

CR/FY-09 UCRRIC
Mail Stop 65115

Memorandum

To: Implementation Committee
Management Committee, Consultants, and Interested Parties
Meeting Attendees

From: Director, Upper Colorado River Recovery Implementation Program

Subject: Final September 24, 2009, Recovery Implementation Committee Meeting
Summary

Attached are the final action and assignment summary and the general meeting summary from the recent Implementation Committee meeting.

Attachments

- Summary -
Actions and Assignments
Recovery Implementation Committee–September 24, 2009

ACTIONS:

1. Approved the February 23, 2009, meeting summary as written.
2. Ratified the FY 2010-2011 Work Plan.
3. The Implementation Committee urged Utah to establish true protection of Green River flows as quickly as possible given the importance of this action to the Recovery Program participants and their water users.

ASSIGNMENTS:

1. The Program Director's office will show the February 23, 2009, meeting summary as final.
2. Steve Guertin will talk with Region 2 about coordination needed to make it possible to do news releases on San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program items.
3. The Program Director's office will send out a doodle.com request to schedule the next Implementation Committee conference call (first week in March) and meeting (late September 2010).

CONVENE: 10:30 a.m.

1. Introductions, modify/review agenda – The agenda was modified as it appears below. The Committee welcomed Tom Chart as the Recovery Program’s new Director. The Committee recognized Randy Seaholm who is representing Colorado today for his last Implementation Committee meeting. Randy is retiring from the Colorado Water Conservation Board on November 6. The Committee extended their deepest appreciation to Randy for his many years of dedicated service and significant contributions to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. The Colorado Water Conservation Board will host Randy’s retirement party in Denver on October 29 from 1 p.m. to 6 p.m. and all are invited. Steve Guertin noted that Interior’s and the Fish & Wildlife Service’s leadership teams are now in place with Ken Salazar as Secretary of the Interior, Tom Strickland as Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks, and Sam Hamilton as Director of the Service. Steve outlined the Service’s new management construct of strategic habitat conservation, which will include an even greater emphasis on partnerships. Geographic areas have been established for landscape conservation cooperatives based on bird conservation regions (there will be no reorganization of Service regions, however). The Upper Colorado River falls within the Southern Rockies geographic area. John Shields asked if there will be more coordination/inclusion of San Juan as a result. Steve said he thought there probably would be and noted that Service regions have already had conversations about better ways of integrating their work.
2. Approve February 23, 2009 meeting summary – The Committee approved the summary as written. >It will be noted as final on the Program’s website.
3. Update from the Program Director’s office on the Recovery Program, status of the fish and coordination with San Juan Program – Tom Chart reviewed each Program element, discussing current challenges as well as long-term, post-recovery considerations (copies of the presentation were provided at the meeting; the one portion that did not print out can be found at the end of this agenda item). (See also [2009 Program Highlights](#).) Dan Luecke asked about White River flow recommendations and whether those would include both base *and* spring flow targets, and Tom said he hopes to incorporate some of Jack Schmidt’s work and address spring flows. With regard to managing Gunnison River flows, Carol DeAngelis said Reclamation would like to continue to use the existing Aspinall Operations Workgroup. John Shields noted that we need to add to this process a mechanism similar to that for Flaming Gorge to provide written communication from the Program Director’s office to Reclamation (based on recommendations from the Biology Committee, etc.). Leslie James suggested that the Program Director (separate from the Service) be represented at the Aspinall Operations Workgroup meetings (held in January, April, and August). Tom Pitts clarified that there are several stakeholders involved, it will be a collaborative process, and we need to avoid the appearance that the Recovery Program is driving the process. Randy Seaholm added that the Park Service’s Federal reserved water right adds a different dimension to the Aspinall process that we don’t have elsewhere. On the subject of fish passages and screens, Tom Pitts emphasized the importance of the water users operating the screens and passages and the need to continue fall and spring meetings with these operators.

Tom Pitts pointed out that nonnative fish management has now become our greatest challenge; Tom Chart agreed. Tom emphasized the importance of preventing additional, illicit introductions of nonnative fishes (e.g., Utah set a strong example by quickly initiating the process to rotenone Red Fleet Reservoir after an illicit introduction of walleye). Water users would like to see more emphasis on control of illegal stocking. Darin Bird said Utah has spent >\$2M on public relations and other efforts to prevent the spread of invasive mussels. Tom Chart referenced the nonnative fish policy and stocking procedures and suggested that we might want to work on a coordinated policy to address illicit introductions of nonnative species. John Reber encouraged finding ways to describe our measures of success for our nonnative fish management efforts. The Committee discussed population estimates; Tom Pitts noted that fluctuation in these populations may be normal, and if so, we'll need to build that into our long-term plans. Dan Luecke asked about the status of the recovery goals. Tom Chart said they're close but we need to make language about selenium in the draft revised recovery goals consistent with the Aspinall PBO. Otherwise, we should be moving forward to publish the draft goals for review in the Federal Register shortly. With regard to information and education, Tom Pitts commented that he's never seen a press release on the San Juan Program and asked >Steve Guertin to establish a procedure with Region 2 to provide the necessary coordination so these releases will be possible.

▪ **Research & Monitoring near term challenges:**

- Costs of Pikeminnow Population Est. – Green River = \$365K / yr; Colorado = \$185K / yr.
- Costs of HBC Population Est. – range from \$60 - 80K
- Costs of Razorback Sucker Population monitoring – unknown, but probably closer to CPM than HBC.
- Continue to pull in necessary expertise to insure we are using the most appropriate and robust population models and getting the most from our data.

4. FY 2010 – 2011 Work Plan approval – Angela Kantola said the Management conditionally approved the draft FY 2010 – 2011 Work Plan subject to ratification by the Implementation Committee. As shown in the summary tables, budgets are tight for 2010 and 2011 because anticipated inflationary increases are very low. In light of that, Program participants have worked hard to hold the line on their budgets, which is appreciated. Projects still being scoped out are shown as contingencies. The bottom line for the 2010 and 2011 budgets has the right amount of latitude we like to see at this point in the work plan process. Changes recommended by the Management and technical committees have been incorporated in the budget summary tables and scopes of work have been, or are being revised accordingly. With the Management Committee, the Program Director's Office recommends that the Implementation Committee ratify the work plan; the Committee approved the work plan.
5. Update on Green River flow protection – Jana Mohrman described Utah's work to protect flows on the Green River for the endangered fish (see Attachment 2). The Water Acquisition Committee has been working with Utah on this effort. Dan Luecke noted that Matt Lindon has said he's not sure Utah water users fully appreciate the benefit they receive from the Recovery Program. Dan said the environmental community has serious concerns with Utah's proposal at this point because it's not clear if it will protect the Green River flow targets, as required in the RIPRAP. It's also unclear how the 400,000 af that Reclamation

transferred to Utah out of Flaming Gorge fits into the subordination. Dan asked if there might be a tiered process to protect the fish flows now and then work on the other issues and modeling implications as the analytic capabilities develop. Dan noted that an important breakthrough in 15-Mile Reach flow protection was collectively agreeing on the analytical mechanism for determining compliance (CRDSS). Tom Pitts added that we rely on state law to protect flows, so we're looking to Utah to show the Committee how this will be done; Dan agreed. The Water Acquisition Committee has a call scheduled Monday, October 5, following the public meetings. Randy Seaholm noted that this is a sufficient progress item; the Service agreed and said it's one they will have to scrutinize very closely as they make next year's sufficient progress assessment. The Implementation Committee urged Utah to get true protection of Green River flows in place as quickly as possible given the importance of this action to the Recovery Program participants and their water users.

6. Update on Aspinall EIS/Gunnison River PBO and how they are expected to affect the Recovery Program – Carol DeAngelis reported that the draft EIS was released in February, and the comment period ended in April. Reclamation received a draft PBO from the Service and sent it to the cooperating agencies for comments, which have been received. Reclamation had a very good meeting with the Service September 9. The draft PBO is a no-jeopardy that covers all existing depletions in the Gunnison River and the Dallas and Dolores projects reconsultation, as well as an increment of new depletions. Reclamation is coordinating their response to comments received on the EIS and expect to complete the EIS and ROD by spring. Ann Castle (Interior's Assistant Secretary for Water and Science) was in Grand Junction last Friday and came to Carol's office for a briefing on this and the Black Canyon water right. Tom Chart said the draft PBO references a study plan and evaluating the flow recommendations. The Recovery Program would be involved in developing the study plan and monitoring the endangered fishes. Biologists working in the Program also would provide muscle plugs for selenium analysis while handling fish for population monitoring, etc. Tom Pitts said he believes the science on selenium in the PBO is not current, and thus the definition of what constitutes a threat to the fish is no longer valid. Assertions made in the PBO with regard to incidental take based on this old science would put the Gunnison River water users in an untenable position. The water users have agreed to participate in a selenium remediation program. Tom said it may be time for the Recovery Program to get involved again in research to define toxic levels based on current science. Tom will recommend that the Program start looking at selenium toxicity, which recent EPA research indicates is very species-specific. National criteria are based on the five most sensitive species; some data indicate pikeminnow and razorback are not among the more sensitive species. This is an issue for both the Upper Basin and San Juan programs. Tom Chart agreed we need to start looking at what this research would cost and then bring it into our work planning process. Randy said Colorado has allocated \$500K from their species conservation trust fund to go toward selenium remediation and is putting together a contract with the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users to start lining the EC canal. The Colorado River Salinity Control Program is also involved and recommended that Reclamation allocate up to \$1.5M for additional further lining (bringing the total to be lined to 1.6 miles). Dan Luecke outlined the environmental groups' concern about the purpose and need language in the EIS and the difference between the Flaming Gorge EIS, i.e. avoid jeopardy vs. assist in recovery.

The PBO rightly cites the Whitewater gage targets, but implicates the remainder of the river even though Reclamation can't model it or manage it in real time, Thus, the Dolores project would be reauthorized without any evidence of benefits accruing to that portion of the river. Carol said she understands the Service is working on strengthening their logic in the PBO with regard to this. Colorado would very much like to keep the benefits to the Dolores water users in place in the PBO. Randy said Colorado also is trying to address the Dolores concerns in their sensitive species work. A Gunnison River Selenium Task Force is in place.

7. Status report on capital projects for the Upper Colorado and San Juan recovery programs – Brent Uilenberg said the final cost ceiling indexing and passage of P.L. 111-11 (which contained additional authorization) put us in a very favorable position to complete capital projects and have a good reserve available for any needed rehabilitation. The Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program has ~\$37M and San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program has ~\$27M capital cost ceiling remaining.
 - a. OMID (Orchard Mesa Irrigation District Water Efficiency Improvement Project) – Brent described this project as very similar to the Grand Valley Water Management Project. OMID originally was proposed as a solution for the 10,825 water supply (for which another solution was found). There is another block of 10,825 af of water from Ruedi Reservoir, which will be lost in 2012. Therefore, water savings from the OMID project could play an important role in meeting the 15-Mile Reach flow recommendations in the future. OMID currently operates at ~27% irrigation efficiency. This project could result in at least 17,000 acre-feet (perhaps up to 30,000 acre-feet) of reduced diversion. In June, the Management Committee approved OMID construction if agreement can be reached on who will pay the incremental O&M costs. Recently, the Colorado Water Conservation District purchased the land for the re-regulating reservoir. The current estimated capital project cost is ~\$16.5M. The annual O&M increment would be ~\$340,000/year. Brent reviewed where we stand with funding commitments to cover the projected O&M: \$50K per year could come from proceeds of a trust fund on reimbursement from this real estate purchase; \$11K from additional hydropower revs; \$100K from OMID; for \$161K of firm commitment for O&M. The Grand Valley Water Users Association would get an additional \$14K in hydropower revenues and they've been asked to consider donating that. Reclamation has proposed that the Recovery Program consider \$100K annual base funding toward this as part of securing flow for the 15-Mile Reach. That would leave a \$65K deficit and Reclamation has a meeting scheduled with Colorado Department of Natural Resources and the Colorado Water Conservation Board to discuss the potential of ~\$1.6m trust fund to provide the \$65K deficit. Meanwhile, Reclamation has begun design and related work (outside of Program dollars). Brent believes construction (estimated to take two to three years) could begin in 2012.
 - b. Others – Brent reviewed completed and ongoing projects. Between the two recovery programs, we've constructed 18 major facilities. This year we've undertaken rehabilitation on the Grand Valley hatchery and that should be complete by mid-November. Upcoming activities may include rehabilitation at the Butch Craig

floodplain site and construction of additional rearing ponds at Horsethief. The Tusher Wash fish screen is still on hold until determine what will be done with the facility and if a weir approach may be feasible.

8. Update on status of 2008 – 2009 sufficient progress items – Tom Chart reviewed the status of action items (see Attachment 3)
9. Update on Management Committee activities
 - a. Cooperative agreement extension – Debbie Felker thanked everyone for their great effort to get the agreement signed and distributed copies.
 - b. Legislation – John Shields said that the annual base funding legislation is before Congress and Pat Tyrell and Leslie James testified Tuesday before the House Natural Resources Water and Power Subcommittee on H.R. 2288. Pat described the lavish support from Congressman Salazar with some critique from the ranking minority member and perhaps the chair (with the critique focusing on endpoints and showing success). Leslie agreed the hearing went pretty well. Tom Pitts noted that 13 of the 14 members of the delegation support the bill. Numerous letters of support also were submitted. The Senate hearing was in July, so we hope that we'll get this passed this year. John Shields, the Program Director's office and others are working on responses to questions from the Subcommittee. Leslie will review this and then Tom Chart will send it to Pat Tyrrell to submit. Angela Kantola said the Program Director's office was contacted by the Congressional Research Service this morning regarding Program partner contributions over the last 10 years. Tom Pitts described additional legislation to permanently reallocate 5,412.5 acre-feet of the regulatory capacity of Ruedi Reservoir for delivery to endangered fish habitat on the Colorado River and assign all costs associated with the re-allocated water as non-reimbursable. Legislation was introduced in the Senate, but contained errors and will be retracted. Tom said they'll redraft that and get it to the Implementation, Management, and Water Acquisition committees for review before it is introduced later this fall.
 - c. Washington, D.C. briefing trip – John Shields said the trip is scheduled for March 17 – 22, 2010, with a Congressional appreciation lunch on March 19. John reviewed the purposes and importance of this trip, and provided the Committee with a summary on this topic. John mentioned the importance of briefing the minority staff and Steve Guertin confirmed this importance.
10. Wrap-up and schedule next Implementation Committee meeting – >The Program Director's office will send a doodle.com request to schedule a conference call the first week of March and a meeting late next September.

ADJOURN: 3:15 p.m.

Attachment 1 - Participants
Colorado River Recovery Implementation Committee Meeting, September 24, 2009

IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Steve Guertin, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Chairman)
Carol DeAngelis, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
John Reber, National Park Service
Dan Luecke, Environmental Groups
Leslie James, Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
Darin Bird for Mike Styler, Utah Department of Natural Resources
Shane Capron for Clayton Palmer, Western Area Power Administration
Tom Pitts, Upper Basin Water Users
Pat Tyrrell, Wyoming State Engineer's Office
Randy Seaholm for Harris Sherman, Colorado Department of Natural Resources
Program Director Tom Chart, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (nonvoting)

OTHERS:

Dave Mazour, Tri-State
John Shields, Wyoming State Engineer's Office
Julie Lyke, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Brent Uilenberg, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Czapla, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Recovery Program
Debbie Felker, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Recovery Program
Jana Mohrman, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Angela Kantola, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Recovery Program

Attachement 2
*Protection of flows through Reach 2 of the Green River
to the confluence of the Duchesne River as measured at the Jensen gage*

The State of Utah presented this proposal at the public meeting in Vernal on August 20, 2009:

Current Green River Policy

- Fully appropriated, closed to new appropriation.
- Fixed-time appropriations are still given.
- Change applications go by the “no-injury rule”; when a water right is changed (point of diversion or use), that change cannot injure a junior.
- Transferred claim which maintains the priority date.

Utah Policy Change - Nov 1994 (subordination policy for summer and fall flows)

- Public meetings and comment period resulted in no written or verbal opposition.
- Subordination through reach 2 in the Green River to the Duchesne River confluence in the summer and fall.
- Based on each year’s hydrologic condition in the range of 1,100 to 2,400 cfs.

Proposed Policy Change – 2009 Green River Reach 2 to the Duchesne River, year-round

- Subordination of any new water rights filed
- Pre-1994 conditional water rights wouldn’t be subordinated
- Summer and Fall fish flows – 1994 priority maintained
- Winter and Spring fish flows – 2009 priority
- 25 cfs flow set aside for critical needs would not be subordinate to fish flows
- All flows measured at Jensen, Utah
- 3-week written comment period beginning then signing (time has passed and revision unknown)
- *Change applications that move water upstream would receive very close review under the proposed subordination policy because they would result in less water available for fish. Water is available from contracts in Flaming Gorge Water or others to buy.
- *Under the proposed subordination policy, Utah would also look closely at applications requiring winter or spring storage.

Future Agreements:

- Extend flow protection to Lake Powell, 3 river reaches, 4 seasons
- 5 hydrological regimes - flood to drought at Jensen and Green River gages
- Adaptive Management: monitor, re-evaluate, recalibrate, reconsider

*** Added after the public meeting in Vernal**

Table 5.5. Recommendations for flows by hydrologic condition for Reach 2. (Muth R.T, et al (2000) Flow and Temperature Recommendations for Endangered Fish in the Green River Downstream of Flaming Gorge Dam)

	Hydrologic Condition ^b				
	Wet (0 to 10% Exceedance)	Moderately Wet (10 to 30% Exceedance)	Average (30 to 70% Exceedance)	Moderately Dry (70 to 90% Exceedance)	Dry (90 to 100% Exceedance)
SPRING PEAK FLOW					
Peak-flow magnitude	≥ 26,400 cfs	≥ 20,300 cfs	≥ 18,600 cfs in 1 of 2 average years; ≥ 8,300 cfs in other average years	≥ 8,300 cfs	

Peak-flow duration	Flows greater than 22,700 cfs should be maintained for 2 weeks or more, and flows greater than 18,600 cfs for 4 weeks or more.	Flows greater than 18,600 cfs should be maintained for 2 weeks or more.	Flows greater than 18,600 cfs should be maintained for at least 2 weeks in at least 1 of 4 average years.	Flows greater than 8,300 cfs should be maintained for at least 1 week.	Flows greater than 8,300 cfs should be maintained for 2 days or more except in extremely dry years ($\geq 98\%$ exceedance).
Peak-flow timing	Peak flows should coincide with peak and immediate post-peak spring flows in the Yampa River				
SUMMER THROUGH WINTER BASE FLOW					
Mean base-flow magnitude	2,800 to 3,000 cfs	2,400 to 2,800 cfs	1,500 to 2,400 cfs	1,100 to 1,500 cfs	900 to 1,100 cfs

ATTACHMENT 3

Action Items from the Draft 2009 Sufficient Progress Memo

September 22, 2009

ACTION ITEM	LEAD	DUE DATE	STATUS
<p>The Service will continue to closely follow the effectiveness of nonnative fish management actions and the responses of the endangered and other native fishes. Data should continue to be reported annually, and necessary changes to nonnative fish management actions should be made in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>FWS, CDOW, UDWR</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>7/13/09: Critical data from 2008 have now been submitted. CDOW has discontinued translocation of smallmouth bass to Craig Justice Center Ponds, which will be returned to a trout fishery. Elkhead Reservoir will remain the primary translocation site for smallmouth bass (subsequent to spills or until the upper reservoir can be accessed). CDOW will continue to translocate northern pike to State Parks Headquarters Pond (Kyle's pond), Loudy Simpson, and Yampa State Wildlife Area ponds (subsequent to connection in the latter two locations). Northern pike CDOW is removing from Catamount Lake are now euthanized. Future actions are contingent on further contaminant results from riverine samples of northern pike and smallmouth bass. Elkhead Reservoir is still under a public fish consumption advisory. 2009 nonnative fish workshop scheduled for December 8-9.</p>
<p>A research framework project was initiated in 2005 to conduct additional data analyses to further understand environmental variables and life-history traits influencing the dynamics of Colorado pikeminnow and humpback chub populations. The draft research framework report is behind schedule (originally due in 2007), but is expected in July 2009. Results will be used to refine hypotheses and direct management actions.</p>	<p>Valdez, Bestgen</p>	<p>7/31/09</p>	<p>8/24/09: Draft sent to PD's office and co-authors for review.</p>
<p>The Flaming Gorge Technical Work Group (Reclamation, the Service, and Western) needs to continue to provide brief updates on current and projected Flaming Gorge operations at Biology Committee meetings.</p>	<p>USBR, FWS, WAPA</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p>Ongoing. A tracking spreadsheet for the FG BO is being developed for review as part of sufficient progress (like those for the 15-Mile Reach and Yampa PBO's).</p>
<p>The Recovery Program and the Utah State Engineer's office have been working on mechanisms to protect year-round flows in the Green River; however, this is behind schedule. A schedule and outline of the steps required for both the year-round protection above the Duchesne (to occur in 2009) as well as flow protection below the Duchesne is needed: a) the public meeting held by August 31, and the protection finalized by December 31, 2009; and b) by September 30, 2009, a schedule outlining steps for year-round protection downstream of the Duchesne to the confluence with the Colorado River.</p>	<p>Utah</p>	<p>Public meeting: 8/31/09 Schedule/outline: 9/30/09</p>	<p>Public meeting held 8/20/09 for above Duchesne; completion anticipated by 12/30/09 (year-round above Duchesne). Outline/schedule for protection below Duchesne anticipated by 9/30/09. Program partners (Service, Reclamation, and Utah) are working to identify specific flow targets that would trigger subordination. The Water Acquisition Committee discussed this process on September 22 and the State has public meeting scheduled at the end of September. On September 24, the Implementation Committee urged Utah to get true protection of Green River flows in place as quickly as possible given the importance of this action to the Recovery Program participants and their water users.</p>

The Colorado Division of Wildlife will complete the Yampa River Aquatic Management Plan (with an Upper Yampa River northern pike strategy) by early July 2009. The Program will use this strategy and available information to evaluate the need to expand northern pike control upstream of Hayden to Steamboat Springs, possibly including removal efforts.	CDOW		8/10: Draft is in internal CDOW review. 9/22: CDOW sent the draft to the Program Director who forwarded it to the States and Service and Biology Committee for a courtesy review prior to final approval.
Now that the Myton Diversion rehabilitation has been completed, the Program, Service, and Duchesne Work Group will work together to determine if any changes are needed in ongoing monitoring efforts necessary to evaluate the flow recommendations.	PD, FWS, DWG	Ongoing	8/10: Diversion operational and SCADA now online. Hydrological monitoring: after a full year's operation, the data will be examined to assure that the water is reaching the Randlette gage. Biological monitoring: Ute Tribe is conducting fish community surveys in the Duchesne; PD/FWS to define monitoring needed to evaluate flow recommendations.
Implementation of Coordinated Reservoir Operations (CROS) provided some peak flow augmentation in 2008; however, constraints on operations due to flooding concerns need further investigation to determine the feasibility of further enhancing CROS benefits.	NWS, Mohrman, CWCB, WAC	March 1, 2010	7/22/09: National Weather Service began a flood stage investigation last season which should provide some answers before the 2010 peak flow.
Work on Coordinated Facilities Operations Project (CFOPS) will resume and is expected to be completed in 2010, but a specific schedule needs to be developed by October 1, 2009.	Upper Basin water users	October 1, 2010.	Implementation schedule to be provided by Oct. 1, 2009.
Close coordination will be maintained by meeting twice a year with Grand Valley water users and conducting conference calls as needed to discuss river conditions prior to the weekly Historic User Pool calls. The focus should be on taking full advantage of water savings brought about by operation of the Grand Valley Water Management project for late summer flow augmentation.	USB, PD's office	Meetings and conference calls ongoing. Hydrologic model completion date?	7/31/09: Declaration of Green Mtn. surplus happens after other fish pools are applied, but should be fairly straightforward this year. CWCB is working on a hydrologic model to better predict base flows at Cameo based on snowpack, etc. (Dan McAuliffe checking with Michelle Garrison re: completion date). 9/24 Brent Uilenberg noted that this year has been a real breakthrough (though the modeling will still be valuable in the future).
The goal of the 10,825 Project is to have agreements signed with the Service prior to Dec. 2009 committing east & west slope water users to permanent sources of Ruedi replacement water (as required by the Colorado River PBO).	Upper Basin water users, FWS	Agreements to be signed by December 2009	8/3/09 Tom Pitts will work with water user attorneys to draft commitments by the water users to implement the two-component 10,825 solution and provide drafts for Service review (meetings to begin in October).

