

Biology Committee Meeting Summary  
December 14, 2005  
Grand Junction, Colorado (Holiday Inn, 755 Horizon Drive)

Biology Committee: Tom Chart, Tom Pitts, Gary Burton, John Hawkins, Melissa Trammell, Kevin Gelwicks, Trina Hedrick for Kevin Christopherson, and Dave Speas.

Other participants: Sherm Hebein, Kevin Bestgen, Dave Irving, Pat Nelson, Bob Muth, Chuck McAda, Angela Kantola, Doug Osmundson, Pat Martinez.

Assignments are indicated by “>” and at the end of the document.

*CONVENE: 8:30 a.m.*

1. Review/modify agenda (Speas) (5 min.)
2. Review and approve draft September 19-20, 2005 meeting summary (posted to listserver on 9/23/05) - The summary was approved as written, with one typographical correction;  
>Angela Kantola will post the revised meeting summary to the listserver.
3. Review assignments from September 19-20, 2005 meeting (see assignments).
4. Nonnative fish management
  - a. Review of smallmouth bass summit and nonnative fish workshop - Pat Martinez summarized the summit results. Recommendations were grouped into categories of policy, mechanical, research, and prevention, with items in the policy category given the highest ranking. Pat Nelson distributed three draft documents from the previous two days' nonnative fish workshop: 1) the meeting agenda with brief notes (including questions and appendices Pat had inserted in advance); 2) ideas for prevention and management of smallmouth bass and northern pike grouped into the policy, mechanical, research, and prevention categories; and 3) ideas boiled down into key questions. Pat suggested the Committee review the key questions to determine what items should be part of the FY 06 work plan, what items can be made assignments, etc. (A final summary of the workshop will be forthcoming.)
  - b. Discussion of recommendations for FY 2006 - The Committee discussed the list of questions generated from the nonnative fish workshop (and a few additional questions).
    1. Should we continue to work with isotopes to identify sources of nonnative fish? Is ongoing work adequate to meet objectives? (E.g. Rifle Gap Reservoir). (Applies to smallmouth bass [SMB] & northern pike [NP].)

Pat Martinez has been working with Dana Winkelman and others; technique shows real promise. Pat discussed with Dr. Brett Johnson (CSU) the potential to develop

signatures for Crawford, Paonia, McPhee, Ridgeway, Rifle Gap, Harvey Gap, and perhaps Lake Powell and Flaming Gorge. Bob Muth suggested Kenney Reservoir also should be included. Pat Martinez will revise the most recent C-18/19 scope of work to address reservoir/river signatures for northern pike, smallmouth bass, largemouth bass. (Note: this is related to item #2, how the reservoirs are operated.)

2. Should we investigate operations of Rifle Gap, Starvation, Flaming Gorge, Elkhead, and McPhee reservoirs as a strategy to prevent/minimize escapement of smallmouth bass? Elkhead and Rifle Gap also apply to northern pike (Harvey Gap, too, but it seems secure).

>CDOW (Sherm Hebein) will look into operations at Rifle, Elkhead and McPhee and determine if reservoir operations provide potential opportunity for nonnative fish escapement and, if so, what the options are to prevent that. >George Smith will investigate this for the other reservoirs (working with Trina Hedrick in Utah on Flaming Gorge, Starvation, and Bottle Hollow reservoirs). Sherm Hebein said it's imperative to have Fish and Wildlife Service cooperation in working with Reclamation. >Sherm and George and Pat Martinez will first develop a list of information that needs to be determined for each reservoir (by the February Biology Committee meeting). It also would be helpful to prioritize the reservoirs of concern. This is likely a fairly large project, so Sherm and George will take a first cut at identifying the overall scope of what needs to be done. A scope of work should be developed (although funding may not be needed).

3. Flow management to disadvantage nonnative fish

>The Flaming Gorge technical work group needs to discuss this potential.

4. Should we direct the I&E Committee to reexamine and possibly expand program to provide information to public? E.g., illicit stocking, contacts with private pond owners, stocking ponds consistent with nonnative fish policy. (SMB & NP)

>Pat Nelson, Debbie Felker, Angela Kantola, and Bob Muth will review the I&E-related recommendations from the smallmouth bass summit and nonnative fish workshop, draft recommendations, get review and input from Utah and Colorado, then report back to the Committee (and will include a summary of current I&E on nonnative fish management). Pat Martinez suggested a simple step would be to put the applicable wording from the 2006 fishing regulations on signs and place them at every boat ramp at every warmwater reservoir in western Colorado and at all boat ramps on the river. This would require working with State Parks, etc., on places to put the signs. John Hawkins suggested that Debbie might encourage the water districts to include articles about nonnative fish in their newsletters.

5. Should we investigate smallmouth bass in the White River below Kenney Reservoir and implement immediate removal? (Or possibly determine

presence/absence/abundance during Colorado pikeminnow population estimates.)

>Pat Martinez will request a revision of the Vernal CRFP's collecting permit for their Colorado pikeminnow population estimate so that they can turn over all smallmouth bass collected on the White River in Colorado to him for isotope analysis. Pat M. will arrange for a place (probably in Rangely) where CRFP can drop off the fish. Utah supports removal of any smallmouth bass collected in the White River in Utah. >CDOW (Bill Elmlad) will sample in Kenney Reservoir this spring to determine smallmouth bass presence/abundance. The Biology Committee's recommendation to CDOW is that smallmouth bass in the White River be treated the same as smallmouth bass in the Colorado River. >The Vernal CRFP will keep the Biology Committee informed of the number of smallmouth bass they capture and if any change is needed in their sampling effort. >Dave Irving will modify the FY 06 population estimate scope of work.

6. Should we expand northern pike removal above Hayden; increase effort between Craig and Hayden? Also a possibility that pike entered Green River floodplains in 2005; may need to investigate these before they reconnect (probably would require a separate scope of work); but 4 sites were sampled already and no pike were found.

Sam Finney highly recommended expansion (sampling in the Chuck Lewis State Wildlife Area) based on movement data (25 of 138 tagged fish moved from the upstream to downstream reach). Billy Atkinson has suggested anglers in the area prefer trout, so they likely would support this. Sam also recommended additional effort on the backwater in the Craig to Hayden reach. The Committee supported both of Sam's recommendations. >Sherm Hebein will review Sam's report and discuss the recommendations within CDOW. Sherm noted that any expansion will require meetings to inform the public of the decision. >Sam Finney will provide an analysis of the utility of increasing passes in the current removal reach and the effort that would be required to do that. The Committee discussed the proposal to shift the Utah crew which would otherwise work in Desolation Canyon to assist Vernal CRFP on the Yampa River (or shift the Utah crew to work on the Vernal CRFP's Green River reach and shift that work by Vernal to the Yampa). Vernal would need to request amendment to their permit to add the names of the additional researchers. Sherm cautioned about the need to be sure boats are disinfected between waters. The Committee noted that we also need to be sure Sam Finney has the flexibility to increase sampling as needed to capture fish which may escape from the Elkhead spill this year. >CDOW and the Service will look into more aggressive nonnative fish control methods in upper Yampa River backwaters. Pat asked if we're getting into these backwaters early enough in the season. >Principal investigators will review their scopes of work to see if they need to (and can) get on the river earlier.

7. Should we monitor or remove northern pike control from Brown's Park?

This is related to Bestgen's currently unfunded Lodore scope of work. Pike reproduction has been discovered in Brown's Park; >Bestgen will add investigation of Brown's Park pike into his Lodore scope of work.

8. Should we expand Yampa River smallmouth bass removal, change protocol, focus on concentration areas, etc.?

Recommendations for expansion don't imply covering the entire area not currently sampled. A 12-mile concentration reach occurs upstream of the current control reach. John Hawkins recommended maintaining the control reach. Melissa pointed out that Hawkins' work has shown we can have a removal effect. However, we must remove more fish to show an effect on native fish. Melissa is concerned that as long as we have the control reach, we can never show a river-wide effect, therefore, she recommends eliminating the control reach and removing the bass from that reach, instead. Kevin Bestgen argued that if we don't have a control reach, we won't be able to determine the level of control needed to have an effect on the native fish, nor will we be able to determine whether any native fish response is due to nonnative fish removal or to flow regimes. Kevin Gelwicks concurred. Melissa noted that Pat Martinez' standing crop analysis supports her assertion that we won't see a native fish response unless we much more aggressively control smallmouth bass. Sherm said CDOW would prefer another year of control/treatment to best determine the effect we can have on smallmouth bass. Pat Martinez pointed out that we don't know smallmouth bass expansion will be limited to current concentration areas; bass appear to be expanding and may very well move into new areas (placing more native fish at risk). Without the control/treatment structure, Martinez won't be able to do the same level of bioenergetics work (which is important to determine how many fish we need to remove). Tom Chart recommended all-out removal this year to try to keep up with the expanding population (and the escaped fish from Elkhead) and consider going back to the control/treatment next year. Melissa maintained that the small native fish are essentially gone from the Yampa, therefore, we must expand control to see any native fish response. It doesn't really matter whether we know the percentage of bass we need to remove, because as long as we're only treating a small reach, it's only a temporary effect anyway. Dave Speas supported the call for all-out removal. John Hawkins said that was never the intent in the Yampa, rather, the intent was to conduct studies to see how effective we can be. Tom Chart said that under the requirements Yampa PBO, the Program needs to respond to 2005 significant Elkhead escapement; thus, he recommends all-out removal this year, and revisiting control/treatment next year. Kevin Gelwicks suggested the possibility of doing all-out removal (no mark-recapture) everywhere else but the control/treatment reach.

In response to the desire for intensive smallmouth bass removal in the 24-mile control/treatment reach in the Yampa, Kevin Bestgen proposed expanding the

Yampa 12-mile treatment reach to the entire 24 miles for the adult spring-early summer fish removal work, then later in the summer duplicate the age-0 electric seine fish removal in the 12-mile treatment reach only (maintaining the control reach for this purpose). Kevin said he still believes it's very important to have a basic understanding of the removal effect, thus, we must retain some level of abundance estimate in that reach (and maintain mark-release on the first pass). (Note: this proposal is in agreement with Management Committee's recommendation for lethal removal unless the fish can be translocated somewhere other than Elkhead until construction is completed there. Tom Chart added that he recommends translocation only if CDOW can conduct it. The Committee supported this proposal; >Pat Nelson will summarize the proposal and the rationale, discuss it with CDOW, and get back to the Biology Committee. Given the scheduling and logistical implications, Pat will ask CDOW to discuss this as soon as possible.

Expansion to other concentration areas: The Committee discussed expansion into the South Beach smallmouth bass concentration area in Lori Martin's sampling area (immediately downstream from Craig to the top of Hawkin's 24-mile reach discussed above), and in the Elkhead to South Beach reach (~15 miles) in Sam Finney's sampling area. Hawkins said the focus of the effort (intensive removal and numerous passes) would still be in the 24-mile reach, since this is the area of greatest concentration. Bass would be removed from the intervening pike removal reaches, but would not be the focus. The Committee supported this proposal; >Pat Nelson will summarize the proposal and the rationale, discuss it with CDOW, and get back to the Biology Committee. >John Hawkins and Dave Irving will determine the level of effort needed to implement this expansion (working with the PI's from Colorado and Utah who may be involved) and report back to the Committee. John added that the additional boats and additional visibility means a need for increased I&E.

Dave Irving cautioned against keeping the same personnel in the field week after week (we need to rotate folks so that they can have a week in the office in between). Melissa noted that if UDWR did the Desolation pikeminnow estimate, that would free Vernal CRFP crews to focus on expanded nonnative fish control.

9. Should we shift effort/gears to target certain life stages (e.g., large adults on nesting areas, smaller fish as see shift in size after initial removal)? E.g., incorporate electric seine, where appropriate.

This is part of what's proposed in #8, other PI's (e.g., Mark Fuller) plan to shift as appropriate.

10. How do we establish criteria for levels of nonnative fish removal (and nonnative fish population levels)? (NP and SMB)

Melissa noted that this is a requirement of the Yampa PBO and recommended that the Program develop criteria for Colorado's consideration. The Committee previously considered criteria of pike density equal or less than Colorado pikeminnow densities (with a non-sliding scale, so that pike density would not be allowed to increase). >Tom Chart will work with Kevin Bestgen, Al Pfister, and Patty Gelatt to develop this proposal and bring it back to the Committee for discussion and presentation to Colorado. The Service is working to understand the Program's response to Elkhead escapement and can consider when criteria are needed for smallmouth bass at that time.

11. Should we focus removal of smallmouth bass on concentration/productive areas? Do we have enough information to know this? What are the tradeoffs? Should we establish predator-free buffer zones?

(See #8, above.) Dave Speas noted importance of continuing nonnative fish removal in areas where we have an abundance of native fishes. The Committee discussed Burdick's recommendation to focus on concentration areas (shift of effort). Doug suggested that the data may already suggest that the 5-pass removal may not be enough, so what do we do? Perhaps increase effort and focus on concentration areas (would need proposal; >McAda will discuss with staff and come back to Committee with some sort of proposal).

12. Should we continue smallmouth bass mark-recapture population estimates or implement alternative methods (e.g., target large bass nesting areas)? Where is this feasible and what are tradeoffs? What other metrics could we employ to assess depletion and species response?

(See #8 above.) The Committee also discussed whether or not to do population estimates in the Colorado River (by adding a pass and making the first pass mark only). Doug and Chuck proposed doing this for one year (>Chuck will write up proposal). The Committee recommended continuing mark-recapture on the Green River (Split Mtn. to Sand Wash) since we've had tag retention problems and haven't really gotten a population estimate yet. The Committee considered the possibility of doing population estimates in a few 1-2 mile index reaches from Lodore to Sand Wash, with removal elsewhere in that stretch, but this might not work due to patchy fish distribution. Another possibility would be to repeat the recapture passes quickly (within a day or so to reduce problem of lack of closure), which could reduce time on the river (3 days instead of 5) so weekend work would not be needed to get ready to go out the next week. John Hawkins could review his data to see what would have happened if they had applied smaller index reaches like this instead of having such a large mark-recapture reach. The Committee concluded there probably would be no change to the Green River work.

The Committee discussed conducting population estimates once every three years instead of every year. Melissa proposed dropping the smallmouth bass population

estimate in the lower Yampa River in 2006 and 2007 and reconsidering it in 2008.  
>Pat Nelson will summarize the proposal and the rationale, discuss it with CDOW, and get back to the Biology Committee.

13. Should we move away from control/treatment to more widespread smallmouth bass removal? (See #8 & #12 above.)
14. Should we test pheromones as attractants for trapping nonnative fish (SMALLMOUTH BASS)? What about opening the State Wildlife Area and perhaps Juniper-area ponds to attract northern pike? Pike usually begins spawning in early to mid-March at temperatures just under 50 F.

>Pat Nelson and Melissa will get back to the Committee on the pheromone idea within a couple of months.

15. Should we propose to establish “native fish conservation areas”: and what would this mean to management? (SMB & NP)

The Committee believes this could be an excellent idea and asks >Colorado and Utah to give a status update on their position/action on this at the next Biology Committee meeting. Pat Martinez may make a presentation on this idea at researchers meeting.

16. Should we design our ongoing investigations with the ability to monitor native/nonnative fish population changes after several years of drought and return of average/high flow water years? Are we prepared to address fish response to high flows?

John Hawkins said he thinks we’re doing this in Middle Green and Yampa with native fish response work.

17. Should the 45-mile reach of the Yampa from Craig to the control treatment section be included in smallmouth bass removal? (See #8 above.)

c. Other items

1. Fish handling protocol; electrofishing boat standardization; standard boat equipment (e.g., oxygen, etc.) - John Hawkins recommended that every boat should have an emergency O<sub>2</sub> bottle in case of handling stress of native fish. >Nelson, Czaplá, Martinez, Martin, and Hawkins will begin work on the protocol and discuss including this as a session (general or break-out) during the researchers meeting. The protocol needs to be in place by March. The Committee discussed standardizing boat power output and agreed this could be done by having Larry Kolz visit each station rather than try to bring all the boats to a common location at a common time. Collecting permits require annual calibration (~\$350); is this

needed in addition to the power output measurement? We need Larry Kolz to address this question. >The Program Director's office will develop a plan in advance of the researchers meeting (working with Martinez, Kolz, etc). Kevin suggested investigators read the Miranda and Spencer 2005 manuscript ("understanding output of a Smith-Root...") in advance of the researchers meeting.

2. Yampa River aerial photos (\$25-\$35K). >Chuck McAda will look at Chris Hill's CD; >Pat Nelson will contact Sherm to see what he has and also find out if CDOW would be willing to fly principal investigators over the river to investigate potential northern pike concentration areas (backwaters, etc.).

>Revised scopes of work should be submitted to Pat Nelson by January 6. (>Pat will communicate this to the PI's)

Angela Kantola said considerable additional funds are available for FY 06, but the Program will have to be careful not to fund projects in FY 06 for which FY 07 funds wouldn't be available.

The rest of the agenda, with the exception of a few items about report review (agenda item #11) and scheduling the next meeting (agenda item #12) was deferred until a future meeting.

- d. Update on Elkhead Lake Management Plan (Muth) (5 min.)
5. Update on potential new projects for 2006 (Muth) (5 min.) - *Bob Muth will review the list of potential new projects for 2006 and how the Committee prioritized them. Approval of these projects has been deferred until 2006 nonnative fish management projects are finalized.*
6. Maybell Canal RFP (Nelson, Speas) (10 min.) - *The Committee will discuss the funding ceiling (what if costs are higher than we've anticipated?).*
7. Service endangered species permit process (Czapla) (15 min.) - *Tom Czapla will update the Committee on changes in the Service's permitting process for 2006.*
8. Report Review/approval: Draft Upper Colorado River Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez) (1 hour)
9. Research framework update (Valdez) (15 min.)
10. Report on database workshop and revised stocking/recapture summary and (McAda, Czapla) (15 min.)
11. Review reports due list - >The Committee needs to review its report review procedures; also make sure that it addresses non-Program reports; >Angela Kantola will post the current procedures (Program and non-Program reports) and put this on the next meeting agenda.

- a. Status update on Price River flow recommendations report (Christopherson)
- b. Status update on Miller-Musser report (Kantola)
- c. Status update on Pitlick Colorado River channel monitoring report (Kantola)

12. Next meeting: date, agenda items, times and location

Conference call from 1:30 - 3:30 on January 9 to hear from Colorado Division of Wildlife regarding 2006 nonnative fish management recommendations.

Meeting February 2-3, 2006 in Grand Junction (beginning at 9:30 a.m. on the 2<sup>nd</sup> and concluding at noon on the 3<sup>rd</sup>).

>The Program Director's office will set up the call and arrange for a meeting room.

>The Program Director's office will draft a proposal by next week for deferring RIPRAP revision and review and FY 07 work plan modifications by a month or two so that the committees can focus on finalizing 2006 nonnative fish management plans.

Future agenda items: those deferred at this meeting; discussion of how to raise more fish in off-channel ponds (see 9/05 meeting summary); review of report review procedures.

*ADJOURN: 4:00 p.m.*

## ASSIGNMENTS

### Carry over from previous meetings:

1. “Tom Nesler still needs to provide the Committee a criteria assessment for when northern pike and bass removal should be expanded upstream (includes pike, bass, and pikeminnow density estimates). The Yampa aquatic management plan can’t be revised until this is accomplished (Biology Committee has requested this by the end of the year). Tom Nesler will discuss the status of the revision with Sherm Hebein (complete revision or just an update of nonnative fish control and native fish management sections).” The Yampa plan will be revised before Bill Elmblad retires in 3 months. Criteria not yet developed.
2. “Tom Czapla is still working with Tom Nesler and Chuck McAda and draft written procedures for who reports what stocking data to whom and when. McAda sent out draft of these procedures this year.” Chuck McAda said principal investigators were directed to send their data to him and summary information to Tom Czapla. After reviewing the information received this year, Tom and Chuck will revise procedures, as needed.
3. “The Service will provide background information on propagation issues/concerns 2 weeks prior to the December meeting.” - Deferred to future BC meeting.
4. “Tom Czapla will work with PI’s to develop a statement on how data gathered from tagging all chubs captured in all humpback chub population estimate sampling would be used.”
5. “CDOW still needs to re-evaluate stocking pikeminnow in currently unoccupied or unavailable habitats, with their stocking plans stating that if pikeminnow are not retained in those areas, stocking would be re-evaluated (many of the stocked fish are being found significantly downstream of those areas). Tom Czapla recommended suspending stocking until Colorado completes the evaluation of potential impacts of downstream movement (and stocking the fish in the San Juan River in the interim). Tom Chart agreed. Tom Nesler concurred via phone.” CDOW has not yet completed evaluation of impacts of downstream movement.

### New assignments

1. **Angela Kantola** will post the revised September 19-20 meeting summary to the listserv.  
*Done.*
2. **CDOW (Sherm Hebein)** will look into operations at Rifle, Elkhead and McPhee and determine if reservoir operations provide potential opportunity for nonnative fish escapement and, if so, what the options are to prevent that. **George Smith** will investigate this for the other reservoirs (working with Trina Hedrick in Utah on Flaming Gorge, Starvation, and Bottle Hollow reservoirs). Sherm Hebein said it’s imperative to have Fish and Wildlife Service cooperation in working with Reclamation. **Sherm and George and Pat Martinez** will first develop a list of information that needs to be determined for each

reservoir (by the February Biology Committee meeting). It also would be helpful to prioritize the reservoirs of concern. This is likely a fairly large project, so **Sherm and George** will take a first cut at identifying the overall scope of what needs to be done. A scope of work should be developed (although funding may not be needed).

3. The **Flaming Gorge technical work group** needs to discuss the potential to use flow management to disadvantage nonnative fish.
4. **Pat Nelson, Debbie Felker, Angela Kantola, and Bob Muth** will review the I&E-related recommendations from the smallmouth bass summit and nonnative fish workshop, draft recommendations, get review and input from **Utah and Colorado**, then report back to the Committee (and will include a summary of current I&E on nonnative fish management).
5. **Pat Martinez** will request a revision of the Vernal CRFP's collecting permit for their Colorado pikeminnow population estimate so that they can turn over all smallmouth bass collected on the White River in Colorado to him for isotope analysis. **Pat M.** will arrange for a place (probably in Rangely) where CRFP can drop off the fish.
6. **CDOW (Bill Elmlblad)** will sample in Kenney Reservoir this spring to determine smallmouth bass presence/abundance.
7. The **Vernal CRFP** will keep the Biology Committee informed of the number of smallmouth bass they capture in the White River and if any change is needed in their sampling effort. **Dave Irving** will modify the FY 06 population estimate scope of work.
8. **Sherm Hebein** will review Sam's Finney's report on movement of northern pike in the Yampa River and discuss the recommendations within CDOW.
9. **Sam Finney** will provide an analysis of the utility of increasing passes in the current northern pike removal reach and the effort that would be required to do that.
10. **CDOW and the Service** will begin to look into more aggressive nonnative fish control methods in upper Yampa River backwaters.
11. **Principal investigators** will review their scopes of work to see if they need to (and can) get on the river earlier to get into backwaters to control northern pike before they spawn.
12. **Kevin Bestgen** will add investigating pike reproduction in Brown's Park into his (currently unfunded) Lodore scope of work.
13. **Pat Nelson** will summarize the proposals and the rationale for expanding Yampa River smallmouth bass removal and dropping the population estimate in the lower Yampa River in 2006 and 2007 and reconsidering it in 2008 (see agenda items 4.b.8. and 4.b.12.), discuss these with CDOW, and get back to the Biology Committee. Given the scheduling and logistical implications, Pat will ask **CDOW** to discuss this as soon as possible. **John**

- Hawkins and Dave Irving** will determine the level of effort needed to implement the expansion (working with the PI's from Colorado and Utah who may be involved) and report back to the Committee.
14. **Tom Chart** will work with **Kevin Bestgen, Al Pfister, and Patty Gelatt** to develop a proposed criteria for levels of nonnative fish removal (and nonnative fish population levels) and bring it back to the Committee for discussion and presentation to Colorado.
  15. **Chuck McAda** will talk with his staff and come back to Committee with some sort of proposal to increase Colorado River smallmouth bass removal efforts and focus on concentration areas. This will include adding a pass and making the first pass mark-only for one year.
  16. **Pat Nelson** and **Melissa Trammell** will get back to the Committee on the pheromone idea within a couple of months.
  17. The Committee requested that **Colorado and Utah** give a status update on their position/action on establishing "native fish conservation areas" at the next Biology Committee meeting.
  18. **Pat Nelson, Tom Czapla, Pat Martinez, Lori Martin, and John Hawkins** will begin work on the fish handling protocol and discuss including this as a session (general or break-out) during the researchers meeting. The **Program Director's office** will develop a plan for standardizing electrofishing boat power output in advance of the researchers meeting (working with Martinez, Kolz, etc) on a plan.
  19. **Chuck McAda** will look at Chris Hill's GIS CD to see what information it has and **Pat Nelson** will contact Sherm to see what he has and if CDOW would be willing to fly principal investigators over the river to investigate potential northern pike concentration areas (backwaters, etc.).
  20. **Investigators** should submit revised scopes of work to Pat Nelson by January 6. **Pat** will communicate this to the PI's.
  21. The **Committee** needs to review its report review procedures and also make sure it addresses non-Program reports. **Angela Kantola** will post the current procedures (Program and non-Program reports) and put this on the next meeting agenda.
  22. The **Program Director's office** will set up the January 9 call (*done*) and arrange for a meeting room in Grand Junction February 2-3.
  23. The **Program Director's office** will draft a proposal by next week for deferring RIPRAP revision and review and FY 07 work plan modifications by a month or two so that the committees can focus on finalizing 2006 nonnative fish management plans.