested that the following language be added to the paragraph in question: "The RIP, in and of itself, is not a compliance vehicle." It was also agreed that the paragraph marked for potential removal undergo legal review prior to retaining or omission.
 - The attempt to describe and encapsulate the Principle in the Program Document will be further reviewed when the Draft BO is available.
 - The endorsement decision on the Revised Program Document was tabled.
- *Significant Edit #2: Page 11 – Sect. 4 RIP Organizational Structure and Governance Procedures A.2.bi*
 - *MRGCD Comment and Proposed Edits:* Under the Science Coordinator duties, the following language is proposed: "...shall oversee the RIP process for developing standards and protocols for synthesizing

monitoring data and other information from multiple sources, designating what the RIP will consider the “best available scientific information” for its various decision-making purposes, including AM, and incorporating this information into particular decision-making processes as appropriate. (See Section 8A2 for more detail.)”

- Proposed New Section 8A2: *“The RIP will develop and adhere to standards and protocols for synthesizing monitoring data and other information from multiple sources, designating what the RIP will consider the “best available scientific information” for its various decision-making purposes, including AM, and incorporating this information into specific decision-making processes as appropriate.”*
- Reasoning: clarify the expectations of the Science Coordinator and specify the intent to be a science-based Program and how science will be considered in the decision-making
- *Discussion Points*
 - It was suggested that specific language referencing “peer reviews” be added: *“...including any peer reviews undertaken pursuant to Section 9 of this document.”*
 - Several attendees expressed concern with the proposed edit, specifically with the terminology “designate.”
- *Part 3: Entity Specific Comments on Program Document*
 - *MRGCD: Sufficient Progress*
 - *Page 18, Section 6B:* proposed deletion of the sentence *“A determination of sufficient progress ensures continued ESA compliance for those actions relying upon the RIP for ESA compliance.”*
 - *Page 18, Section 6B:* proposed deletion of the phrase *“...stated in relevant BOs”* from the last sentence of that paragraph. Conversely, add a new sentence clarifying the Service’s ESA Section 4 role(s) and motivation in developing the criteria and Separating Section 4 from Section 7 responsibilities.
 - *Discussion*
 - It is acknowledged that this proposed edits ties into the previous conversations from today relating to the progress determinations and Principle language.
 - It will also require legal review.
 - *MRGCD: Science Coordinator*
 - *Throughout the document:* it is suggested that reference to the new Section 8A2 provisions be inserted as appropriate throughout the document (ex. *“...consistent with Section 8A2”* or *“...as described in Section 8A2.”*).
 - *Reclamation: Annual Workplan And Role Of The Budget Subcommittee*
 - *Background:* The RIP document (and current decision-making in the Bylaws) needs to clearly describe the decision-making processes for all RIP activities (ex. workplan development, sufficient progress determination, etc.) to ensure timely action and decisions on recovery activities. Reclamation has specifically flagged areas in the Program Document (related to budget and contracting decisions) where delays in these areas could lead to (1) loss of funding from Reclamation’s annual

appropriations budgets or (2) the inability to fund scientifically-supported recovery activities. Activities funded by the Department of the Interior (DOI) must meet DOI's scientific integrity policies. Subjecting certain decisions to an EC supermajority vote could result in false expectations by EC members. Reclamation believes agreement needs to be reached on decision-making processes for key RIP activities before the Program Document can be endorsed.

- *Clarification:* The scope of this proposed edit on governance is limited to the Action Plan Updates and Annual Workplan; specifically, it is the Annual Workplan that triggers spending. All other governance is unchanged.
 - An example was shared: the Draft Action Plan and Workplan are developed by the Executive Director. They go to the EC for endorsement. Any “consensus approved” activities then go to Reclamation’s contracting; at least those activities/projects that the EC agreed on. Any activities lacking consensus agreement are returned to the Budget Subcommittee for resolution. If consensus is reached, they are returned to the EC for endorsement. But if the subcommittee cannot agree, it will then be up to the funding agencies (ISC, Reclamation, Corps, MRGCD) and the Service to decide.
- *Discussion:*
 - The intent is to address and provide insurance against the potential situation where the federal agencies and non-federal agencies disagree on the science and therefore which projects/activities to pursue. Reclamation funds “the lion share” of this Program and will not continue to fund science that won’t be used or agreed on – and will only fund things that it considers scientifically defensible.
 - It was cautioned that the Science Panel will define the “good” and “best” science and just because an agency doesn’t like the outcome, doesn’t mean they can just chose to not abide by it.
 - In response, others shared the opinion that the Program, as a whole, is pursuing and accepting the “best science” as referenced by the recent completion of the Genetics and Population Monitoring Peer Reviews and ongoing work with AM.
 - AM can be very challenging and there needs to be a streamlined decision-making process for the funding agencies.
 - There are protections in the Bylaws specifying that the EC cannot vote an entity to spend money in ways it is not authorized to do.
 - Attendees briefly discussed the lack of Statements of Work for the next fiscal year. It takes time to develop the scopes and contracting packages, but the Program has not supplied those to Reclamation yet. It was shared that the Program was not informed of the need in the usual timeframe (budget recommendations in September/October) and therefore the workgroups have yet to be tasked with the scope development.

- The workgroups have become poorly attended and there is a perspective that things have become “stalled” (lack of direction and instruction) during the long transition.
- The suggested edits relate to the “reasonable certainty” concern expressed by the Service and designing an impasse process.
 - The opinion was shared that the Program has a long and arduous history of not making process and “getting stuck.” Something has to change in order for the Service to have certainty that the RIP won’t encounter the same issue(s).
 - However, this assumes that no one will “act like an adult.” In the past, when issues/items come to the EC as official agenda decision items and the EC has been given the chance to be fully prepared, there is a track record of decisions and moving forward. The Bylaws are in place and already address this issue and process.
 - Just because a specific, historic example cannot be given does not mean it wouldn’t be prudent to establish an agreed-to process for the future, especially considering the long-term (covering many years) and science-based intentions of the Program. Outlining the process now supports the “spirit” of transparency.
- Concern was expressed that the Program Document is very “silent” in terms of budgeting and funding. The proposed edits could introduce a disconnect without other explanations of how the RIP is expected to be funded.
- This conversation was then tabled for future discussions.
 - *Army Corps: Hydrologic Objective*
 - This was not reviewed or addressed during this meeting due to lack of time.
 - *RIP Milestone Schedule:*
 - This was not reviewed or addressed during this meeting due to lack of time.

Public Comment

- There was no public comment.

Meeting Summary:

- A quorum was present for today’s meeting. The agenda was approved with the clarification that endorsement of the Revised Program Document is the goal. The April 21st meeting summary was approved for finalization with acceptance of the proposed edits
- Agencies presented updates during the Agency Roundtable.
- A Population Monitoring Workshop presentation on outcomes and recommendations was given. The report is available and the planning workgroup is looking ahead to Task 2 and how to address the report recommendations. This work and the genetics works are very important to the future of the Program in terms of science-based decisions and moving toward recovery.
- The MAT 2016 Recommendation were reviewed and endorsed.
- The EC then discussed the role of the RIP - in the consultation and for broad coverage – and concerns with sufficient progress determinations related to “offsetting” versus “conservation”

measures. Attendees reviewed the new red-line edits and agency comments for the Revised Program Document.

Announcements:

- The Program and Science Support (PASS) solicitation was posted last night and will close Wednesday, June 22nd. Proposal evaluations can be expected within approximately 1 month from date of issuance. Reclamation will work with the EC to have 2 non-voting participants. The solicitation can be found at: www.fedbizops.gov or www.fbo.gov, solicitation number: R15PS00594
- There is a 2016 Water Summit scheduled for tomorrow, May 20th, at UNM. The \$25 registration fee covers a provided box lunch.
- During their meeting this week, ABCWUA voted to not add fluoride to the City's water.

Future Meetings:

- Due to scheduling conflicts, it has been requested the EC adjust their standing meetings. Suggestions included the 2nd or 4th Thursdays or another day of the week.
- It was agreed to move the standing EC meetings to the 4th Thursday of each month.

Next Meeting: **July 14th, 2016 from 9:00am to 1:00pm, location TBD**

- The EC determined to not attempt to meet in June, prior to the issuance of the Draft BO. Continuing work on the Program Document, resolution of concerns, and legal reviews can be addressed via email or conference calls, if needed/necessary.
- Tentative July agenda items: (1) Revised RIP Program Document Updates; (2) Review Draft BO – presentation from the Service?; (3) Update on PASS Contract;

Tentative future agenda items: (1) EC Attendance Policy in the Bylaws – address possible exceptions and/or changes; (2) Discussion/Updates on Recent and Upcoming Reports (Adaptive Management Documents; Genetics Peer Review Draft Report);

Executive Committee Meeting Attendees May 19th, 2016

Attendees:

<i>Representative</i>	<i>Organization</i>	<i>Seat</i>
Brent Esplin	Bureau of Reclamation	Federal co-chair
Rick Billings (A)	Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority	Non-federal co-chair
Jennifer Faler (P)	Bureau of Reclamation	Reclamation
David Gensler (P)	Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	MRGCD
Rolf Schmidt-Petersen (P)	NM Interstate Stream Commission	NMISC
LTC James Booth (P)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Corps
Michelle Shaughnessy (P)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	FWS
Matt Schmader (P)	City of Albuquerque	COA
Kim Eichhorst (P)	Bosque Ecosystem Monitoring Program	BEMP
Frank Chaves (P)	Pueblo of Sandia	Sandia
Matt Wunder (P)	NM Department of Game and Fish	NMDGF
Janet Jarratt (P)	Assessment Payers Association of the MRGCD	APA
Steve Farris (P)	NM Attorney General's Office	NMAGO
Alan Hatch (A)	Pueblo of Santa Ana	Santa Ana
Ryan Ward (P) (via phone)	NM Department of Agriculture	NMDA

Others

Ali Saenz	Bureau of Reclamation
Jim Wilber	Bureau of Reclamation
Leann Towne	Bureau of Reclamation
Ann Demint	Bureau of Reclamation
Brian Hobbs	Bureau of Reclamation
James Durante (via phone)	Bureau of Reclamation - contracting
Josh Mann	Solicitor's Office
Kris Schafer (A)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Susan Bittick (A)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Danielle Galloway	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Ryan Gronewold	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Mick Porter	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Beth Pitrolo	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Wally Murphy (A)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Campbell	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jason Davis	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Johanna Roy	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Thomas Archdeacon	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Thomas Sinclair	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bill Grantham (A)	NM Attorney General's Office
Brooke Wyman	MRGCD
Patrick Redmond	MRGCD
Anne Marken	MRGCD
Grace Haggerty (A)	NMISC
Ken Richard	NMISC
Chris Shaw	NMISC
Deb Freeman	for NMISC
Rich Valdez	SWCA for NMISC
Rick Carpenter	BBD/City of Santa Fe
Mike Marcus	for APA
Todd Caplan	GeoSystems Analysis
Elizabeth Reitzel	Rep. Lujan-Grisham
Wayne Hubert	Atkins/Pop Mon Workshop facilitator
Matt Cusack	Atkins/Pop Mon Workshop contractor
Marta Wood	Alliant Environmental (note taker)