

**COLORADO RIVER RECOVERY PROGRAM
FY 2014-2018 PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK**

Project No.: 128

Abundance estimates for Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River

Reclamation Agreement number [if applicable & known]: _____
Reclamation Agreement term [if applicable & known, e.g., Oct. 1, 2013 – Sep. 30, 2018]: _____

Lead Agency: Larval Fish Laboratory (LFL)

Submitted by: Kevin Bestgen (Lead), John Hawkins, Gary White
Larval Fish Laboratory
Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, CO 80523
voice: KRB (970) 491-1848, JAH (970) 491-2777
fax: (970) 491-5091
email: kbestgen@colostate.edu

Date Last Modified: 5/7/2013 10:05:00 AM [This field is set to update automatically.]

<u>Category:</u>	<u>Expected Funding Source:</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing project	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual funds
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ongoing-revised project	<input type="checkbox"/> Capital funds
<input type="checkbox"/> Requested new project	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (explain)
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsolicited proposal	

I. Title of Proposal: Abundance Estimates for Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin, Utah and Colorado

II. Relationship to RIPRAP:

See RIPRAP at <http://www.coloradoriverrecovery.org/documents-publications/foundational-documents/recovery-action-plan.html>

Green River Action Plan: Mainstem

- V. Monitor populations and habitat and conduct research to support recovery actions (Research, monitoring, and data management).
- V.C. Population estimate for Colorado pikeminnow.
- V.C.1. Middle Green River

III. Study Background/Rationale and Hypotheses:

Background.—Abundance estimates of endangered Colorado pikeminnow *Ptychocheilus lucius* are needed to better monitor population status and provide benchmarks against which progress toward recovery can be measured. The 1998 meeting of the *Interagency Standardized Monitoring Program (ISMP)* workgroup recommended obtaining abundance estimates for each

population of endangered fish. The Genetics Management Plan identified a population (the Yampa-Green stock) of Colorado pikeminnow that inhabits the middle Green River (Middle Green River reach) from Lodore Canyon downstream to approximately the White River. The middle Green River stock includes fish in the Yampa River (Yampa River reach) and the White River (White River reach); the few fish captured in the Duchesne River are included in the middle Green River reach. The other Green River stock resides in the mainstem Green River downstream of the White River. Two reaches include the Desolation-Gray Canyon portion of the Green River (Desolation-Gray Canyon reach) and the lower Green River (lower Green River reach) from about the town of Green River, Utah, downstream to the confluence of the Colorado River. This scope of work outlines a procedure to obtain abundance estimates for juvenile (< 400 mm total length [TL]), recruit (400 to 449 mm TL) and adult (≥ 450 mm TL) Colorado pikeminnow in each of the five reaches of the Green River Basin, Colorado and Utah, as described above. From those reach estimates, an abundance estimate for each length-based life stage will be estimated for the entire Green River Basin.

Catch/effort data that describes abundance of juvenile/recruit/adult Colorado pikeminnow have been collected in the Colorado (three reaches), Green (five reaches), Yampa (three reaches), and White (two reaches) rivers from 1986 to 2000 under the auspices of the *ISMP*. Abundance estimates based on capture-recapture sampling were made from 2000-2003 in the middle Green River and from 2001 to 2003 in the lower Green River. Collectively, these data suggested increased abundance of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin until 2000 but abundance estimates indicated an apparent decline after that (Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007). Populations recovered in the 2006-2008 period, in response to increased survival rates and increased recruitment of young fish (Bestgen et al. 2010), but reduced capture rates from 2011-2013 may indicate reduced populations. Recovery goals call for sampling on a three year on, two year off schedule and abundance estimates for the Green River population are due again from 2011 to 2013, with data analysis and summary in 2014, and then another round of sampling in 2016-2018. Therefore, this proposal outlines procedures to conduct capture-recapture sampling in 2016-2018 similar to that conducted from 2000 to 2003, 2006-2008, and 2011-2013 using uniquely marked animals so that the necessary abundance estimates can be calculated. Estimated costs for data analysis and reporting will be provided for 2014.

Parameter estimation models and assumptions.—Two general classes of models can be used to estimate abundance of animal populations in the wild and are differentiated based on assumptions about population demographics. The first class of models are closed population estimators. Closed population estimators have three main assumptions. The first is that the population is closed so that N , the true population size, is constant during the short-term annual sampling event. Geographic closure assumes that there is no immigration to or emigration from the population of interest. Demographic closure assumes no births or deaths within the sampling period. A second assumption that is often difficult to meet is that all individuals in the population have the same probability of being captured during each sampling occasion. Differences in capture probability among individuals are well-known in fish populations, often involving size related differences in susceptibility to the sampling gear. Another situation that may cause unequal probability of capture is a group of individuals that occupy a habitat type different than that used by most individuals in the population. Behavioral differences may also cause differences in capture probability among individuals. Capture probabilities may also vary among capture occasions because of changes in environmental conditions such as stream flow. A third assumption of closed abundance estimators is that previously marked animals can be reliably distinguished from unmarked animals.

The second class of models is open population estimators. Open population models are useful to estimate population abundance as well as the joint probability of survival/immigration, and births or recruitment/emigration (Burnham et al. 1987, Lebreton et al. 1992). This general

model class is termed the Jolly-Seber (J-S) model (Jolly 1965, Seber 1965). Similar to closed population models, J-S population estimation models assume that tagged fish are representative of the population to which inferences are being made and that the fate of individuals is independent of each other. An assumption not common with closed abundance estimators is that fish in an identifiable class or group (e.g., adults) have the same survival and capture probabilities for each time interval. A consequence of this component in J-S population models is that all releases should be made within a short time period so that rates among individuals are the same. The J-S models do not generally require assumptions of no immigration/emigration, and no recruitment or mortality. An exception is that geographic closure is still important when population size is the parameter of interest. Although open models can estimate more and different parameters and have less restrictive underlying assumptions, abundance estimates generated from such models are often less precise than those for closed population models. Another disadvantage of abundance estimates calculated from open population models is that they are all based on model M_t , a model that allows for time varying probabilities of capture. Although time variation is likely among sampling occasions, J-S models assume no heterogeneity or behavioral response among individuals in the estimated population. Thus, abundance estimates calculated from open population models do not allow as thorough an evaluation of assumptions as do closed population models.

Robust design for capture-recapture studies.—The robust design attempts to capitalize on the strengths of closed and open population models by combining the use of each in an overall sampling and estimation program (Pollock 1982, 1990). The robust design employs sampling at two scales. Sampling occasions completed at closely spaced intervals (e.g. weeks) are used to estimate population size using closed population models. That level of sampling completed in two or more consecutive years allows for estimation of population probabilities of capture, recruitment, and annual survival rates. The robust design approach was employed by Osmundson and Burnham (1998) and Bestgen et al. (2005; 2007; 2010) to estimate abundance and survival rates of Colorado pikeminnow in the Colorado River and the Green River, respectively. This approach offers advantages of both closed and open population estimation methods if certain assumptions are met. A particular advantage is that the robust design allows evaluation of heterogeneity effects within individuals among capture occasions. We can meet the requirements of the robust study design with the approach described below.

IV. Study Goals, Objectives, End Product:

Goals: Obtain accurate (unbiased) and reliable (precise) estimates of adult population abundance and survival of Colorado pikeminnow that occupy the Green River study area.

Objectives:

1. Complete a minimum of three sampling passes through the five Green River Basin reaches listed to capture sub-adult and adult Colorado pikeminnow:
 - a) Green River between the confluence of the White River upstream to the lower end of Whirlpool Canyon (i.e., upper Rainbow Park).
 - b) White River between the confluence of the Green River upstream to Taylor Draw Dam,
 - c) Yampa River between Deerlodge Park and Craig, excluding Cross Mountain Canyon,

d) Green River from the White River confluence downstream to near Green River, Utah, and,

e) Green River from downstream of Green River, Utah, to the confluence with the Colorado River.

The LFL and CDOW will attempt 3-8 sampling passes in the Yampa River, in part associated with bass and northern pike removal projects, in order to obtain a more precise and accurate Colorado pikeminnow abundance estimate.

2. Obtain highest possible rates of capture of Colorado pikeminnow within concentration habitats and maximize number of individuals marked and captured on each sampling occasion.
3. Obtain estimates of probability of capture and abundance for Colorado pikeminnow in each of the five reach and for the entire study area.

End Products: The end products are abundance and survival estimates for sub-adult and adult Colorado pikeminnow for each of the White, Yampa, and Green River populations. An overall estimate will also be calculated. The report for data gathered in the 2011-2013 period should be available in summer 2014; a report for data collected from 2016-2018 should be available in summer 2019.

Report Review schedule: Annual reports will be submitted each year. A final summary report for Green River Colorado pikeminnow data will be submitted to the Recovery Program Coordinator in summer 2014.

The Colorado pikeminnow analyses (including the Colorado River data analysis and the Green River data analysis and report) will include:

1. Abundance estimates for all reaches and the entire basin for all three years.
2. A summary of sampling effort and discussion of issues related to sampling efficiency.
3. A list of PIT tagged fish will be submitted to the database manager at the end of each year.
4. Depending on the wishes of the Biology Committee and the Recovery Program, other parameter estimates such as survival rates and population rates of change may be estimated.

V. Study Area

The Green River Basin, including Green River main stem, the lower White River, and portions of the Yampa River.

VI. Study Methods/Approach

We propose to conduct abundance estimation for sub-adult and adult life stages of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green, White, and Yampa rivers as outlined in the Study Area

description. Investigators will thoroughly sample habitat where Colorado pikeminnow are known to congregate (concentration habitat) in each reach on three separate, consecutive occasions (passes) during springtime beginning just after ice-off and ending prior to or during runoff. Concentration habitats are usually shorelines, eddies, pools, flooded tributary mouths, and backwaters. This approach will permit annual abundance estimate calculations for populations by reach and also allows for a combined estimate for the study area. This sampling program conducted over a three-year period will fulfill the requirements of the robust design and also permit calculation of survival estimates for pikeminnow in the study area.

Annual sampling to estimate pikeminnow abundance.—Annual sampling will involve a minimum of three sampling occasions through the five river reaches identified above. The three sampling occasions will be conducted in spring between the time when ice off occurs and end prior to or during spring runoff before pikeminnow migration begins. Sampling will begin at the top of each major reach and proceed downstream. It is important to maximize the number of fish captured on each pass (Lebreton et al. 1992). Different gear types may be used in different sampling areas. Electrofishing will be the primary gear in main channel and small backwaters. Large backwaters and concentration areas may be sampled with a blocking trammel net and perhaps electrofishing. Gear use depends on habitat availability as well but will be applied as consistently as possible across reaches and rivers. The goal of using different gear types is to maximize capture probability on each pass.

Investigators will proceed downriver, sampling all available Colorado pikeminnow concentration habitat on each pass. Information recorded at each Colorado pikeminnow capture location will be major habitat type (e.g., main channel pool, main channel eddy, backwater, flooded tributary mouth), a specific capture and release location identified by a GPS unit, and fish total length and mass. Each fish will be scanned for the presence of a PIT tag, making sure to follow standard Program protocols to ensure detection of tags with new and old frequencies. The fish will be tagged if it has not been previously marked, and the tag number recorded. The importance of back-up PIT tag scanners of both frequencies and adequate tagging supplies is critical to the success of this project. Scanning and tagging of all fish will reduce bias and result in the most accurate and precise abundance estimates possible. Tagged fish will be released in recovered condition at the point of capture.

After a single marking occasion is completed for the reach, they will proceed back to the upstream terminus and begin the second sampling occasion. A sufficient amount of time (e.g., 5-10 days) should elapse between the start of consecutive sampling occasions to allow for sufficient mixing of marked and unmarked fish. In the appropriate reaches, an *ISMP*-like sampling pass may be conducted within a primary sampling occasion to add to that data set.

Assumptions of closed population abundance estimators.—Fulfilling the assumptions underlying any abundance estimation model is a critical first step in the planning of a large field study. We have evaluated the assumptions of closed population abundance estimators in a previous study and feel confident that these assumptions can be met again (Bestgen et al. 2005). The first assumption, that of constant N during short-term annual sampling, can be assumed because the size of the study area dictates that the only point of emigration/immigration from the population of interest would be to or from the lower Green River. The likelihood of movement is much reduced at that time of year because fish occupy small and stable home ranges. Lack of movement during that time period will also reduce movement of fish within the main study area from sampled reaches to areas that may receive little or no sampling effort such as canyons. Limiting the target group of fish to sub-adult and adult pikeminnow and limiting sampling to a relatively short time period in spring prior to migration, eliminates the possibility of additions to the population through recruitment. This fulfills the assumption of demographic closure.

The second assumption of equal probability of capture of individuals is unlikely to be met except in all but the most restricted conditions. However, techniques can be employed to reduce effects of heterogeneity among capture probabilities of individuals (e.g. size effects). Variation among capture probabilities among reaches and years can be reduced by explicitly modeling time effects. We also utilized total length as a covariate in previous analyses to account for a proportion of capture heterogeneity due to fish size differences (Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007; 2010). Previous studies have shown that behavior effects such as avoidance of capture gear are not generally important (Bestgen et al 2005; 2007; 2010). An exception may be for Colorado pikeminnow 800-mm TL or larger, which had very low recapture rates among years. The low number of those fish in samples suggested that bias of abundance estimates due to presumed behavior effects of those larger fish should be low. A separate study may be necessary to fully understand if those behavior effects are important, or if low recapture rates of large Colorado pikeminnow are due to other factors.

Another assumption is of accurate recognition of marked and unmarked animals. To ensure that this assumption is fulfilled, investigators need to make sure tag detection equipment is in good operating order, carefully scan each fish with old and new types of tag scanners, and make sure tags are detectable prior to insertion. This requires that the tagging protocol be diligently followed.

Study duration.—The robust design requires at least two years of data collection in order for a survival estimate to be calculated, but the addition of more years will increase the number of estimates possible, and their accuracy and precision. Although survival estimation is not a main goal of this study, such estimates are useful for other purposes related to determining recovery goals and for comparison with survival rates of Colorado pikeminnow in other systems or periods (Osmundson and Burnham 1998, Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007; 2010). A minimum of three years of data will also yield three separate abundance estimates for pikeminnow in the study area, and will provide a consistency check for estimates among years.

Other considerations for FY 2016-2018.—This sampling design does not include canyon reaches because fish are presumed rare in those habitats during the non-spawning period (Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007; 2010). Another consideration in the decision not to intensively sample canyon reaches is the high level of logistics and effort needed to accomplish such sampling. We will use ancillary data collected in those reaches, such as was done from 2000 to 2003 and 2006-2008, to evaluate that this consideration still holds (Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007; 2010).

Program Mark will be used to estimate abundance and survival estimates for Colorado pikeminnow in the study area. Program Mark is an omnibus data analysis program that allows exploration of a number of closed and open sampling design estimators for calculating estimates of abundance and survival. The robust design specifically incorporates closed model abundance estimation techniques, while survival is estimated from variants of the Jolly-Seber model.

VII. Task Description and Schedule (FY 2014, 2016-2018)

Because of the complexity and short duration of the sampling, and the need to use five relatively autonomous units to complete this work, we will continue to use a Standard Operating Procedure for field personnel to ensure a consistent sampling approach and timely completion of tasks. We will also have frequent conference calls with team members and field crews to discuss issues and problems. This will also provide an opportunity for each group to report on progress in completing tasks. The Larval Fish Laboratory will be responsible for routine coordination of the study. The Program Directors office will assist in resolution of problems related to timely completion of tasks.

Task 1. Feb.-March. Order and prepare equipment. This task relates to objectives 1 and 2.

Task 2. April. Secure sampling location access, final equipment preparation, and crew coordination. As occurred in FY 2013, this related to coordination among sampling crews, a review of sampling and fish handling practices, effort allocation among trips, permit requests, and other tasks. This task relates to objectives 1, 2, and 3. Several river reaches are relatively remote or on private property and will require reconnaissance to acquire permission and find boat launch and take-out sites.

Task 3. Apr.-June. 3-pass sampling. Relates to objectives 1-3.

Task 4. Jan.-Sept. Sampling team coordination, data entry, and analysis. Relates to 4 objectives 1-4.

Task 5. November-December. Write Recovery Program final summary report for data collected in each year in the 2016-2018 period, and prepare data analysis for Colorado pikeminnow data analysis. Relates to objectives 3 and 4.

VIII. FY-2014, 2016-2018 Work

- Deliverables, Due Dates, and Budget by Fiscal Year: Project summary report summer 2014 and 2019; annual reports to Program Directors Office by November each year.

Budget by reach:

Larval Fish Laboratory, sampling and data analysis

Larval Fish Laboratory: Budget includes data analysis costs for Principal Investigator. Budget presented assumes that ½ of field-related expenses associated with Colorado pikeminnow abundance estimation will be covered under project 125, pike and smallmouth bass removal in the middle Yampa River and under CDOW sampling. Additional funds are to be used to attempt five or six full passes (at present three complete passes and sampling in concentration areas three more times will be completed under existing CDOW and CSU projects) for the Yampa River to improve precision of abundance estimates. We reduced our budget by \$7,350 (9%) per year because of efficiencies in data entry and analysis, but additional funding is needed in 2014 for final analysis and report preparation. Fringe benefits are 27% of the total amount of salaries. LFL overhead rate is 17.5% and is charged to all items. Fringe on salary and overhead are figured into costs for LFL items.

Travel: Travel costs for field work based on estimated per diem rates for Colorado State University for the area we are working in. Mileage is based on the standard rate for Motor Pool vehicles, which varies depending on age and size of the vehicle. We will use \$ 0.50 per mile for 2014. Meeting costs include three nites of hotel, per diem, and mileage to travel to meetings. These include costs for two people.

Personnel: Salaries include 27% fringe rate, an estimate for 2014, plus overhead. Overhead is calculated on all items (including salary plus fringe rate) at 17.5%, per our agreement with BOR.

Supplies: Supplies are used in the conduct of field sampling and lab analysis of specimens and otoliths. Containers and preservatives are to hold field specimens and to curate specimens in the lab, preservative are formalin and ethanol for preservation of samples. Camping gear includes tents, kitchen supplies for field camping, and coolers. Nets include seines and trammel nets, disposable goods that need replacements due to attrition. Fyke nets are stationary gear for pike sampling and need to be replaced due to attrition. Tools for repairs include hammers, pitons, rock bags, wrenches, and other hand tools to assist with sampling and gear repair in the field. Raft gear includes personal flotation devices, straps and other rigging for rafts, oars, shocking boat booms, frame repair or replacement, and flooring. Estimated costs based on current prices procured from various online sources (local vendors for camping supplies, NRS rafting supplies, Christiansen Inc, for net supplies, Fischer Scientific for preservatives, sample jars).

Budget notes: Costs were reduced to accommodate Program requirements. This was accomplished by not building in raises in salary between 2013 and 2014 and decreasing costs for sample identification and other analyses; budget was static from 2011-2013. Increases needed to support mandated raises for personnel and if additional funds are available, increased sample costs should be added.

Task 5, report summarizing sampling from 2011-2013

FY-2014			
Item			Cost
Labor	Units	Cost/unit	
Principal investigator (d)	55	594	\$32,670
Senior technician (d)	35	226	\$7,910
Technician (d)	30	145	\$4,350
			subtotal \$44,930
Travel			
trip	2	600	\$1,200
Mileage (miles)	700	0.5	\$350
			subtotal \$1,550
			Total \$46,480

Larval Fish Laboratory, **FY2016**

Tasks 1 and 2, Prepare sampling equipment, literature work, site visit, sampling team coordination

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost
Labor			
Principal investigator (d)	3	625	\$1,875
Biologist (d)	5	375	\$1,875
Senior technician (d)	5	226	\$1,130
Technician (d)	2	145	\$290
			subtotal
			\$5,170
Travel			
Per diem (d)	4	50	\$200
Mileage (miles)	750	0.5	\$375
			subtotal
			\$575
			Total
			\$5,745

Task 3, complete 3 sampling passes, 10d ea, represents 1/2 the costs, other 1/2 covered by project 125, pike and bass removal in the middle Yampa River

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost
Labor			
Principal investigator (d)	10	625	\$6,250
Biologist (d)	15	375	\$5,625
Senior technician (d)	15	226	\$3,390
Technician (d)	60	145	\$8,700
			subtotal
			\$23,965
Travel			
Per diem (d)	100	20	\$2,000
Mileage (miles)	3600	0.5	\$1,800
			subtotal
			\$3,800

Supplies			
gas	450	4	\$1,800
oil	20	3.5	\$70
motor repair	2	500	\$1,000
nets, seines, pens	9	75	\$675
preservative	1	33	\$33

subtotal \$3,578

Total \$31,343

Task 4, data entry and analysis

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost
Labor			
Principal investigator (d)	35	625	\$21,875
Biologist (d)	25	375	\$9,375
Senior technician (d)	38	226	\$8,588
Technician (d)	7	145	\$1,015

subtotal \$40,853

Task 5, annual report preparation

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost
Labor			
Principal investigator (d)	10	625	\$6,250
Biologist (d)	3	375	\$1,125
Senior technician (d)	5	226	\$1,130
Technician (d)	5	145	\$725

subtotal \$9,230

Travel

Meeting	1	600	\$600
---------	---	-----	-------

subtotal \$600

Total \$9,830

Total tasks 1-5 \$87,771

Larval Fish Laboratory, **FY2017**

Tasks 1 and 2, Prepare sampling equipment, literature work, site visit, sampling team coordination

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost
Labor			
Principal investigator (d)	3	637.5	\$1,913
Biologist (d)	5	382.5	\$1,913
Senior technician (d)	5	230.52	\$1,153
Technician (d)	2	147.9	\$296
			subtotal
			\$5,273
Travel			
Per diem (d)	4	50	\$200
Mileage (miles)	750	0.5	\$375
			subtotal
			\$575
			Total
			\$5,848

Task 3, complete 3 sampling passes, 10d ea, represents 1/2 the costs, other 1/2 covered by project 125, pike and bass removal in the middle Yampa River

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost
Labor			
Principal investigator (d)	10	637.5	\$6,375
Biologist (d)	15	382.5	\$5,738
Senior technician (d)	15	230.52	\$3,458
Technician (d)	60	147.9	\$8,874
			subtotal
			\$24,444
Travel			
Per diem (d)	100	20	\$2,000
Mileage (miles)	3600	0.5	\$1,800

			subtotal	\$3,800
Supplies				
gas	450	4		\$1,800
oil	20	3.5		\$70
motor repair	2	500		\$1,000
nets, seines, pens	9	75		\$675
preservative	1	33		\$33
			subtotal	\$3,578
			Total	\$31,822

Task 4, data entry and analysis

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost	
Labor				
Principal investigator (d)	35	637.5	\$22,313	
Biologist (d)	25	382.5	\$9,563	
Senior technician (d)	38	230.52	\$8,760	
Technician (d)	7	147.9	\$1,035	
			subtotal	\$41,670

Task 5, annual report preparation

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost	
Labor				
Principal investigator (d)	10	637.5	\$6,375	
Biologist (d)	3	382.5	\$1,148	
Senior technician (d)	5	230.52	\$1,153	
Technician (d)	5	147.9	\$740	
			subtotal	\$9,415
Travel				
Meeting	1	600	\$600	
			subtotal	\$600
			Total	\$10,015

Total tasks 1-5 \$89,355

Larval Fish Laboratory, **FY2018**

Tasks 1 and 2, Prepare sampling equipment, literature work, site visit, sampling team coordination

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost
Labor			
Principal investigator (d)	3	650.25	\$1,951
Biologist (d)	5	390.15	\$1,951
Senior technician (d)	5	235.1304	\$1,176
Technician (d)	2	150.858	\$302
			subtotal \$5,379
Travel			
Per diem (d)	4	50	\$200
Mileage (miles)	750	0.5	\$375
			subtotal \$575
			Total \$5,954

Task 3, complete 3 sampling passes, 10d ea, represents 1/2 the costs, other 1/2 covered by project 125, pike and bass removal in the middle Yampa River

Item	Units	Cost/unit	Cost
Labor			
Principal investigator (d)	10	650.25	\$6,503
Biologist (d)	15	390.15	\$5,852
Senior technician (d)	15	235.1304	\$3,527
Technician (d)	60	150.858	\$9,051
			subtotal \$24,933
Travel			
Per diem (d)	100	20	\$2,000
Mileage (miles)	3600	0.5	\$1,800

			subtotal	\$3,800
Supplies				
gas	450	4		\$1,800
oil	20	3.5		\$70
motor repair	2	500		\$1,000
nets, seines, pens	9	75		\$675
preservative	1	33		\$33
			subtotal	\$3,578
			Total	\$32,311

Task 4, data entry and analysis

Item			Cost	
Labor	Units	Cost/unit		
Principal investigator (d)	35	650.25	\$22,759	
Biologist (d)	25	390.15	\$9,754	
Senior technician (d)	38	235.1304	\$8,935	
Technician (d)	7	150.858	\$1,056	
			subtotal	\$42,503

Task 5, annual report preparation

Item			Cost	
Labor	Units	Cost/unit		
Principal investigator (d)	10	650.25	\$6,503	
Biologist (d)	3	390.15	\$1,170	
Senior technician (d)	5	235.1304	\$1,176	
Technician (d)	5	150.858	\$754	
			subtotal	\$9,603
Travel				
Meeting	1	600	\$600	
			subtotal	\$600
			Total	\$10,203

Total tasks 1-5

\$90,971

Middle Green River, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Vernal

FY 2014

No work to be completed unless otherwise advised by the Recovery Program.

UDWR–Vernal FY 2014 TOTAL \$0

FY 2015

No work to be completed unless otherwise advised by the Recovery Program.

UDWR–Vernal FY 2015 TOTAL \$0

FY 2016

Task 3. Three pass sampling and associated trip preparation.

	Rate	Hours/Units	Cost
Labor			
Project Leader	33.24	120	3988
Biologist II	34.02	220	7484
Journey Maintenance/Construction Specialist	26.97	400	10789
Technician II (Field Supervisor)	23.13	240	5552
Technician II (Assistant Crew Leader)	17.83	240	4279
Technician I	16.55	720	11919
Shuttle Drivers	16.91	200	3382
		Subtotal	\$47,394
Travel^a			
4 trucks @ 12% of annual use	28298.88	0.12	3395.87
Per diem (15 day trips x 6 people)	13.53	90.00	1217.27
		Subtotal	\$4,613
Equipment			
Boat fuel (gallons)	4.16	168	699
Boat oil (quarts)	11.44	24	275
Replacement props	156.06	10	1561
Replacement water pumps	78.03	5	390
Steering helm assembly	260.10	1	260
Replacement lower units	1248.48	3	3745
Replacement gear box/remote assembly	473.38	1	473
Lower unit oil (bucket)	166.46	1	166
Electrofishing repair supplies			520
Boat/motor repair and maintenance supplies			624
Sampling equipment			1759
		Subtotal	\$10,474
		Task 1 Total	\$62,480

^a The State of Utah uses Automotive Resources Inc. for motor pool operations. Rental is approximately \$6,800/year/vehicle (includes fleet rental, mileage, and gas), which is based on the average annual cost for all trucks used in our program.

Task 4. Data entry, analysis, and reporting.

	Rate	Hours/Units	Cost
Labor			
Project Leader	32.91	20	658
Biologist II	33.69	40	1348
Technician II (Field Supervisor)	22.91	80	1833
Task 2 Total			\$3,838

UDWR–Vernal FY 2016 TOTAL \$66,319

FY 2017

Task 3. Three pass sampling and associated trip preparation.

	Rate	Hours/Units	Cost
Labor			
Project Leader	33.90	120	4068
Biologist II	34.70	220	7634
Journey Maintenance/Construction Specialist	27.51	400	11004
Technician II (Field Supervisor)	23.60	240	5663
Technician II (Assistant Crew Leader)	18.18	240	4364
Technician I	16.89	720	12158
Shuttle Drivers	17.25	200	3450
Subtotal			\$48,342
Travel ^a			
4 trucks @ 12% of annual use	28864.86	0.12	3463.78
Per diem (15 day trips x 6 people)	13.80	90.00	1241.61
Subtotal			\$4,705
Equipment			
Boat fuel (gallons)	4.24	168	713
Boat oil (quarts)	11.67	24	280
Replacement props	159.18	10	1592
Replacement water pumps	79.59	5	398
Steering helm assembly	265.30	1	265
Replacement lower units	1273.45	3	3820
Replacement gear box/remote assembly	482.85	1	483
Lower unit oil (bucket)	169.79	1	170
Electrofishing repair supplies			531
Boat/motor repair and maintenance supplies			637
Sampling equipment			1795
Subtotal			\$10,683
Task 1 Total			\$63,730

^a The State of Utah uses Automotive Resources Inc. for motor pool operations. Rental is approximately \$6,800/year/vehicle (includes fleet rental, mileage, and gas), which is based on the average annual cost for all trucks used in our program.

Task 4. Data entry, analysis, and reporting.

	Rate	Hours/Units	Cost
Labor			
Project Leader	33.57	20	671
Biologist II	34.36	40	1374
Technician II (Field Supervisor)	23.37	80	1869

Task 2 Total \$3,915

UDWR–Vernal FY 2017 TOTAL \$67,645

FY 2018

Task 3. Three pass sampling and associated trip preparation.

	Rate	Hours/Units	Cost
Labor			
Project Leader	34.58	120	4149
Biologist II	35.39	220	7787
Journey Maintenance/Construction Specialist	28.06	400	11224
Technician II (Field Supervisor)	24.07	240	5776
Technician II (Assistant Crew Leader)	18.55	240	4452
Technician I	17.22	720	12401
Shuttle Drivers	17.59	200	3519
		Subtotal	\$49,308
Travel ^a			
4 trucks @ 12% of annual use	29442.15	0.12	3533.1
Per diem (15 day trips x 6 people)	14.07	90	1266.4
		Subtotal	\$4,800
Equipment			
Boat fuel (gallons)	4.33	168	727
Boat oil (quarts)	11.91	24	286
Replacement props	162.36	10	1624
Replacement water pumps	81.18	5	406
Steering helm assembly	270.61	1	271
Replacement lower units	1298.92	3	3897
Replacement gear box/remote assembly	492.51	1	493
Lower unit oil (bucket)	173.19	1	173
Electrofishing repair supplies			541
Boat/motor repair and maintenance supplies			649
Sampling equipment			1830
		Subtotal	\$10,897
		Task 1 Total	\$65,005

^a The State of Utah uses Automotive Resources Inc. for motor pool operations. Rental is approximately \$6,800/year/vehicle (includes fleet rental, mileage, and gas), which is based on the average annual cost for all trucks used in our program.

Task 4. Data entry, analysis, and reporting.

	Rate	Hours/Units	Cost
Labor			
Project Leader	34.24	20	685
Biologist II	35.05	40	1402
Technician II (Field Supervisor)	23.84	80	1907
		Task 2 Total	\$3,994

UDWR–Vernal FY 2018 TOTAL \$68,998

Green River—Ouray, UT to Green River, UT, USFWS, Vernal

FY2016

Task Activity	Rate \$/hr	Total hours	
Tasks 1-3			
Labor			
GS-11 Biologist trip prep	\$44.25	96	\$4,248
4 GS-5 Techs trip prep	\$18.27	384	\$7,016
White River confluence to Sandwash (6 days)			
GS-11 Biologist	\$44.25	60	\$2,655
4 GS-05 Tech	\$18.27	192	\$3,508
GS-05 Tech OT	\$27.41	48	\$1,316
Sandwash to Swaseys (18 days)			
GS-11 Biologist	\$44.25	210	\$9,293
4 GS-05 Tech	\$18.27	480	\$8,770
GS-05 Tech OT	\$27.41	240	\$6,578
Swaseys to Tusher diversion (3 days)			
GS-11 Biologist	\$44.25	30	\$1,328
GS-05 Tech	\$18.27	24	\$438
GS-05 Tech OT	\$27.41	6	\$164
Subtotal			\$45,313

Travel, Per Diem, Equipment			
GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$334/mo	\$334	6	\$2,004
Vernal to Ouray to Sandwash round trip (3 trucks/trip x 192 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$518
Shuttle Drivers Ouray to Sandwash round trip (3 trucks x \$135/truck x 3 trips)			\$1,215
Boat gas Ouray to Sandwash (12 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$432
Boat oil Ouray to Sandwash (2 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$198
Per diem Ouray to Sandwash (5 people/day x \$30/person x 2 days/trip x 3 trips)			\$900

Vernal to Sandwash to Swaseys round trip (3 trucks/trip x 448 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$1,210
Shuttle Drivers Sandwash to Swasey's round trip (3 trucks x \$180 x 3 trips)			\$1,620
Boat gas Sandwash to Swaseys (18 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$648
Boat oil Sandwash to Swaseys (3 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$297
Per diem Sandwash to Swaseys (5 people/day x \$30/person x 5 days/trip x 3 trips)			\$2,250
Vernal to Swaseys round trip (1 trucks/trip x 374 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$337
Boat gas Swaseys to Tusher Diversion (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 1 boat x 3 trips)			\$72
Boat oil Swaseys to Tusher Diversion (1 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 1 boat x 3 trips)			\$33
GS-08 Maintenance work	\$37.38	151	\$5,644
Equipment and supplies (nets, electrofishing gear, maintenance and repairs, boat motors, etc.)			\$5,000

Subtotal			\$20,374
----------	--	--	----------

Tasks 4-5

Labor

GS-14 Project Leader	\$74.16	0	\$0.00
GS-13 Assistant Project Leader	\$61.38	0	\$0.00
GS-12 Supervisory Fish Biologist	\$49.65	0	\$0.00
GS-11 Biologist	\$44.25	168	\$7,434.00
GS-9 Admin Assist.	\$38.54	104	\$4,008.16
Supplies (paper, computer disks, copies, etc.)			\$350

Subtotal			\$11,792
----------	--	--	----------

Total			\$77,479
-------	--	--	----------

FY 2017

Task Activity	Rate \$/hr	Total hours	
---------------	---------------	----------------	--

Tasks 1-3

Labor			
GS-11 Biologist trip prep	\$45.54	96	\$4,372
4 GS-5 Techs trip prep	\$18.80	384	\$7,219
White River confluence to Sandwash			
GS-11 Biologist	\$45.54	60	\$2,732
4 GS-05 Tech	\$18.80	192	\$3,610
GS-05 Tech OT	\$28.20	48	\$1,354
Sandwash to Swaesys			
GS-11 Biologist	\$45.54	150	\$6,831
4 GS-05 Tech	\$18.80	480	\$9,024
GS-05 Tech OT	\$28.20	120	\$3,384
Swaseys to Tusher diversion			
GS-11 Biologist	\$45.54	30	\$1,366
GS-05 Tech	\$18.80	24	\$451
GS-05 Tech OT	\$28.20	6	\$169
Subtotal			\$40,512

Travel, Per Diem, Equipment			
GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$334/mo	\$334	6	\$2,004
Vernal to Ouray to Sandwash round trip (3 trucks/trip x 192 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$518
Shuttle Drivers Ouray to Sandwash round trip (3 trucks x \$135/truck x 3 trips)			\$1,215
Boat gas Ouray to Sandwash (12 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$432
Boat oil Ouray to Sandwash (2 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$198
Per diem Ouray to Sandwash (5 people/day x \$30/person x 2 days/trip x 3 trips)			\$900

Vernal to Sandwash to Swaseys round trip (3 trucks/trip x 448 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$1,210
Shuttle Drivers Sandwash to Swasey's round trip (3 trucks x \$180 x 3 trips)			\$1,620
Boat gas Sandwash to Swaseys (18 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$648
Boat oil Sandwash to Swaseys (3 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$297
Per diem Sandwash to Swaseys (5 people/day x \$30/person x 5 days/trip x 3 trips)			\$2,250
Vernal to Swaseys round trip (1 trucks/trip x 374 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$337
Boat gas Swaseys to Tusher Diversion (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 1 boat x 3 trips)			\$72
Boat oil Swaseys to Tusher Diversion (1 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 1 boat x 3 trips)			\$33
GS-08 Maintenance work	\$38.45	151	\$5,806
Equipment and supplies (nets, electrofishing gear, maintenance and repairs, boat motors, etc.)			\$5,000

Subtotal			\$20,536
----------	--	--	----------

Tasks 4-5

Labor

GS-14 Project Leader	\$76.34	0	\$0.00
GS-13 Assistant Project Leader	\$65.05	0	\$0.00
GS-12 Supervisory Fish Biologist	\$52.69	0	\$0.00
GS-11 Biologist	\$45.54	168	\$7,650.72
GS-9 Admin Assist.	\$38.54	104	\$4,008.16
Supplies (paper, computer disks, copies, etc.)			\$350

Subtotal			\$12,009
----------	--	--	----------

Total			\$73,057
-------	--	--	----------

FY 2018

Task Activity	Rate \$/hr	Total hours	
---------------	---------------	----------------	--

Tasks 1-3

Labor			
GS-11 Biologist trip prep	\$45.54	96	\$4,372
4 GS-5 Techs trip prep	\$18.80	384	\$7,219
White River confluence to Sandwash			
GS-11 Biologist	\$45.54	60	\$2,732
4 GS-05 Tech	\$18.80	192	\$3,610
GS-05 Tech OT	\$28.20	48	\$1,354
Sandwash to Swaesy			
GS-11 Biologist	\$45.54	150	\$6,831
4 GS-05 Tech	\$18.80	480	\$9,024
GS-05 Tech OT	\$28.20	120	\$3,384
Swaseys to Tusher diversion			
GS-11 Biologist	\$45.54	30	\$1,366
GS-05 Tech	\$18.80	24	\$451
GS-05 Tech OT	\$28.20	6	\$169
Subtotal			\$40,512

Travel, Per Diem, Equipment			
GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$334/mo	\$334	6	\$2,004
Vernal to Ouray to Sandwash round trip (3 trucks/trip x 192 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$518
Shuttle Drivers Ouray to Sandwash round trip (3 trucks x \$135/truck x 3 trips)			\$1,215
Boat gas Ouray to Sandwash (12 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$432
Boat oil Ouray to Sandwash (2 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$198
Per diem Ouray to Sandwash			\$900

(5 people/day x \$30/person x 2 days/trip x 3 trips)			
Vernal to Sandwash to Swaseys round trip (3 trucks/trip x 448 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$1,210
Shuttle Drivers Sandwash to Swasey's round trip (3 trucks x \$180 x 3 trips)			\$1,620
Boat gas Sandwash to Swaseys (18 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$648
Boat oil Sandwash to Swaseys (3 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 3 boats/day x 3 trips)			\$297
Per diem Sandwash to Swaseys (5 people/day x \$30/person x 5 days/trip x 3 trips)			\$2,250
Vernal to Swaseys round trip (1 trucks/trip x 374 mi/truck x \$0.30/mi x 3 trips)			\$337
Boat gas Swaseys to Tusher Diversion (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 1 boat x 3 trips)			\$72
Boat oil Swaseys to Tusher Diversion (1 qts. Oil/boat x \$11/qt x 1 boat x 3 trips)			\$33
GS-08 Maintenance work	\$38.45	151	\$5,806
Equipment and supplies (nets, electrofishing gear, maintenance and repairs, boat motors, etc.)			\$5,000

Subtotal			\$20,536
----------	--	--	----------

Tasks 4-5

Labor

GS-14 Project Leader	\$76.34	0	\$0.00
GS-13 Assistant Project Leader	\$65.05	0	\$0.00
GS-12 Supervisory Fish Biologist	\$52.69	0	\$0.00
GS-11 Biologist	\$45.54	168	\$7,650.7 2
GS-9 Admin Assist.	\$38.54	104	\$4,008.1 6
Supplies (paper, computer disks, copies, etc.)			\$350

Subtotal			\$12,009
----------	--	--	----------

	Total		\$73,057
--	-------	--	----------

White River—Taylor Draw Dam to confluence with the Green River, USFWS, Vernal

FY 2016

2012																					
Tasks 1-3							Hourly	hours													
Labor																					
GS-12 Biologist trip prep							\$57.96	96												\$5,564.16	
3 GS-5 Techs trip prep							\$18.27	144													\$2,630.88
Taylor Draw Dam to Rangely river bridge																					
GS-12 Biologist							\$57.96	30													\$1,738.80
3 GS-5 Tech							\$18.27	72													\$1,315.44
GS-5 Tech OT							\$27.41	18													\$493.38
Rangely river bridge to Pipeline																					
GS-12 Biologist							\$57.96	60													\$3,477.60
3 GS-5 Tech							\$18.27	144													\$2,630.88
GS-5 Tech OT							\$27.41	36													\$986.76
Pipeline to Enron (Cowboy Canyon)																					
GS-12 Biologist							\$57.96	90													\$5,216.40
4 GS-5 Tech							\$18.27	288													\$5,261.76
GS-5 Tech OT							\$27.41	72													\$1,973.52
Enron to Green River confluence																					
GS-12 Biologist							\$57.96	60													\$3,477.60
3 GS-5 Tech							\$18.27	144													\$2,630.88
GS-5 Tech OT							\$27.41	36													\$986.76
GS-08 maintenance and equipment repair							\$37.38	151													\$5,644.38
Subtotal																					\$44,029.20

FY 2017

Tasks 1-3						Hourly	hours						
Labor													
GS-12 Biologist trip prep						\$59.65	96					\$5,726.40	
3 GS-5 Techs trip prep						\$18.80	144					\$2,707.20	
Taylor Draw Dam to Rangely river bridge													
GS-12 Biologist						\$59.65	30					\$1,789.50	
3 GS-5 Tech						\$18.80	72					\$1,353.60	
GS-5 Tech OT						\$28.20	18					\$507.60	
Rangely river bridge to Pipeline													
GS-12 Biologist						\$59.65	60					\$3,579.00	
3 GS-5 Tech						\$18.80	144					\$2,707.20	
GS-5 Tech OT						\$28.20	36					\$1,015.20	
Pipeline to Enron (Cowboy Canyon)													
GS-12 Biologist						\$59.65	90					\$5,368.50	
4 GS-5 Tech						\$18.80	288					\$5,414.40	
GS-5 Tech OT						\$28.20	72					\$2,030.40	
Enron to Green River confluence													
GS-12 Biologist						\$59.65	60					\$3,579.00	
3 GS-5 Tech						\$18.80	144					\$2,707.20	
GS-5 Tech OT						\$28.20	36					\$1,015.20	
GS-08 maintenance and equipment repair						\$38.45	151					\$5,805.95	
Subtotal													\$45,306.35

FY 2018

Tasks 1-3						Hourly	hours						
Labor													
GS-12 Biologist trip prep						\$59.65	96					\$5,726.40	
3 GS-5 Techs trip prep						\$18.80	144					\$2,707.20	
Taylor Draw Dam to Rangely river bridge													
GS-12 Biologist						\$59.65	30					\$1,789.50	
3 GS-5 Tech						\$18.80	72					\$1,353.60	
GS-5 Tech OT						\$28.20	18					\$507.60	
Rangely river bridge to Pipeline													
GS-12 Biologist						\$59.65	60					\$3,579.00	
3 GS-5 Tech						\$18.80	144					\$2,707.20	
GS-5 Tech OT						\$28.20	36					\$1,015.20	
Pipeline to Enron (Cowboy Canyon)													
GS-12 Biologist						\$59.65	90					\$5,368.50	
4 GS-5 Tech						\$18.80	288					\$5,414.40	
GS-5 Tech OT						\$28.20	72					\$2,030.40	
Enron to Green River confluence													
GS-12 Biologist						\$59.65	60					\$3,579.00	
3 GS-5 Tech						\$18.80	144					\$2,707.20	
GS-5 Tech OT						\$28.20	36					\$1,015.20	
GS-08 maintenance and equipment repair						\$38.45	151					\$5,805.95	
Subtotal													\$45,306.35

Lower Green River, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Moab

Budget Tables for UDWR Moab Project #128 FY16-18 (FY14-15 are off years)

FY 2016 Costs for UDWR- Moab (with 2% increase from FY 13 on all line items)

Task 1-3. Trip preparation and field sampling

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Project Leader	\$30.30	300	\$9,091
Biologist	\$27.36	1100	\$30,100
Technician	\$17.31	3220	\$55,730
		subtotal	\$94,921

Food and Transport (current expense)

	Rate	Quantity	Cost
Fleet Costs (5 trucks for 10% of total fleet costs)	\$41,616.00	0.100	\$4,162
Food (8 people, 9 days, 3 trips)	\$30.60	216	\$6,610
		subtotal	\$10,771

Equipment (current expense)

	Rate	Quantity	Cost
Camping gear repair/replacement:			\$2,368
Sampling gear repair/replacement:			\$2,193
Boating gear repair/replacement:			\$4,106
Fuel for motors (30 gallons/trip)	\$4.08	300	\$1,224
		subtotal	\$9,891

Task 1-3 subtotal **\$115,583**

Task 4. Sampling team coordination, date entry and analysis

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Biologist	\$27.36	60	\$1,642
		subtotal	\$1,642

Task 4 subtotal	\$1,642
------------------------	----------------

Task 5. Write Recovery Program Annual Report

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Biologist	\$27.36	60	\$1,642
		subtotal	\$1,642

Task 5 subtotal	\$1,642
------------------------	----------------

Grand Total FY 2016	\$118,866
----------------------------	------------------

FY 2017 Costs for UDWR- Moab (with 2% increase from FY16 on all line items)
--

Task 1-3. Trip preparation and field sampling

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Project Leader	\$30.91	300	\$9,273
Biologist	\$27.91	1100	\$30,702
Technician	\$17.65	3220	\$56,844
		subtotal	\$96,819

Food and Transport (current expense)

	Rate	Quantity	Cost
Fleet Costs (5 trucks for 10% of total fleet costs)	\$42,448.32	0.100	\$4,245
Food (8 people, 9 days, 3 trips)	\$31.21	216	\$6,742
		subtotal	\$10,987

Equipment (current expense)

	Rate	Quantity	Cost
Camping gear repair/replacement:			\$2,415
Sampling gear repair/replacement:	\$0.00		\$2,237
Boating gear repair/replacement:	\$0.00		\$4,188
Fuel for motors (30 gallons/trip)	\$4.16	300	\$1,248

subtotal \$10,088

Task 1-3 subtotal **\$117,894**

Task 4. Sampling team coordination, data entry and analysis

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Biologist	\$27.91	60	\$1,675
		subtotal	\$1,675

Task 4 subtotal **\$1,675**

Task 5. Write Recovery Program Annual Report

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Biologist	\$27.91	60	\$1,675
		subtotal	\$1,675

Task 5 subtotal **\$1,675**

Grand Total FY 2017 **\$121,244**

FY 2018 Costs for UDWR- Moab (with 2% increase from FY17 on all line items)

Task 1-3. Trip preparation and field sampling

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Project Leader	\$31.53	300	\$9,458
Biologist	\$28.47	1100	\$31,316

Technician	\$ 18.01	3220	\$57,981
		subtotal	\$98,756
<u>Food and Transport (current expense)</u>			
	Rate	Quantity	Cost
Fleet Costs (5 trucks for 10% of total fleet costs)	\$43,297.29	0.100	\$4,330
Food (8 people, 9 days, 3 trips)	\$31.84	216	\$6,877
		subtotal	\$11,206
<u>Equipment (current expense)</u>			
	Rate	Quantity	Cost
Camping gear repair/replacement:			\$2,464
Sampling gear repair/replacement:			\$2,282
Boating gear repair/replacement:			\$4,271
Fuel for motors (30 gallons/trip)	\$4.24	300	\$1,273
		subtotal	\$10,290
Task 1-3 subtotal			\$120,252

Task 4. Sampling team coordination, date entry and analysis

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Biologist	\$28.47	60	\$1,708
		subtotal	\$1,708
Task 4 subtotal			\$1,708

Task 5. Write Recovery Program Annual Report

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

	Hourly Cost	Hours	Cost
Biologist	\$28.47	60	\$1,708
		subtotal	\$1,708
Task 5 subtotal			\$1,708

Grand Total FY 2018	\$123,668
----------------------------	------------------

IX. Budget Summary

Year	LFL	UDWR, Vernal	FWS, White	FWS, Green	UDWR, Moab	Total
2014	\$46,480	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$46,480
2016	\$87,771	\$66,319	\$72,651	\$77,479	\$118,866	\$423,086
2017	\$89,355	\$67,645	\$74,199	\$73,057	\$121,244	\$425,500
2018	\$90,971	\$68,998	\$74,199	\$73,057	\$123,866	\$431,091

X. Reviewers: Dr. Richard Valdez, Dr. Paul Holden, Doug Osmundson

XI. References

- Bestgen, K. R., J. A. Hawkins, G. C. White, K. Chrisopherson, M. Hudson, M. Fuller, D. C. Kitcheyan, R. Brunson, P. Badame, G. B. Haines, J. Jackson, C. D. Walford, T. A. Sorensen, and T. B. Williams. 2005. Population status of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin, Utah and Colorado. Larval Fish Laboratory Contribution 140. 112 pp.
- Bestgen, K. R., J. A. Hawkins, G. C. White, K. Chrisopherson, M. Hudson, M. Fuller, D. C. Kitcheyan, R. Brunson, P. Badame, G. B. Haines, J. Jackson, C. D. Walford, and T. A. Sorensen. 2007. Population status of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin, Utah and Colorado. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 136:1356-1380.
- Bestgen, K. R., J. A. Hawkins, G. C. White, C. D. Walford, P. Badame, and L. Monroe. 2010. Population status of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin, Utah and Colorado, 2006-2008. Final report to the Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fishes in the Upper Colorado River Basin. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, CO. Larval Fish Laboratory Contribution 161.
- Crowl, T. A. and N. W. Bouwes. 1998. A population model for four endangered Colorado River fishes. Draft Final Report. January 9, 1998. Ecology Center, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Utah State University, Logan.
- Jolly, G. M. 1965. Explicit estimates from mark-recapture data with both death and immigration-stochastic model. Biometrika 52:225-247.

- Lebreton, J. D., K. P. Burnham, J. Clobert, and D. R. Anderson. 1992. Modeling survival and testing biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies. *Ecological Monographs* 62 (1):67-118.
- Osmundson, D. B. and K. Burnham. 1996. Status and trends of the Colorado squawfish in the Upper Colorado River. Final Draft report. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Grand Junction.
- Osmundson, D. B. and K. Burnham. 1998. Status and trends of the endangered Colorado squawfish in the Upper Colorado River. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 127:957-970.
- Pollock, K. H. 1982. A capture-recapture design robust to unequal probability of capture. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 46:757-760.
- Pollock, K. H., J. D. Nichols, C. Brownie, and J. E. Hines. 1990. Statistical inference for capture-recapture experiments. *Wildlife Monographs* 107:1-97. The Wildlife Society.
- Seber, G.A. F. 1965. A note on the multiple-recapture census. *Biometrika* 52:249-259.
- Tyus, H. M., and C. A. Karp. 1989. Habitat use and streamflow needs of rare and endangered fishes, Yampa River, Colorado. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological report 89(14). Washington, D.C.
- White, G. C., D. A. Anderson, K. P. Burnham, and D. L. Otis. 1982. Capture-recapture and removal methods for sampling closed populations. Los Alamos National Laboratory, LA-8787-NERP, Los Alamos, New Mexico.