

	Actions/Commitments	Status	Reference/Letter or Document	Date Required for Project	Why it was not completed?	Responsible Party
<b>Ongoing Activities</b>						
1	<u>Web Site Updates/Posting</u>	On-going	<a href="http://www.usbr.gov/uc/albuq/envdocs/index.html">http://www.usbr.gov/uc/albuq/envdocs/index.html</a>	Ongoing		Reclamation
<b>Pre Project Activities – Need For Completed NEPA</b>						
2	<u>Memorandum of Understanding and Right of Ways:</u> Reclamation will work on a MOU with the landowners for access and Right-of-Ways. The NMSLO is working on an MOU for access and use of state lands. A longer term MOU is desired over obtaining short-term rights of entry. Potential construction staging areas have been visited and discussed by have yet to be determined. It may be possible to stage on private land. The NMSLO is working on an MOU for access and use of state lands. A longer term MOU is desired over obtaining short-term rights of entry.	Draft Documents will be discussed with landowners May 2012.	Anderson MOU Lopez MOU State Land Permit Patterson ROA	July 2012		Reclamation/ New Mexico State Lands Office (NMSLO)
3	<u>Monitoring/Adaptive Management Plan:</u> Reclamation will implement an AMP as provided as Attachment 1 in the Final EA. The AMP will be implemented to guide how management actions should be adjusted over time based on results of monitoring. The core components of the AMP are criteria, triggers, monitoring, and responses. The AMP provides guidance for addressing changing conditions in the future management of river operations by modifying operations within established parameters. Communication for the AMP will be carried out primarily through conference calls among the Pecos River Stakeholder Group and preparation of an Annual Adaptive Management Report. Members of the Pecos River Stakeholder Group include the Service, Reclamation, CID, FSID, NMDGF, New Mexico Office of the State Engineer, NMISC, Corps, and interested non-governmental stakeholder groups. Other stakeholders (such as the USGS) will be contacted when specific information or input is needed.	Reclamation staff will begin drafting plan in May 2012	Draft document	September 2012		Reclamation and Stakeholders
4a	<u>Project Description:</u> Reclamation will remove tamarisk, and strategically lower banks within project area. Experimental “Sunflower Swale” on BLM or Reclamation portions.  NOTE: Need to determine if upper boundary of project should be moved downstream slightly to limit effect to properties above projects area.	Draft project design plan completed by Reclamation March 2012. Need	Project design plans – available on website.	Draft Completed – Need to Finalize – July 2012		Reclamation / All

	Actions/Commitments	Status	Reference/Letter or Document	Date Required for Project	Why it was not completed?	Responsible Party
		to finalize project design with all parties.				
4b	<p><u>Project Description:</u>                      Vegetation Removal Plan: Reclamation would remove tamarisk mechanically. The BLM burn crew could burn the piles of debris onsite. It needs to be confirmed whether BLM can conduct the burns on private lands or Reclamation can chip up the piles. Some brush would be placed to create in-river habitat. Only hand spraying on any vegetation 50 feet or less from the water. On the state trust land there will be areas on the east side of the river where the tamarisk would be cut and the stumps treated with herbicide where it would be beneficial to leave in some roots to keep bank stable and protect nearby wetlands. BLM has completed non-native vegetation removal along the river in their sections. Reclamation is proposing to do vegetation removal on the state trust and private land sections, and look at some bank lowering on all sections.</p>	No- On-going	Decision on approach needed for the proposed action.	July 2012		Reclamation/BLM
5	<p><u>Depletions:</u> There will need to be a calculation of depletions that may be associated with the restoration and increased surface area in the channel subject to evaporation. The NMISC's Strategic Water Reserve could cover any depletions. The approach used for Bitter Lake could be done here. A water budget is determined and estimated depletions are included in the EA. Accounting is based on post-project monitoring and rights transferred if water is owed. There are gages at the top and the bottom of the reach proposed for restoration, although the lower gage is inaccurate and needs to be fixed.</p>		Water Budget estimate and Letter from ISC	August 2012		Reclamation/NMISC
6	<p><u>Section 404/401 Permits:</u> Reclamation will coordinate with the US Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and the NMED for compliance with the Clean Water Act. This project will likely meet the requirements for authorization and Section 404 compliance under the Corps' Nationwide Permit (27) (Stream and Wetland Restoration Activities), just as the work at Bitter Lake did. That process can proceed when the COR receives the project design. The permit will require a minimum commitment of five years of monitoring and Section 401 Water Quality Certification to ensure that the project</p>	Yes- Pending response	Reclamation sent letter out to Corp of Engineers, Nov 4, 2011	June 2012		Reclamation

	<b>Actions/Commitments</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Reference/Letter or Document</b>	<b>Date Required for Project</b>	<b>Why it was not completed?</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
	complies with New Mexico water quality standards. The Section 401 certification is completed by the NMED Surface Water Quality Bureau after the Corps makes its determination.					
7	<u>ESA Issues</u> : Biological Assessment will be combined within the EA	On-going		Summer FY2012		Reclamation/USFWS
8	<u>Archaeological Surveys/SHPO</u>	On-going		Summer FY2012		Reclamation/BLM
9	<u>NEPA/Environmental Assessment</u> : Interested Parties letters out May 2011, Native American Government to Government Letters out May 2011 and Cooperating Agency Invite Letters out May 2011 EA/BA will be done for this action.	On-going	Draft Chapters 1 and 2 out to team	August 2012		Reclamation BLM and NMISC Cooperating Agencies
10	<u>Signed FONSI</u>			September 2012 or as late as December 2012		Reclamation
<b>Construction Schedule – October 2012- October 2014</b>						
11	Bank lowering and contouring			Will be developed w/Socorro Field Office Fall of 2012		
12	Vegetation Removal			Will be developed w/Socorro Field Office Fall of 2012		
13	Sunflower swales			Will be developed w/Socorro Field Office Fall of 2012		
<b>During Project Timeframe – October 2012 through FY2014 depending on funding – could be split into 2 fiscal years.</b>						
14	<u>Determine the need for a BLM Burn Plan</u> : The BLM burn crew could burn the piles of debris onsite. Some brush would be placed to create in-river habitat. Another option is to chip up the debris.		Draft document	September 2012		BLM
15	<u>Revegetation of Area</u> : Revegetation with native grasses, baccharis and coyote willow is anticipated. Invasives such as kochia, ravenna grass and tamarisk will try to colonize – native grasses could slow that down. A flood event would help establish other natives such as alkali sacaton and four-winged saltbush. Adaptive management based on monitoring would continue into the future.	On-going	Design will be described in the Monitoring/ Adaptive Management Plan	Post Construction		Reclamation & BLM

	<b>Actions/Commitments</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Reference/Letter or Document</b>	<b>Date Required for Project</b>	<b>Why it was not completed?</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
<b>Post Construction – Follow Up</b>						
16	<u>Post Construction Maintenance Plan:</u> A maintenance plan would be needed. The BLM has needed to do some work on their cleared areas to stay ahead of resprouts and new growth. Smaller shoots are best removed by hand, rather than spraying. The NMSLO may be able to fund or maintain the restoration on its lands and small grants may also be available for work on private land.	No- On-going	Design will be described in Adaptive Management Plan	Post Construction		Reclamation/ NMSLO BLM
17	<u>Fish Monitoring Plan/Work:</u> With a limited amount of work and expense, there could be good benefits in restoring the 2.5 to 3 miles of the river to more natural conditions. Shiner populations are present and would benefit. The project is close to the Bitter Lake restoration project. The proximity to good upstream habitat would likely help improve the survival and breeding of shiner.  The shiner needs mobile sandy sediment, which requires inputs from the banks and side channels. There is not much data on the Pecos on what we can expect the channel to do in the long-term. The river is not functioning under a natural hydrograph and does not have as large base or flood flows as it did historically. Rather than losing control of the river, there is a bigger risk that the river will not be induced to erode enough and additional excavation work may be needed in the future.	Ongoing	Design will be described in Adaptive Management Plan	Baseline Information Available- Final Plan Post Construction		Reclamation/FWS
18	<u>Monitoring of Restoration Work:</u> monitor to ensure that it meets the restoration objectives (e.g., native vegetation, wider channel, provide for channel movement, sediment input)	On-going	Design will be described in Adaptive Management Plan	Post Construction		Reclamation & BLM