



# Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Summary Dated: September 25, 2013

CR/FY-13 UCRRIC  
Mail Stop 65115

## Memorandum

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

From: Director, Upper Colorado River Recovery Implementation Program

Subject: Final March 5, 2013, Recovery Implementation Committee Webinar Summary

Attached are the final action and assignment summary and the general summary from the March 5, 2013, Implementation Committee webinar.

Attachment

- Summary -  
Actions and Assignments  
Recovery Implementation Committee Webinar – March 5, 2013

**ACTIONS:**

1. Approved the September 19, 2012, conference call summary as revised.
2. Delegated review and approval of RIPRAP revisions/assessment and FY14-15 Program Guidance to the Management Committee.
3. Discussed the date of their next meeting, which was later set as a video teleconference (if available) or webinar on Monday, September 23, 2013, from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**ASSIGNMENTS:**

1. Angela Kantola will finalize the revised September 19, 2012, conference call summary and have it posted to the Program's website (done).
2. Brent Uilenberg will inform the Management and Committee what projects have been conducted over the last five years or so with the ~\$400K "activities to avoid jeopardy" funds. Angela Kantola will then put a discussion of this on the appropriate Management Committee agenda.

**MEETING SUMMARY:**

**CONVENE: 9:00 a.m.**

1. (Action Item) Approve Final September 19, 2012, meeting summary – Angela Kantola posted the draft summary to the fws-colorriver listserver on 9/21/12. Minor changes were made for clarification near the bottom of page 7. The Committee approved these revisions and Angela Kantola will finalize the summary and post to the listserver (done).
2. Program Director's update – Tom Chart began by noting that the Program provides ESA compliance for 2,025 new and historical water projects depleting 2.85 million acre-feet of water from the upper Colorado River basin. Of this amount, 337,850 acre-feet are new depletions that have occurred since the inception of the Recovery Program. The Program's extensive work to protect and manage instream flows has helped offset depletions and really helped us improve habitat.

The Program has demonstrated considerable, long-term progress in protecting instream flows through water management for the 15-Mile Reach of the Colorado River, re-operation of the Aspinnall Unit (Gunnison and Colorado rivers), releases of water to the Yampa River from the enlarged Elkhead reservoir, reoperation of Flaming Gorge Reservoir on the Green River, and the Duchesne River Work Group. Dan Luecke noted that the Grand Valley water management also has been a tremendous benefit for irrigators in the Grand Valley and suggested that the Program should take a bit more credit and highlight the resilience that project added to that system, Tom Chart and Tom Pitts agreed. Tom Pitts noted both spring and base flows are augmented in the Colorado River and more than one million acre-feet of

water have been released to benefit the endangered fishes in the Colorado River from 1997 through 2012. Completion of OMID improvements will provide additional benefits to the 15-Mile Reach and OMID water users.

Also regarding flow protection, Tom Chart noted:

- The Program exercised its right to lease an additional 2,000 acre-feet of Elkhead Reservoir water in 2013
- Reclamation signed the Aspinall reoperation ROD last spring
- The Program initiated the Larval Trigger Study Plan with experimental Flaming Gorge releases to connect floodplain habitats when razorback sucker larvae first appear
- Progress has been made on the 10,825 water with West Slope contracts in place and East Slope contracts in negotiation
- Developing a management plan and completing flow recommendations are in the works for the White River.

In the habitat restoration arena, an e-barrier is in the planning as part of the Tusher Wash Diversion rehabilitation on the Green River. Kevin McAbee of the Services Salt Lake City office has been instrumental in this.

The Horsethief Ponds in Grand Valley have been completed. Tom Czapl is working with hatchery managers to determine how to produce larger fish in our hatcheries to improve first-year survival.

Our monitoring efforts have included increased deployment of PIT tag antennas. These passive systems: detect tagged fish 24/7; complement field sampling with presence/absence, survival, and movement information; and gather data without handling stress to the fish. In just a couple of weeks of gathering data on the Green River spawning bar, a PIT tag array detected ~50 razorback sucker, some of which hadn't been recaptured since their release. The drawback to all this is the significant increase in data has created a workload issue. Tom Pitts thinks we'll need to hire a professional firm to design a system to download the data and provide it to the Upper Colorado and San Juan programs in a usable format. Tom Chart said the Biology Committee would discuss this later this week (starting with a draft Czapl has prepared). Right now, we just have a half FTE for database management, and that is not enough to keep pace with existing data. Tom Pitts said he thinks we need to be maintaining a database, whereas right now we're just maintaining a file cabinet. John Reber added that we also need to better manage nonnative fish data; Tom Chart agreed, and noted we've contracted with CSU to synthesize smallmouth bass data (of which the first of three parts has been completed) and northern pike.

The San Juan Program has stocked Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker for many years and found endangered fish below the waterfall in the San Juan inflow to Lake Powell in 2011 and 2012. Razorback sucker stocked by the San Juan Program also have been recaptured in the Colorado River mainstem near Moab, so we now know fish are connecting from the San Juan to the Colorado via Lake Powell. Some Lake Powell inflow habitats may also be supporting endangered fish. The Service discussed this in November, but neither recovery program currently has funds for further investigation. Tom Chart recommended to the SRLCC that this might be appropriate work for them to fund.

On the nonnative fish front, the 2011 high flows moved northern pike into flooded habitats where they reproduced and low flows of the early 2000's and 2012 contributed to smallmouth bass expansion. Tom Chart reviewed the significant expansion of nonnative fish throughout the basin since the 1980's. A total of 1216 river miles are affected by nonnative fish presence and the Program has control efforts underway in 900-1000 of those. We continue work on the basinwide nonnative fish strategy. Risk assessment focused our efforts on northern pike, smallmouth bass, and then walleye. The Program has put significant effort into nonnative fish control and is seeing some success in some places (e.g. smallmouth bass in Little Yampa Canyon, although there was a strong smallmouth bass age-0 cohort there at end of 2012). We've reduced the average size of northern pike in the Yampa River, but seem to have hit a threshold in our removal efforts. The lowest densities we've reached (in the low 600's) are still far above the minimum target we need to reach to see an endangered fish response. In addition, we saw an unfortunate increase in northern pike densities in 2012 following the 2011 high flows. We haven't demonstrated near the progress with northern pike in the Yampa that we may be seeing with smallmouth bass.

The draft basinwide nonnative strategy focuses on three broad areas:

- Get to the sources (spawning sites and reservoirs) (e.g., CPW's reclaiming of Paonia Reservoir);
- Stop or slow the spread of invasive species; and
- Promote compatible sportfishing.

Nonnative fish concerns have now entered recovery team discussion of recovery timelines. We thought we could consider downlisting Colorado pikeminnow as early as 2013, but preliminary population estimates indicate that the Green River subpopulation may be trending down, and Yampa River populations continue their decline. The Colorado pikeminnow recovery team met in November and when they reviewed these preliminary findings, they concluded nonnative fish continue to be a greater threat than originally thought and a change in listing status should be postponed until more progress shown with nonnative fish control. The new *Program Highlights* briefing book indicates that our goal now is to downlist Colorado pikeminnow recovery by 2018. In light of the nonnative fish concern, the Service has invited representatives from the upper Basin State wildlife agencies to join the recovery teams. Leslie James asked if the Service would consider adding a WAPA biologist to the recovery teams; Tom Chart said the Service will consider it, but is focused on keeping team limited to specialized technical expertise. David Bennion and Leslie James both suggested Jerry Wilhite has the necessary technical expertise.

The Management Committee has agreed they should meet with the States' fish chiefs and the Program Director's office to discuss controversial actions in the draft basinwide nonnative fish strategy. Next steps will be to finalize the strategy and implement nonnative fish management actions with the goals and life of the Recovery Program (through 2023) firmly in mind.

Tom Pitts said water users understand that despite the \$200+ million we've spent and all the recovery actions we've implemented, the ultimate bottom line for ESA compliance for >2,000 water projects is the status of the species. Despite our efforts, Tom Pitts believes our nonnative fish management actions are not working well enough. Water users are therefore

concerned about continued ESA compliance and support a much more aggressive approach to nonnative fish control than has been exercised to date. The water users would appreciate strong recommendations from State fish chiefs as to what can be done along regulatory and other avenues. We need to act quickly and effectively so we can get to recovery. John Shields agreed and emphasized that the Program's credibility (and ability to get resources in the future) depends on being effective with our nonnative fish control.

### 3. Legislation and budget-related updates

- a. Program annual base funding extension legislation – [H.R. 6060](#) was passed late December 31 and was signed into law ([PL 112-270](#)) by the President on January 14, 2013. Congress chose to add Sections 3 and 4/5 about indirect cost recovery rate and travel by Federal employees to participate in Program briefing trips. Tom Pitts said the nonfederal participants explained that the Program Directors accompany the group to provide answers to technical questions. Therefore, questions of this nature will have to be deferred and answered later. Bill Miller will participate in the D.C. briefing trip this year to provide technical support. The Senate had some concerns about the language in Sections 3-5, but preferred to get the bill passed than reject that language. John Shields noted that the work to get the legislation extended began five years ago.
- b. March 19-22 Washington, D.C., briefing trip – John Shields sent background materials by e-mail on March 4. John said the non-Federal participants likely will not have funding support letters in hand with them on the trip this year because the President's budget may not be released in time (in the past it's been released in early February). John will prepare a trip report after the trip, as usual. John thanked the water users for once again supporting the Congressional luncheon. Tom Pitts thanked John for arranging the itinerary.
- c. Capital projects update – Brent Uilenberg said Reclamation is working on three near-term capital projects for the recovery programs: the Tusher Wash e-barrier; OMID canal automation; and the Hogback Fish Barrier. Under the continuing resolution, they're working with the 2012 budget level of ~\$6M (the 2013 budget request was ~\$8M), of which \$5.773M is capital funds. Hogback should be completed this spring with a total cost of ~\$3.5M, leaving \$2.273M for Upper Colorado projects. The Tusher Wash e-barrier will be a small component of the overall Tusher rehabilitation that likely will not occur until winter of 2014/2015; 2013 will only involve pre-construction, design work, and NEPA compliance. The remainder of 2013 capital funds will go toward OMID canal automation project. Reclamation is awaiting completion of the EA before they can sign the contract providing the mechanism for funding incremental O&M costs (non-Program funds in recognition of benefit provided to water users). (O&M will consist of \$1.5M + 900K = \$2.4M in an escrow account plus approval of up to \$100K Program funds/year total for O&M costs. OMID also has agreed to provide up to \$100K, if needed.) The project consists of ~25 check structures in the two canal systems, a re-regulating "reservoir" (large pond) to meet peak irrigation demands, two small pumping plants and interconnecting plumbing. They dropped the large pumping plant that would have captured spills and return to Gunnison because it's fairly energy intensive, but will offset the water savings with other techniques to maintain the anticipated ~17Kaf of water saved. This will be in full compliance with State water

law and priority water rights so these instream flows are protected. Reclamation will put out contract for bid on the check structures in 2013. They anticipate the bid will exceed available funds, so will divide the contracting over 2013/2014. Construction will occur winter 2013/2014 and the check structures will be in place for the 2014 irrigation season. In all probability, OMID will be completed by 2016 at a total cost of \$16.5M. The Upper Colorado program would then have ~\$16M left in unallocated ceiling. Ted Kowalski said Colorado is pleased to support the OMID project and thanked Reclamation and the non-Federal partners for their work. Tom Pitts noted that the Tusher e-barrier will be much lower cost (~\$2M) than the originally estimated ~\$8M for a physical barrier; the e-barrier was suggested by water user Kevin Urie of Denver Water. Brent added that we may want to consider retrofitting some of our mechanical screens with e-barriers (and/or traveling belt screens) in light of operational problems with mechanical screens. John Shields asked about “activities to avoid jeopardy” funds; >Reclamation will let the Committee know what the ~\$400K/year has gone towards the last 5 years or so and >Angela will put a discussion of this on the appropriate Management Committee agenda.

- d. Sequestration: update on any impacts to Service base or Reclamation capital funding – Tom Chart said the Service’s annual appropriated dollars of ~\$1.2M may be subject to sequestration, which would come to ~\$60K at 5%. The Program’s other major annual funding source is power revenues, which are understood as not subject to sequestration. State funds contributed to the Program are not subject to sequestration, either. Per P.L. 112-270, the indirect cost recovery rate was reduced from 11% to 3%, which made some additional funds available to the Program. Mike Thabault said the Region 6 Ecological Services (ES) branch believes they can deal with FY13 reductions, but is also facing operational effects, including a hiring freeze and travel restrictions. Some vacant positions have been left in limbo, but the Service is trying to work the Recovery Program’s seasonal hires through the exception process. Other offices (e.g., GJ ES) are carrying vacancies they can’t fill. Mike is very concerned about what happens next year, because he won’t have carryover funds and other resources he’s relying on to get through FY13. Ed Warner said Reclamation is doing everything within their power and the rules as they now stand to minimize sequestration effects on programs and people. They have similar travel restrictions and may have to reduce contracts where appropriate, etc., but hope they won’t get to the point where it would impact the recovery programs’ capital projects budgets. John Shields commented that our ability to hire seasonals for nonnative fish control is critical and encouraged everyone to work as hard as they can on the exceptions policy. If communication from non-Federal Program participants to DOI is needed, John added that they’ll want to provide that. Tom Chart said the FWS CRFP offices submitted their exception requests immediately and Mike Thabault said these positions are at the top of the Region’s list. To the extent non-Federal partners can emphasize the importance of these positions and their funding source which is not subject to sequestration, that would be helpful.

#### 4. Sufficient progress

- a. Review of 2012 sufficient progress items (see Attachment 1) – Dan Luecke asked the source of the northern pike in the Colorado River near Rifle and Tom Chart said they likely escaped from Rifle Gap Reservoir. Colorado Parks and Wildlife is in the process

of screening Rifle Gap, but overall concerns remain about the effectiveness of screens. The Service previously asked gravel pit companies to restore habitat and reconnect gravel pits to the river when gravel mining is complete, but no longer does so due to nonnative fish problems (northern pike). Dan Luecke referenced Tom Pitts' earlier comment that we clearly haven't gotten the nonnative fish problem under control; Dan emphasized his agreement with this concern and with John Shields' comment regarding our credibility hinging on solving this problem.

- b. Update on 2013 sufficient progress schedule and strategic communications plan – Angela Kantola said the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service considers the Program's assessment of progress under the RIPRAP as the Service reviews "sufficient progress" each spring, according to the following general schedule:
1. March 31: RIPRAP assessment is completed and approved by the Program.
  2. April 15: Program Director's office distributes a draft of the following elements of the sufficient progress memo (with final RIPRAP assessment attached) to the Service and MC:
    - a. the population status update;
    - b. list of accomplishments and shortcomings; and
    - c. discussion and recommended action items.
  3. April 30: Management Committee web conference to review and comment on the draft elements of the sufficient progress memo.
  4. May 7: Service web conference to review and comment draft elements for sufficient progress memo. The Service will consider the Management Committee comments during the review.
  5. May 15: Program Director's office prepares final draft sufficient progress memo/determination for Service review.
  6. May 30: Service sends Management Committee the final draft sufficient progress memo primarily for informational purposes. The Management Committee will notify the Service if members have any significant issues/concerns.
  7. June 15: Service finalizes sufficient progress memo.

Last year's Sufficient Progress memo got some mention in the press. The Implementation Committee asked the Program Director's office to develop a strategic communications plan so all partners would have it in hand when future Sufficient Progress memos are signed (~mid-June). The Program Director's office proposes to include a draft strategic communications plan along with the draft elements of the sufficient progress memo that will be sent to the Service and the Management Committee in mid-April. The Committee agreed.

5. (Action Item) Review and approval of RIPRAP revisions/assessment and FY14-15 Program Guidance – In keeping with past practice and to maintain the schedule for the Service's sufficient progress determination and the Program's development of the FY14-15 work plan, the Management Committee recommends that the Implementation Committee delegate review and approval of RIPRAP revisions/assessment and FY14-15 Program Guidance to the Management Committee (meeting via webinar on April 2). The Implementation Committee delegated this responsibility as requested.
6. Southern Rockies LCC update – Tom Chart attended last week's SRLCC workshop on focusing resources on science needs. Tom gave presentation on Program activities and data that the Program can provide. Tom advocated using SRLCC resources for: 1) Lake Powell investigations; 2) effects of wildfire on aquatic ecosystems (focusing attention on upper Basin tributaries where we think effects from burned area runoff are acute and how additional monitoring in those smaller systems could augment ongoing Recovery Program

fish community monitoring in the main channel); and 3) general database management concerns. Although the third item is more of a Recovery Program(s) issue, it is something LCC's are supposed to address, and perhaps they can provide some guidance. Tom thinks the SRLCC will issue an RFP in next few months; he and Dave Campbell will be ready to respond with aforementioned items.

7. [Regional Director's 2013 Program priorities](#) – Mike Thabault discussed the Mountain-Prairie Region's FY13 priorities as they relate to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program and noted the strong tie of CRFP seasonals (and sage grouse) hires to these priorities (which is why these hires are at the top of the Region 6 exception list).
8. (Action Item) Schedule September 2013 Implementation Committee meeting and identify agenda items – In light of travel restrictions, the Committee agreed to forego their usual face-to-face meeting this coming September and replace it with a video teleconference or webinar. A tentative date was set, but didn't work for members not on the call and was later changed to Monday, September 23, 2013, from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

**ADJOURN: 11:20 a.m.**

## Attachment 1 - Participants

### IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Mike Thabault for Noreen Walsh, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Chair)  
Ed Warner, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
John Reber, National Park Service  
Dan Luecke, Environmental Groups  
Leslie James, Colorado River Energy Distributors Association  
Greg Lanning, Wyoming State Engineer's Office  
Ted Kowalski, Colorado Water Conservation Board  
David Bennion for Lynn Jeka, Western Area Power Administration  
Tom Pitts, Upper Basin Water Users  
Dennis Strong for Mike Styler, Utah Department of Natural Resources  
Program Director Tom Chart, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (nonvoting)

### OTHERS:

Pete Taylor, Colorado State University  
John Shields, Wyoming State Engineer's Office  
Brent Uilenberg, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation  
Jana Mohrman, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Angela Kantola, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Recovery Program  
Melissa Trammell, National Park Service

ATTACHMENT 2

Action Items from the [2012 Sufficient Progress Memo](#)

March 13, 2013

General – Upper Basin-wide				
#	Recommended Action Items	Lead	Due Date	Status
1	The Service will make a recommendation for how to ensure that all new petroleum pipelines have emergency shutoff valves and will investigate the use of the <a href="#">Pipeline Integrity Management Mapping Application</a> (PIMMA) to address existing pipelines potentially needing shutoff valves (e.g., pipelines upstream of or near critical or other important habitat).	FWS	12/31/12	Service may consider asking industry to assist via Section 7 consultation. 2/7/13: Tom Chart said pipeline location information is available (PIMMA), but the Section 7 process may be the best way to address the need for shutoff valves on existing pipelines (perhaps asking project proponents to address existing pipelines when they consult on new projects). Harry Crockett said CPW comments on BLM's resource management plans as a cooperating agency. If the Service also is commenting, we should be sharing comments; Tom Chart agrees. John Reber said NPS has considered endangered fish and recommended shutoff valves in their comments. Tom Chart said EPA also is working on this and is reviewing their emergency response plans for the Green River (Tom has asked them to include these pipeline crossings in that review).
2	The Program Director's office is working with the Nonnative Fish Subcommittee and signatories to the <a href="#">Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures</a> to address comments on the draft <i>Upper Colorado River Basin Nonnative and Invasive Aquatic Species Prevention and Control Strategy</i> . Following "internal" review by the Recovery Program's Biology and Management committees, the Program will seek external peer review prior to accepting the <i>Strategy</i> as final.	Program	Draft sent 1/13/13	A subgroup of the I&E Committee will refine comments on the I&E section of the <i>Strategy</i> and then have a conference call with the Nonnative Fish Subcommittee. An update of steps leading to completion was provided to the Management and Biology committees on November 15, 2012. The Management Committee asked that the Program Director's office streamline the document somewhat and accelerate the schedule. A revised, draft Nonnative Strategy was sent to the Management and Biology Committees on January 13, 2013. A meeting will be scheduled with State fish chiefs and the Management Committee to discuss controversial issues.
3	The Service recommends that the Recovery Program carefully review the applicability of proposed screens for nonnative fish on a case-by-case basis and scrutinize screen designs, including projected operation and maintenance costs in the future. And, that the Recovery Program fully recognizes that screens are only a component of a multi-faceted nonnative fish control strategy (e.g., one that adheres to the NNF Stocking Procedures, promotes compatible sportfisheries, and prevents new nonnative fish threats).	<i>Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures</i> signatories	Ongoing	See item #2 re: <i>Basinwide Strategy</i> .

4	Revised Integrated Stocking Plan needs to be completed.	PDO	<del>4/23/12</del> 3/31/13	Draft sent to <i>ad hoc</i> group 4/13/12; conference call held 5/9/12. Revised draft to <i>ad hoc</i> group 9/27/12; comments due Oct. 31. : The Program Director's Office will provide a revised draft by March 31, 2013.
5	The Program Director's Office will monitor results from ongoing humpback chub population estimates (Deso-Gray 2010-2011; Black Rocks and Westwater 2011-2012 and monitoring (Cataract Canyon annual CPUe; Yampa River information gathered through nonnative fish management projects). The Program Director's Office convened a panel to discuss humpback chub genetics and captivity and identify actions necessary to ensure the survival and recovery of humpback chub and an implementation plan for those actions in 2011.  200 age-0 Gila will be brought into captivity from Black Rocks/Westwater in 2012 (relates to broodstock development once fish are determined to be humpback chub).	PDO, Service, UDWR	Deso-Gray data reported annually; Black Rocks draft final report due 8/1/13; Westwater draft final report due FY13.	Results reviewed annually. Bringing age-0 <i>Gila</i> from Black Rocks into captivity was planned for fall 2012, but deferred until spring due to high mortality risk from low flow conditions.
<b>Green River</b>				
6	An RFP for a 2012-2013 mortality study and literature review is anticipated in April 2012. Meanwhile, Program participants are investigating the potential for an electrical barrier at the head of the canal as one option to reduce or eliminate entrainment (and thus, "take") of fish in the canal.	Tusher Wash <i>ad hoc</i> group.		No response to RFP; dropped. Biology Committee discussed in July and October and endorses electric barrier option, which is being pursued. Passive PIT-antenna being installed spring 2013.
7	Red Fleet Reservoir has been recommended for reclamation (rotenone). A microchemical analysis of otoliths from both the reservoir and the river is underway to better understand the contribution of walleye to critical habitat from this potential source population.	UDWR	2014	Otoliths processed; draft report in review; data will be included in draft final C18/19 report due October 1, 2012 (behind schedule due to PI illness). Red Fleet very low and UDWR plans to rotenone in 2014 with funding assistance from Program.
<b>Yampa River</b>				
8	CWCB is scheduled to complete accounting of past depletions using the StateCU model by the spring of 2012. The depletion accounting report will include a discussion of the need for flow protection (which would require a peak flow recommendation). The Water Acquisition Committee will continue to discuss the need for a peak flow recommendation.	CWCB, Water Acquisition Committee	<del>June 2012</del> <del>4/23/12</del>	Depletion accounting for Yampa & Colorado rivers will be based on 2005 consumptive use (irrigated acreage based on satellite images and some aerial photography). CWCB is double-checking irrigated acreage, will have it verified by the Water Commissioner (hopefully by December 31, 2012), and then can run the model. Contractor began work on irrigated acreage portion in early February 2013. Another contract still needs to be awarded to update dataset. The models will be updated through 2010 or 2011. Colorado has prioritized the Yampa and Colorado river basins portion of this work.

9	CSU will complete the <a href="#">programmatic synthesis of smallmouth bass removal efforts</a> , providing a comprehensive evaluation of the Program's removal efforts as well as a thorough assessment of escapement from Elkhead Reservoir (draft final report due to Recovery Program 8/31/2012). The Recovery Program will review the final report on escapement from Elkhead Reservoir and determine appropriate adaptive-management response. CSU also is conducting a <a href="#">programmatic synthesis of northern pike removal efforts</a> (2011-2012) to evaluate current removal efforts in the context of northern pike life history throughout the Yampa River drainage (draft final report due to Recovery Program 6/30/13).	CSU, Program, CPW	Draft final smallmouth bass synthesis report due 10/1/12 (behind schedule).	The programmatic synthesis report will consist of three parts and each will be separately peer-reviewed. Part 1, Elkhead escapement has been peer reviewed. Part 2, Population Dynamics was due October 1, 2012, and Part 3, Projection Tool, will follow shortly thereafter. The three parts will then be finalized in one document. The NNFSC continues to evaluate opportunities and priorities for applying appropriate responses to source populations. Water users have met with local water and sportfish interests to build on preliminary results.
10	Native fish conservation areas are being evaluated as part of the draft basinwide nonnative fish strategy. Subsequently, applicability to the Yampa River will be evaluated.	Program, CPW		See item #2 re: <i>Basinwide Strategy</i> .
11	CPW has detailed its ongoing and anticipated pike management actions throughout the drainage in its 2010 'Yampa River Basin Aquatic Wildlife Management Plan (CDOW 2010).' CPW will tabulate these activities for the Program Director's Office and, based upon Program Office feedback, will provide management objectives and actions for any waters within the drainage that CPW and the Program Office mutually agree are inadequately addressed by the 2010 Plan.	CPW		Pending. Tabulation complete and was to go to PDO by September 30, 2012. Joint recommendations from PDO and CPW for how to address any inadequacies will be made at the NNF workshop. 2/7/13: Harry will have this completed before the March 7 Biology Committee meeting.
<b>White River</b>				
12	A working draft <i>Flow Recommendations for the Endangered Fish of the White River, Colorado and Utah</i> was sent to the Biology and Water Acquisition committees and GRUWAT on July 1, 2011. Conflicting comments were received. A revised draft is expected by midsummer 2012. Work on a PBO is anticipated subsequent to report approval.	PDO	Summer 2012. <del>12/31/12.</del>	Pending. Good progress is being made and TNC is providing assistance. PDO, TNC, and water users (CO and UT) met 12/10/12 to review recent hydrologic analyses, which served as a preliminary response to water users' comments on the draft flow recommendation report. Participants recommended development of a White River Management Plan (including some level of future water development + recovery actions to offset depletion effects). The Management Plan likely will entail some StateMod runs.
13	Program scheduled to begin specific effort to remove smallmouth bass in 2012. CPW will propose plans to removing bag limit for smallmouth bass (and possibly other nonnative sport fishes) in the 400 yards below Kenney Reservoir that still has limits in 2013. Recovery Program supports multi-agency effort to designate White River as native fish conservation area.	CPW, UDWR		White River smallmouth bass removal conducted by Service & CPW; additional electric seining also conducted. CPW has prepared an issue paper on the bag limit for Commission consideration in this regulation cycle. (Regulation expected to be finalized in November and go into effect in March 2013.)

<b>Colorado River</b>				
14	Recovery Program participants will consider options and opportunities for meeting flow recommendations on a more consistent basis after completion of 10,825 agreements.	Program		Ruedi (West slope) agreement completed; Granby (East Slope) is still being negotiated.
15	The CWCB will provide the depletion accounting for 2006-2010 for the Upper Colorado River using State CU in the spring of 2012. If the amount of consumptive use, location of use, and timing of use is not the same as in the past, they would then put that information into StateMod to show how those changes affect the river.	CWCB	June 2012	See item #8.
16	Completion of CFOPS Phase III should be out in draft in August 2012 and report completion anticipated by September 30, 2012.	Water users	<del>September</del> <del>November,</del> <del>30, 2012.</del> September 30, 2013.	Completion of CFOPS Phase III was to have been out at the end of November 2012, with the report completed by January 31, 2013. Plan to have draft by July 1, 2013, and final report by September 30, 2013.
17	In 2012, additional passes will be devoted in the reach of the Colorado River from Rifle to the Beavertail to remove invading northern pike. CPW will conduct a reconnaissance in floodplain & canal habitats to identify potential sources of this species. Sampling will also be conducted from Silt to Rifle to remove northern pike.	FWS, CPW	Ongoing.	Additional passes completed. A critical new ramp was constructed that improves access. CPW has been working with landowners to get permission for reconnaissance work; some underway. Work will continue in 2013.
<b>Gunnison River</b>				
18	Every effort should be made to ensure that the Gunnison River remains a native fish stronghold. The topic of precluding new species introductions also will be addressed in the draft Nonnative Fish Strategy.	Program		See item #2 re: <i>Basinwide Strategy</i> .
<b>Dolores River</b>				
19	The Nonnative Fish Subcommittee will review response options and propose action item(s) to be reviewed with the Dolores River Dialogue and Lower Dolores Working Group and potentially added to the RIPRAP in 2013.	NNFSC, others.	January 2013.	CPW implemented an emergency order removing all bag and possession limits on smallmouth bass in Miramonte Reservoir and announced plans to rotenone the reservoir in fall 2013.

