



## COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Ft. Lewis College, Durango, CO

May 14, 2015

### Meeting Notes

#### COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Tom Sinclair, Chair  
Catherine Condon  
Regina Whiteskunk  
Darryl Vigil  
Michael Howe  
Dale Ryden  
Tom Pitts  
Stanley Pollack  
Michelle Garrison  
Brent Uilenberg  
Kristin Green  
Patrick McCarthy  
Absent

#### REPRESENTING:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), Reg. 2  
Southern Ute Indian Tribe (SUIT)  
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (UMUT)  
Jicarilla Apache Nation  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 6  
Water Development Interests  
Navajo Nation (NN)  
State of Colorado  
Bureau of Reclamation  
State of New Mexico  
The Nature Conservancy  
Bureau of Land Management

#### PROGRAM MANAGEMENT:

Sharon Whitmore, Asst. Program Coordinator  
Scott Durst, Program Biologist

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2

#### OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

Celene Hawkins, CC Alternate  
Leland Begay, CC Alternate  
Bill Miller – BC Chair  
Brian Westfall – BC Member  
Mark McKinstry – BC Member  
Mike Ruhl – BC Member  
Vincent Lamarra – BC Member  
Jason Davis – BC Member  
Wayne Hubert – Peer Reviewer  
Steve Ross – Peer Reviewer  
Mel Warren – Peer Reviewer  
Chris Cheek  
Carrie Lile  
Steven Platania  
Dan Lamarra

Ute Mountain Ute Tribe  
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe  
SUIT  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
NM Department of Game and Fish  
Navajo Nation  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2  
Hubert Fisheries Consulting  
Eco-Consulting Services and UNM  
USFS Southern Research Station  
Navajo Nation  
Southwestern Water Conservation District  
American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers  
Ecosystems Research Institute

**Introductions/changes to agenda** – Tom Sinclair welcomed the group and said he was filling in as committee chair for Stewart Jacks who could not attend the meeting. He said if we cannot get through full agenda, a follow-up conference call can be scheduled.

Celene Hawkins introduced Regina Whiteskunk, Ute Mountain Ute's new CC representative.

**Approval of Sept. 10, 2014 conference call summary** – Whitmore said the current version includes minor changes received from Condon. Ryden moved to approve the summary, Condon seconded, and the summary was approved.

**Status of Program Coordinator** – Pitts said Campbell has not attended the last couple Program meetings and he is very concerned with Campbell being pulled off of the Program. McCarthy said it is disconcerting that the Program Coordinator was not able to attend the Annual Meeting. There was general agreement among the CC that the level of participation by the Program Coordinator in BC and CC meetings and conference calls is unacceptable. Whitmore explained he was tasked by Service Region 2 managers to lead the section 7 consultation on Middle Rio Grande operations, hence, why Campbell designated her as acting Coordinator with full authority of that position. He expects to come back to the Program when that effort wraps up. Sinclair said he will bring the CC's concerns up to Service Region 2 managers. The CC requested a June in-person meeting with Service Regional Director Tuggle to discuss how this situation will be resolved.

**Status of decision on proxy voting** – Whitmore explained this issue was brought up at the last meeting so she looked into past Program documentation and found it is not specifically addressed in the current or past Program Documents. She also looked into past files of CC business and found a one-page document from November 2006 called Draft Voting Procedures. It included various voting rules and processes for approving technical committee nominees and alternates. The last sentence of the document states, "There shall be no use of proxies at meetings." She could not find specific mention of it in any CC meeting summaries around that time frame. She asked Campbell what he recalled about the document. His recollection is that the CC's thinking at the time was if proxy voting is not specifically described in the Program Document, then it is not allowed. The CC agreed that proxy voting is not currently allowed.

The CC discussed current voting procedures. There are 13 CC members with one vote each except for the Service that has representatives from Region 2 and Region 6 and they share one vote. The Program Document states, "On all issues except Program participation, the Committee will function by two-thirds vote of the committee membership. A quorum is two-thirds of the appointed committee membership." Because of the small number of total votes, it is critical that all CC members participate. BLM's lack of participation was noted and that their participation in the Program is a requirement of a consultation and is an ESA compliance issue. The Program Office was tasked with pursuing BLM's participation on the CC.

**2015 Long-Range Plan** – Whitmore said the 2015 draft LRP has been reviewed and revised several times by the BC and is in good shape. Hawkins asked about getting a red-line version for review. Whitmore said she did not think that would be very useful because unlike last year, there were no major changes other than the routine annual updates of the recovery elements narrative descriptions and recovery tasks in the Appendix A tables. CC Members will provide comments on the LRP to the Program Office by June 18, 2015. Whitmore will resend the 2015 draft LRP in MS Word format.

**2016 Draft Annual Work Plan and Budget** – Whitmore went through the draft 2016 AWP. She reported that budgets for most SOW's were similar to last year with some small increases and decreases. Some of the significant changes from last year included adding a new SOW (\$48,250) for O&M of PIT tag antennas. It was added because O&M of facilities and structures is considered nondiscretionary. It would be irresponsible to have invested in antenna installations in the river and not maintain them. Pitts asked about the data being uploaded into the new UCR/SJR database. McKinstry said the data coming from the antennas require some post processing before it can be used and that the SOW does not include evaluation of the data.

Other SOWs that came in higher than the previous year are Reclamation's habitat videography, funds management and peer review. McKinstry explained the videography SOW now also includes costs for temperature monitors on USGS flow gages, the increase in funds management SOW is to cover the stepped-up processes for contracting that resulted from the Reclamation audit done a couple years ago and is out of his control. He explained that the increased peer review budget (\$80,000) more accurately reflects what was spent last year and includes increased participation by the peer reviewers. Whitmore said an additional \$60,000 is included for the fish entrainment assessment because the one-year project has not been awarded yet and it will probably come in higher than the \$50,000 that was budgeted in the 2015 AWP. Two projects from last year are on the list without budgets pending further BC consideration, i.e., Analysis for Determining Natal Origin and SJR Population Model. At the bottom of the budget is a list of potential new SOWs submitted. They are not included in the total because they are also being considered by the BC.

Miller said the AWP was a major agenda item during the BC meeting on Tuesday. The BC supports the draft AWP in concept but some BC members have concerns with nonnative fish removal. Miller does not support doing nonnative fish removal and thinks the money should be used for something else. Based on discussions at the February BC meeting, NMFWCO and UDWR were tasked with developing several options for revising the 2016 SOW for doing removal in the middle/upper reaches. Davis said because the Service said doing away with nonnative fish removal is not an option at this time, all of their scenarios included different methods for removing non-native species. Their preferred option focuses on increased non-native removal effort in a shorter river reach in order to mimic the effort that led to reductions in channel catfish in the PNM-Hogback reach. Miller said Steve Ross initiated a literature review of effects of nonnative species on native fish and effectiveness of removing nonnative fish in the San Juan River and he asked him to give a short summary of his findings. Ryden voiced concern about this not following the Program's peer review process appropriately. Sinclair asked if it was the wishes of the CC to have Ross give his summary at this time. Pollack said he also does not think we should be doing nonnative fish removal and said he would like to hear what Ross had to say.

Ross described the preliminary findings from the literature review he started on Saturday with input from Hubert and Warren examining four hypotheses: 1) channel catfish pose no significant predatory threat to the recovery of native fishes; 2) channel catfish have no significant competitive impact on the native fishes; 3) choking on channel catfish by Colorado pikeminnow is not a significant mortality force; and 4) boat-mounted electrofishing as currently practiced is not effective in significantly reducing the overall population of channel catfish in the San Juan River. So far, he had not found any information to disprove these hypotheses. Ryden said a major factor missing is the response of the native fish community from nonnative fish removal. The increasing numbers of adults and larvae are a signal that nonnative fish removal is having an effect. Also, nonnative fish removal has reduced the common carp population in the San Juan to an insignificant level. Whitmore said the Service looks at all evidence available but does not believe there is enough evidence at this time to stop doing nonnative fish removal in the San Juan River. The Program Office's strategy for nonnative fish removal in 2016 is to modify current methods by concentrating efforts into a smaller reach and see if exploitation rates can be increased. Pollack asked if there is a detriment to native fish from electrofishing. Ryden and Ross said a signal has not been detected that there is a negative effect. Ross will finalize this review and distribute it.

What happens if the CC votes to eliminate nonnative fish removal? Whitmore said Program procedures for the AWP include: BC provides recommendations to the Program Office on recovery projects to implement, the Program Office provides the CC with a final draft AWP with a full explanation of the BC

recommendations and any Service modifications, and the CC approves. She would hope that the CC would give top consideration to Service needs in their deliberations to approve the AWP.

To conclude the 2016 AWP discussion, Whitmore said the BC supported: keeping the population model as a line item in AWP with a place holder of \$10,000 for potential model runs conducted outside of BC meetings; UDWR's proposal to move fish from below the waterfall into the river (could be budget neutral if one non-native removal trip is eliminated); development of larval razorback sucker daily growth rates for the San Juan River; incorporating some of Nate Cathcart's PIT tag antenna data integration into the PIT Tag Antennas O&M SOW; and continuing natal origin analyses in the San Juan River. The BC will provide comments on the draft AWP and modification to SOWs to the Program Office by June 15 and will discuss it again during their next conference call July 8. She emphasized that the first draft budget estimate sent out on May 5 shows a surplus of ~\$32,000 but once all the projects are included, the final budget is expected to exceed the amount of funds available.

McKinstry mentioned that the Four Corners Power Plant consultation included mitigation measures that may result in additional funds for the Program. Whitmore said there would be one-time and annual funding available to the Program to conduct specific recovery actions. including investigating the impact of cold-water releases from Navajo Dam, conducting studies to resolve the impact of mercury on Colorado pikeminnow, contributing to fish passage at APS Weir, conducting mercury and selenium monitoring, implementing habitat restoration and habitat monitoring, contributing to endangered fish augmentation program and non-native removal programs. The NFWF account would be used to manage the money. If this occurs it would fund a position in the Program Office to oversee these activities and would happen around October. Whitmore said Campbell plans to provide further updates.

**SJRIP Information and Education Program** – Pitts wants Melanie Fischer, I&E Coordinator for the UCR Recovery Program, to work with the Program Office to do more press releases. He suggested putting another \$5,000-10,000 in the budget to make this happen. Whitmore said increasing the budget to the UCR Program would not necessarily result in more SJR press releases because Fischer is just one person who has a full workload with just the UCR Program I&E work. Pitts said we need to look for creative solutions then. Whitmore will work with Fischer to put specific detail in the Program Office's SOW to include more presses releases.

**Population Model Review and MOU between SUIT and the Program** – Miller said BC recommends that the population model stay in the AWP as a line item with a budget of ~\$10,000 as a placeholder. Miller will do runs during BC meetings at no additional cost but if requests require Miller to run the model outside of BC meetings, he will need compensation. McKinstry can do an agreement with SUIT to fund work through the Tribe. Condon said she incorporated comments from Tom Pitts in the draft MOU she sent out September 3. She did not receive any other comments. Pitts moved to go forward with the MOU between the Southern Ute Indian Tribe and the Program regarding access to and use of the SJR Population Model and Pollack seconded. Ryden said MOU #9 regarding the Tribe retaining intellectual property and #10 about SUIT not retaining ownership of the model seems contradictory. Miller said the Tribe retains the model itself but does not retain ownership of the Stella software which is public or the Program data used to build the model. The CC approved entering into the MOU. Approval is subject to clearance by the DOI Solicitor's Office. Condon mentioned she would like to wrap up the MOU before meeting with the Tribal Council in June.

**2015 SJR Environmental Flows/Navajo Dam Release Recommendations** – Whitmore said she sent out a draft document describing the process for making environmental releases in 2015 developed by the BC at the February 2015 e-flow workshop #1. She also sent the BC's recommendation for 2015 Navajo

Dam releases. The process is based on Reclamation's proposed use of an end of water year storage target (EOWYST) of 6,063 feet but includes flexibility to drop to 6,050 feet for biological purposes and adaptive management flexibility. For 2015, the BC recommendation to the CC is to forego a small spring pulse and maintain base flows in order to store water for near future large spring pulses. The Program Office fully supports this recommendation. The CC approved the BC's recommendations for 2015 environmental flows from Navajo Reservoir. Uilenberg added it was a good workshop but we need to move forward with workshop #2. Whitmore said the Program Office will work to schedule it toward the end of the year.

**FY15 appropriations/DC trip update** – Pitts reported on this year's Washington, DC trip. Several SJR Program partners participated including McCarthy, Condon, Green, Pollack, and Miller. He emphasized the importance of these trips and the purpose to remind UCR Basin states, congressional subcommittees, and agency directorates of the importance of the UCR recovery programs. It is a commitment of time and money but they are consistently told the trips are very beneficial. A common question asked is about the status of the species. Having biologists there to answer technical questions is important. Considering the \$416 million spent in 28 years, another frequent question asked is if the programs are on-track to recover the species by 2023. The trips appear to be successful as the dollars have stayed in the appropriations. Pollack said they are constantly asked if we are achieving recovery and downlisting/delisting. Pitts said the meeting with the Service was good as they recognized the need to start the downlisting process and he thinks we might be able to do that with razorback sucker. He noted clarification needs to be sent to the House Subcommittee on Power and Water about what happens after the programs end in 2023 and that funding will still be needed for activities such as O&M of facilities and structures. Pitts said recovery looks a lot like what we are doing now but it needs to be described and conveyed. McCarthy said we need to use caution and be realistic in our messaging about down- and de-listing windows. Uilenberg pointed out that although P.L. 106-392 as amended by P.L.'s 109-183 and 111-11 only supports base funding through 2019 and will need reauthorization, capital funding goes through 2023 and O&M of capital projects and monitoring goes beyond 2023. The CC will provide information back to House Subcommittee regarding how the Program will operate after 2023. The information transmitted will be carefully crafted so as to avoid hard dates for expected delisting and downlisting.

**Reauthorization of annual and capital funding** – Uilenberg provided the 5-year plan for the UCR and SJR Recovery Programs' capital projects (attached). They are still using pumps with variable frequency drives (VFD) at Hogback fish barrier that interfere with the remote PIT tag readers and makes them ineffective. Bob Norman has been working with the Navajo Nation (NN) to resolve the issue but he is not sure it will get resolved. Capital and NFWF funds will be used so the money is there but getting it through to Marlin with NN appears to be the problem. A contract between the NN, PNM, and Reclamation could be used to do repairs under the "extraordinary measures" language by bypassing NN and using PNM to pay Marlin. McKinstry found \$100,000 to pay for replacement of the VFD's and tried for 6 months to get them replaced but was unsuccessful. Pollack said he will look into it.

Cheek reported PNM fish passage automated debris removal project is in good shape and the new screens should be installed this week. NFWF and NN matching funds are being used. McKinstry gave accolades to Cheek for all his hard work maintaining the passage and dealing with repair issues.

The budget includes about \$2.5 million for Fruitland but it looks like the NN will be addressing passage and entrainment as part of their rehabilitation of the permanent facility. Pollack wants the Program to cost share on the project because it will benefit more than just the Program including decreasing water diversions from about 100 cfs to 86 cfs. Uilenberg will work with Keller-Bliesner, the contractor, similar to the Cudei project (primary contact is Mike Isaacson). Farmers Mutual Ditch repair is in the budget for

\$9 million starting in 2018. Uilenberg said it was authorized in 2009 in P.L. 111-11 to permanently repair the slide prone ditch that requires use of heavy equipment in the river in critical habitat for the fish. He is not sure when or if the money will be appropriated.

Uilenberg mentioned that using the NFWF account for some capital project expenses provides flexibility. Colorado has paid out their full obligation to the Program but New Mexico is not fully paid out yet. They need to obligate \$1.2 million by 2023. Green said she is working on getting money for the Program this year but it will not be New Mexico's full obligation. Pitts said if she needs a specific project for justification, she can use Fruitland.

Whitmore said the Program Office asked Uilenberg to put two Animas River structures on the capital projects list, i.e., Farmers Ditch and Animas Pumping Plant #1. She said the BC recommended that the Program further investigate the structures for potential entrainment and fish blockage. Miller said several reports were done in the past that identified structures in the Animas that could be entraining or blocking passage. The CC asked if passage in the Animas River was needed for recovery. Whitmore said recovery factor criteria is identified in the recovery goals for both species to provide passage over barriers within occupied habitat to allow unimpeded movement and, potentially, expand range, and to minimize entrainment of subadults and adults in diversion canals. The recovery factor criteria describe site-specific management actions necessary to minimize or remove threats to the species and support wild self-sustaining populations. Whitmore was tasked with providing the CC with justification of why range expansion into the Animas Basin is needed for recovery of listed fishes.

**Annual base funding update** – McKinstry reported that all 2015 funds have been allocated. For 2016, they are estimating a 2% CPI increase to base funds as reflected on Whitmore's 2016 budget estimate. He pointed out that the amount of 2016 projects currently exceeds the amount of funds that will be available.

**Contracting method for Program studies authorized by CC** – McKinstry reported that Reclamation contracting made the RFP for the entrainment assessment only available to bids from GSA-registered contractors. He had no control over that decision. Condon voiced frustration with the restriction. She said the CC went through a rigorous process several years back to insure tribal consultants could compete for projects and they had arrived at a solution that all work considered to be inherently governmental would be put out as a RFP for all Program participants to compete for. McCarthy asked why their consultants are not on the GSA schedule. Miller responded that he has not wanted to do it because it is a long, expensive process involving GSA auditing and he does not bid on that many government contracts. He is not sure he would have gone after the entrainment contract anyway.

Platania added that it is basically a GSA vetting process that sets the rates up front that contractors will charge for various tasks. The contractor is agreeing to not charge more than the agreed upon scheduled rates. His company went through the process because he knew others that had done it and he views it as a cost of doing business. For his company, it was actually a good thing because it caused them to tighten up their cost structure and it makes putting budgets together much easier since costs for various tasks are already set. Platania is not sure why some government RFP's come out with the GSA requirement and some do not but it seems to be about half and half. McKinstry said the GSA requirement may become more prevalent because the Reclamation audit resulted in the agency needing to tighten up their contracting procedures. If a contractor is on the GSA list, they are pre-approved so it is much easier for the government to contract with them rather than having to vet the contractor during the selection process.

Uilenberg said they could ask if contracting can ease up on requirements for small businesses but expects contracting will say they are within what was agreed to with the Program. Miller said his contract is running out in 2016 and he wants to make sure he will be able to compete for future Program work. Whiteskunk emphasized the need to communicate regularly with government contracting staff because staff and rules change frequently. Platania said all RFPs coming out of Salt Lake City are requiring that contractors be on the GSA list.

Pitts said the contracting process needs to be clarified. Uilenburg and McKinstry will contact their contracting office to obtain a written explanation of why the recent Animas River entrainment RFP was limited to GSA-approved small businesses. They will also explore what the options are for future RFPs.

**Status of Colorado pikeminnow recovery plan** – Whitmore reported the UCR Recovery Program held webinars for their MC and the SJR CC on April 7 and May 6. Several CC members attended both. The Service R6 said that based on input during the first call, they have decided to delay completion of the Colorado pikeminnow recovery plan until after a Population Viability Assessment (PVA) is done. In the interim, they will continue to work on parts of the plan focusing on the threats criteria. The Service will begin preparing a species status assessment (SSA) for razorback sucker. The Service has developed a new approach for recovery plans that starts with a SSA then develops a much shorter recovery plan focused on time and costs, site specific management actions, and objective measurable criteria. Therefore, the razorback and humpback chub plans will be done differently than the pikeminnow. Program partners were asked to provide consolidated comments to Seth Wiley and Tom Czaplá by June 5 focusing on threats criteria.

**Status of Recovery Program database development** – Durst reported the contractor, Colorado Natural Heritage Program (CNHP) out of CSU, is making good progress. He attended a workshop held in Grand Junction on March 9-10 and has participated in monthly conference calls to address issues. CNHP is creating a website that is live but not yet fully functional, <https://streamsystem.org>. You can go to the site now to see how it will be set up but will need to go through a registration process. CNHP is on track to go live in September then they have two years to continue working on it.

**2015 Annual Hydrology Meeting** - Uilenberg said he talked to Susan Behery who would like to schedule the 2015 Annual Hydrology meeting. She suggested holding it during the last week of July or the first week of August. It is typically a half day meeting and could be held as a webinar. The CC decided to have the Annual Hydrology Meeting on **July 30, 2015** as a webinar. The specific start time is to be determined, but members should plan on devoting about three hours that day to the webinar.

**Schedule next CC meeting(s)** - Pitts said he wants to see the Program Office host more meetings as webinars because they save time and money. At the last CC meeting, Stewart Jacks said he would look into increasing bandwidth so the Program Office can originate webinars. New Mexico Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office and Reclamation committee members will explore the possibility of hosting since the Service's Program Office has limited bandwidth for this activity. The Coordinating Committee scheduled a conference call for August 3, 2015, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. MDT.

	SJRIIP	UCRIP	TOTAL
Remaining Cost Ceiling End of FY 2011 1/	\$ 29,298,000	\$ 38,440,000	\$ 67,738,000
Unallocated Cost Ceiling	\$ 10,296,452	\$ 13,427,022	\$ 23,723,474

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
<b>Projected Expenditures FY 2010 - 2023 2/</b>													
Farmers Mutual Ditch Repair	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,500,000	\$ 4,500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,000,000
APS Fish Passage	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,525,213	\$ 974,787	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000
Fruitland Fish Passage	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,290,213	\$ 1,209,787	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000
Pit Tab Antena(s)	\$ 464,270	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 464,270
Hogback Fish Barrier	\$ 8,285	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 83,284	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,691,569
PNM Automated Debris Removal System	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000
San Juan Capital Projects Management	\$ 2,705	\$ 50,000	\$ 99,800	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 602,505
<b>Projected San Juan Program Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 475,260</b>	<b>\$ 3,550,000</b>	<b>\$ 183,084</b>	<b>\$ 300,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,340,213</b>	<b>\$ 2,785,000</b>	<b>\$ 5,524,787</b>	<b>\$ 4,550,000</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>	<b>\$ 50,000</b>	<b>\$ 18,908,344</b>
Butch Craig Levee Repair	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Horsethief Canyon Fish Rearing Ponds	\$ 559,224	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 559,224
GVIC Fish Screen Retrofit	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000
OMID Canal Automation 4/	\$ 902,000	\$ 1,130,000	\$ 1,967,213	\$ 8,700,000	\$ 2,150,787	\$ 1,650,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 16,500,000
Price-Stubb Fish Passage Pit Tag Reader	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Price-Stubb Rehabilitation	\$ 1,339,475	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,339,475
Tusher Wash Fish Screen/Barrier 5/	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ 54,430	\$ 2,213,340	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,367,770
Thunder Ranch Backwater Remediation	\$ 296,947	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 296,947
Upper Colorado Capital Projects Management	\$ 131,089	\$ 100,000	\$ 261,677	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 1,392,766
Stewart Lake Gate Installation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 150,000
Gravel Pit Breaches	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000
Elkhead Reservoir Fish Escapement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000
Ridgway Reservoir Fish Escapement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000
Red Fleet Reservoir Fish Escapement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000
Starvation Reservoir Fish Escapement	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000
Catamount	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 380,000
Wahweap Flood Control Levee	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
<b>Projected Upper Colorado Program Subtotal</b>	<b>\$ 3,228,735</b>	<b>\$ 1,330,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,283,320</b>	<b>\$ 11,643,340</b>	<b>\$ 3,010,787</b>	<b>\$ 2,130,000</b>	<b>\$ 980,000</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>	<b>\$ 100,000</b>	<b>\$ 25,106,182</b>
<b>Projected Expenditure Total</b>	<b>\$ 3,703,995</b>	<b>\$ 4,880,000</b>	<b>\$ 2,466,404</b>	<b>\$ 11,943,340</b>	<b>\$ 4,351,000</b>	<b>\$ 4,915,000</b>	<b>\$ 6,504,787</b>	<b>\$ 4,650,000</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>	<b>\$ 150,000</b>	<b>\$ 44,014,526</b>
<b>Current Budget Amount 3/</b>	<b>\$ 5,773,000</b>	<b>\$ 7,948,000</b>	<b>\$ 8,500,000</b>	<b>\$ 11,943,340</b>	<b>\$ 4,351,000</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ -</b>

**Notes:**

- 1/ Cost ceiling authorized by P.L. 106-392 as amended by P.L. 109-183 and P.L. 111-11 indexed to October 2011 price level
- 2/ Expenditure schedule based on current understanding of factors influencing ability to construct facilities and is subject to change. The schedule for individual line items and budget amounts do not agree with BRC budget documents or PF2B. Projected costs are based on estimates of varying detail. Near term expenditures (2012 through 2013) are based on more refined estimates. Out year costs (2014 through 2023) should be used as approximations only.
- 3/ Does not include Activities to Avoid Jeopardy which is not accounted for as part of the authorized cost ceiling.
- 4/ FY 2013 - Phase 1, consists of 33 canal check structures in OMID Canal 1 and 2  
 FY 2014 - FY 2015, Phase 2, consists of 87 AF regulating reservoir, pumping plant and Mutual Mesa Lateral interconnect  
 FY 2015 - FY 2016, Phase 3, consists of pipeline replacement of open channel suburban laterals  
 FY 2016 Phase 4, consists of OMID Canal 1 and 2 interconnect pipeline, B 1/4 Road Pumping Plant, SCADA system and miscellaneous minor control structures
- 5/ Likely schedule slip to 2015