

**Conference Call Summary  
Colorado River Management Committee  
October 18, 2007**

Participants: See Attachment 1

CONVENE - 1:00 p.m.

1. Palisade whitewater park – Bob Muth alerted the Committee that the public notice with comments by November 5<sup>th</sup> (see <http://www.spk.usace.army.mil/organizations/cespk-co/regulatory/PNs/index.html>). >Committee members will share their draft comment letters with one another by October 26. Given the Program's \$17.3 million investment in fish passage on the Colorado River mainstem, before a 404 permit is issued for this park, the applicant should demonstrate that it will be fully passable by fish. Also, if this were to impede recovery, that would put water projects at risk which rely on this Program for ESA compliance. This needs to go through a full environmental review, including an EA because this is not just a local issue. Bob Muth said the Service has been working with Palisade and Lacey for the past several months and plans to submit detailed comments. >Reclamation will share their draft letter with the Management Committee as quickly as possible. Wyoming will include some basic, background information about the Recovery Program in their letter.
  
2. Draft report to Congress – Tom Iseman re-sent the environmental group comments as his previous e-mail contained both draft and final comments. Tom outlined their comments which are: 1) need to elaborate on the source of power revenues, the mechanics of the basin fund, and the status and trends of this funding source into the future; 2) need to better describing species status and the link to annual funding; 3) question the assumption of level annual funding, in light of nonnative fish management needs; and 4) need to reach agreement on future funding recommendations. Tom asked if additional annual funding should be tied to the proposed request for additional capital annual funding. John Shields and Leslie James wondered if more description of power revenues/basin fund is appropriate given that it's authored by the Secretary of the Interior. Tom Iseman suggested that just a little more description of the basics about the fund would be helpful unless there are strategic or political reasons to leave it out. >No later than tomorrow, Clayton Palmer will provide a few paragraphs to Robert Muth and the Committee (including Leslie James). Tom Pitts asked that this language also include some discussion of the demands on the basin fund. John Shields suggested that this language go under Section 3.3 where we discuss power revenues. With regard to the environmental groups' second concern, Bob Muth said he can include language emphasizing the importance of nonnative control, etc. John Shields suggested inserting something like their sentence "The Program's ongoing annual base-funded activities are intended to ensure that the fish receive the full benefit of the capital projects and will address other on-going threats that are not alleviated by those infrastructure projects;" Bob Muth agreed. With regard to the environmental groups' third point, Tom Pitts said he doesn't believe we could justify a need for additional annual funds at this point. Melissa Trammell said she questions whether the current annual funding level is

adequate, especially in light of potential additional nonnative fish management as well as ongoing floodplain maintenance and perhaps major floodplain construction activities. Bob Muth said these needs are speculative at this point, and therefore not something that can be taken to Congress. Tom Iseman agreed that these are potential needs, but believes we do need to raise the issue. Leslie James said CREDA would not support any increase in power revenues. Tom Pitts summarized that if we do determine that we need more annual funding, that goes beyond the scope of this report and raises a larger issue of where those funds would come from (not just from power revenues). Bob Muth agreed that this concern goes beyond power revenues (which are the focus of this report); therefore, if the Program believes that current annual funding needs are inadequate, then we will need to consider that separately. Carol Taylor recommended that the Committee take this up separately at another Management Committee meeting. John Shields emphasized that the Cooperative Agreement and extension thereof are predicated on the current annual funding level.

Dave Mazour had questions about the paragraph beginning “P.L. 106-392 authorizes up to \$4 million per year...” on page 7; Bob Muth will add “see Table B1 in Appendix B” in that paragraph. In the executive summary, Dave suggests that the sentence beginning “Nonnative fish management, research, and public information and involvement efforts would be eliminated from both recovery programs” should start with “Base funding for...” We need to keep the cooperative funding of the Program firmly in mind.

The Committee took up Tom Pitts’ draft recommendations section. Clayton said Pitts’ draft addresses the two concerns that they had, although he still needs final okay from the finance office on the language. Brent suggested that the last sentence in 2B should read: “Reclamation *and/or Western*” to inform Congress if such a situation is foreseeable. It also should mention interest repayment. Tom Pitts agreed and said the language in this recommendation will mirror the language in the existing law.

John asked about a transmittal letter, and the group agreed that Reclamation and the Service will take care of that within DOI.

With regard to letters supporting the recommendations, we’ll have to figure out the timing (to make sure that the letters refer to recommendations that the Secretary, in fact, will send forward).

>Bob Muth will send out a revised draft by next Wednesday (October 24). The San Juan Coordination Committee has a conference call on October 29 (and so their comments will come to us after that).

Leslie James re-emphasized that their Board will need to have additional discussion about the report. One question she has is how specific the report needs to be (specificity being directly related to the amount of time it will take for the Board to consider the report). Leslie said that our discussions today emphasizing the cooperative nature of this Program help alleviate some of the concerns they’ve had (e.g., pressures on the Basin Fund, rate increases, magnitude of dam reoperations, etc.). Their next Board meeting is

in 2 weeks. After discussion of these and related issues; the Committee agreed that this report is not the venue for discussion/resolution of those.

3. Potential amendments to the Recovery program legislation – This topic will be on the agenda for the November 5<sup>th</sup> conference call.
4. Other – John Shields noted the non-federal Program participants had a good meeting with Acting Regional Director Steve Guertin. John Shields is working on our cooperative conservation award submission.
5. The Committee scheduled another call for 1 – 3 p.m. on November 5. >Bob Muth will invite Dave Campbell to participate on that call.

ADJOURN - 3:00 p.m.

#### Assignments

1. Committee members will share their draft comment letters on the Palisade whitewater park with one another by October 26. Reclamation will share their draft letter with the Management Committee as quickly as possible. Wyoming will include some basic, background information about the Recovery Program in their letter.
2. No later than tomorrow, Clayton Palmer will provide a few paragraphs on the basin fund (and demands upon it) for the report to Congress to Robert Muth and the Committee (including Leslie James).
3. Bob Muth will send out a revised draft of the report to Congress by next Wednesday (October 24). This will also go to the San Juan program.
4. Bob Muth will invite Dave Campbell to participate on the November 5 call.

**Colorado River Management Committee Conference Call  
April 11, 2006**

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Carol Taylor	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Melissa Trammell for John Reber	National Park Service
Tom Blickensderfer	Colorado Department of Natural Resources
Dave Mazour	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
Clayton Palmer	Western Area Power Administration
Tom Iseman	The Nature Conservancy
Robert King	State of Utah

Nonvoting Member:

Bob Muth	Recovery Program Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
----------	---

Recovery Program Staff:

Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
----------------	--------------------------------

Others

Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
Carol DeAngelis	Bureau of Reclamation
Terry Hickman	Central Utah Water Conservancy District