

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

February 6, 2008

Country Inn & Suites, 4343 Airport Way, Denver, Colorado

CONVENE: 10:15 a.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper – The agenda was revised as it appears below.
2. Approve [December 6, 2007, meeting summary](#) and review assignments – Brent suggested some changes to items 5c (clarifying Phase 2 of CFOPS) & d (current burden on Ruedi is 20,000 af). Item 5d and the related assignment were modified to reflect that Tom Pitts will arrange for, not give a presentation on the 10,825 to the Management Committee. Item 5h was revised to say the water users have no concerns with moving to no jeopardy opinions as long as it is consistent with the Section 7 agreement. Item 5j of the summary was revised to reflect a 1:1 match from NFWF for environmental groups' funding. Item 5l was corrected to say "effects of nonnative predator removal on Yampa *native* fishes." >Angela Kantola will post the revised summary to the listserver.
3. Cooperative Conservation Award – Bob Muth said the Upper Colorado River and San Juan River recovery programs have been selected to receive a cooperative conservation award from the Department of the Interior. There will be an awards ceremony this spring (possibly late April or early May), and perhaps a workshop, as well. The Committee thanked Regional Director, Steve Guertin, for his support of this nomination. >The Program Director's office will post information about this award to the fws-coloriver listserver. John Shields suggested placing a silver foil sticker on the front of the briefing book this year that identifies the Programs as the recipient of this award. >Bob Muth will check with D.C. to see if this is appropriate; John Shields will work on getting the stickers made.
4. Report to Congress – On January 7, the draft report to Congress, entitled "Utilization of Power Revenues for Annual Base Funding of the Upper Colorado River and San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Programs" was transmitted from Steve Guertin (Regional Director, Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service) to Bryan Arroyo (Assistant Director, Endangered Species, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, bryan_arroyo@fws.gov). The transmittal memo, report, and appendices may be found at <http://www.fws.gov/mountain-prairie/crrip/pot.htm>. Appendix A is being updated to add letters of support as they are received. Letters of support have been received from Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Wyoming, the Jicarilla Apache Nation, Southern Ute Indian Tribe, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Colorado Water Congress, Wyoming Water Association, and Colorado River Energy Distributors Association. A letter from the Utah Water Users Association is still pending. Terry Hickman said the letter should be submitted any day now. No letter has been received from the Navajo Nation. The Nature Conservancy and Western Resource Advocates support the recommendations contained the Report to Congress. They will review the final version of the report when it is provided to Program participants and will submit a formal letter of support at that time, assuming there are no substantive and problematic changes to the final recommendations and report. (Bob Muth said it's unlikely that we'll get to see the

report again before it goes to Congress. >Bob Muth and Tom Iseman will work to find out if any changes have been made so that the environmental groups can submit their support letter. Leslie James noted that their letter specifically referenced the January 4 draft.) The map on page 3 and budget numbers on pages 8-9 have been updated to match the "Program Highlights" briefing book. Jonne Hower is coordinating the review for the Commissioner's (Bureau of Reclamation) office in Washington, D.C. and has been very helpful. The report needs to go to Congress by March 1, 2008. (The March 1 date is recommended because 2008 is an election year, and the annual D.C. trip by recovery program participants is March 5-11, 2008.) Bob Muth got an e-mail from Washington, D.C. yesterday indicating that the report is ready to go through the surnaming process; Bob will work with John Shields and Tom Pitts to provide D.C. with a draft transmittal memo from the Secretary to the authorizing committees. >Bob Muth will let the Committee know if the report is submitted prior to March 1.

5. Washington, D.C. briefing trip (March 5-11) – John Shields noted that the Bureau's FY 09 budget (as released by the President on Monday) will cover our outstanding obligation to the Colorado River Water Conservation District on Elkhead. The Fish and Wildlife Service budget is believed to be what's needed (everything is in the base), but the Green Book is not available yet. John has drafted the joint delegation funding support letter, but rather than just circulating this letter this year, the non-Federal Program partners also are working to get appropriation request forms gathered for each of the Congressional members. The group will ask Senator Bennett's office to circulate the joint Senate letter and Representative John Salazar's office to circulate the House letter. >John Shields and Tom Pitts will provide draft wording for this to the other non-Federal partners. If the governors' support letters can be sent in as soon as possible, they can be included in the request. Everyone will need to work fast to get these letters in on time. The water users will again sponsor an appreciation luncheon in the Library of Congress. Jana Mohrman will give a presentation on water management activities. John Shields has begun working to set some of the appointments, and >will send out the first draft schedule tomorrow so that others will know when to set appointments. Mary Nelson will be contacting those participating in the meeting with OMB for required background information. When the group meets with Dale Hall on March 11, they also will invite Gary Frazier and Byran Arroyo. Tom Pitts plans to draft a short paper on roles and responsibilities in advance of the trip so everyone knows their role in the various meetings. Tom Iseman said TNC included a write-up on the recovery programs in their government relations package.
6. Potential amendments to the Recovery program legislation – Tom Pitts said the proposed legislation would provide \$12M in capital funds for the San Juan program, \$15M for our Program, and extend authorization for both programs through 2023. This will be important for rehabilitation and maintenance of our existing facilities (hatcheries, passages, etc.) It also takes care of remediation of the rock slide that went into a water supply ditch adjacent to critical habitat in the San Juan River. Senators Domenici and Bingaman likely will sponsor the legislation. >Tom Pitts will draft a 2-page briefing document on this and send it to the Management Committee. The legislation maintains the 50/50 cost share with no additional cash from the States. The language in the recommendations in the Secretary's report likely will be included, as well. This will be discussed during the Washington, D.C., trip briefings. Tom Iseman noted he thinks this is a good idea. John Shields noted that three things will need to be covered in the D.C. briefings this year: 1) 2009 appropriations; 2)

report to Congress; 3) recommendations in the report to Congress as potential amendments as well as these potential amendments. It may be best to ask for 30 minute appointments. Leslie said CREDA's support of amendments will depend on the specific legislative language.

7. Implementation Committee meeting – The February 27 meeting had been scheduled for 10 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 2000 (second floor of the east building) of the Utah Department of Natural Resources office at 1594 West North Temple in Salt Lake City, Utah. John Shields asked to defer the start time to 10:30 a.m. If need be, we could order lunch in. The Committee agreed. This Salt Lake City venue may allow Larry Walkoviak, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's new Regional Director, to attend a portion of the meeting and also increases the possibility of attendance by Mike Styler, Director of the Utah Department of Natural Resources and/or Darin Bird, also of Utah DNR, even though the Utah Legislature will be in session during this time. Agenda items will include:
 - Appointment of Implementation Committee chair (new Mountain-Prairie Regional Director, Stephen D. Guertin, has indicated his willingness to serve as chair).
 - Program Director's update (including fish status, status of capital construction projects, recovery goals status, and a brief summary of the San Juan program and how we coordinate).
 - Updates on:
 - The Washington, D.C., trip and proposed legislation
 - The report to Congress (emphasizing our relationship to Congress, the budget pie charts, etc)
 - A report on upcoming Management Committee activities from John Shields (RIPRAP review; sufficient progress, etc.).
 - The cooperative conservation award.
 - Report on nonnative fish management activities.
 - Proxy to Management Committee to approve RIPRAP revisions, assessment, and related documents.

>Management Committee members will make sure their Implementation Committee members have seen the briefing book and the report to Congress. >The Program Director's office will draft the agenda and send it out for Management Committee review next week.

8. Aspinall EIS – Steve McCall and Clayton Palmer provided background information in advance of the meeting. Tom Pitts asked why this is being brought to the Management Committee (rather than being discussed in the Aspinall EIS forum); and what action Clayton expects from the Management Committee. Clayton proceeded to explain Western's concerns over the Aspinall consultation and EIS process. The model runs Western has seen to date in the EIS have potential for considerable impact on electrical power generation. Reclamation seems to view the Aspinall EIS as having no tie to the Recovery Program; however, the Recovery Program's Section 7 Agreement clearly outlines a process for adding additional RIPRAP items when needed for the Program to serve as a reasonable and prudent alternative (RPA). Western believes that this is the tie between the Program and the Aspinall EIS, and that the Management Committee should communicate that to Reclamation. The Service's Gunnison River flow recommendations were approved by the Recovery Program, but Clayton believes these have been significantly altered in the EIS

process. Clayton believes the Committee should recommend to the Service that any modifications to the flow recommendations be submitted for Program review, beginning with the Biology Committee.

Margot Zallen, responding on behalf of Interior, said the assumption of no tie between the Program and the EIS is incorrect, and, in reference to Clayton's 2/4/08 letter to Steve Guertin, said that she has not stated otherwise. The Recovery Program and the Aspinall EIS are related but separate processes. The appropriate place for the discussion of the Program is in the baseline of the biological opinion. The Section 7 Agreement would only come into play if an RPA cannot be found, which Margot says she does not believe will be the case, since she anticipates a non-jeopardy opinion. Therefore, it isn't appropriate to try to answer a hypothetical question about a jeopardy opinion. Clayton said he believes it is appropriate because it appears that Reclamation is unwilling to consider alternatives that would result in a jeopardy opinion. Margot emphasized that this is not the forum to discuss the alternatives. That discussion belongs in the cooperating agency meetings.

Randy Seaholm said he would like to explore the fact that the flow recommendations will be evaluated based on results of ongoing studies, which may result in modifications to those flow recommendations. Randy suggested considering alternatives that meet the current flow recommendations as well as other options. Randy thought the Program might write a letter outlining the background of the Program and the Program's current activities in the Gunnison Basin and encouraging the EIS participants not to make irretrievable commitments of resources. Clayton supported this. Margot said the adaptive management process that Randy has suggested has been supported in the EIS process, and it would be fine for Colorado to send Reclamation a letter regarding things they would like to be considered in that process. Randy said he believes it would be helpful if we could focus on meeting the flow recommendations to the extent possible with the amount of water that everyone is agrees is available.

Tom Pitts said the Program approved flow recommendations; it is Reclamation's job to propose Aspinall operations that take those recommendations into consideration, and it is the Service's job is to determine if Reclamation's proposals comply with the ESA. Leslie added that the flow recommendations were debated extensively as they were reviewed by the Program, and that we were finally able to reach consensus with the table footnotes. Leslie believes that a different view of that table and the footnotes has emerged in the EIS process. Margot Zallen said Interior does not believe they are altering the flow recommendations. Clayton Palmer disagreed, saying that it is clear that the flow recommendations have been re-interpreted. Western can't support power users being required to bear an excessive burden for recovery, which is how they view what's going on in the Aspinall process. Tom Pitts asked what Clayton considers to be an undue burden on the power users. Clayton said Western believes the Service refused to modify the Flaming Gorge flow recommendations without going through Program review process but that the Service is modifying the Aspinall flow recommendations and is unwilling to go through a Program review process (to Western's disadvantage in both cases). Clayton said that perhaps Tom Pitts is right: if Western believes the flow recommendations are being reinterpreted, then Western should take that to the Biology Committee.

Randy said Colorado does not want to see the Aspinall and Black Canyon processes delayed. It would be preferable for review of the flow recommendations to take its normal course. If there's enough flexibility in the alternatives, that should be possible. A letter from the Committee outlining what the Program is about, what we're doing in the Gunnison Basin and encouraging such flexibility would help this. Tom Pitts said we already know that the flow recommendations may change based on additional information; Randy said a statement to that effect from the Program would help the Aspinall process. John Reber cautioned that language drafted by the Committee could be received in very differently by different parties, and thus has the potential to actually slow the process. Bob Muth said the Program's commitments to conduct studies to evaluate and revise flow recommendations are clearly outlined in the RIPRAP and annual work plans. Margot noted that the EIS cooperating agencies are all on the Management Committee, and clarified the EIS is on operation of the Aspinall Unit; the Biological opinion is on that operation, as well as other Reclamation projects, and private projects. Alex suggested many participants in the Black Canyon negotiations don't understand the Recovery Program, thus the kind of letter Randy proposes would be helpful.

Alex asked if there's a way to quickly get closure on whether the flow recommendations are being reinterpreted. Clayton said Randy's suggested flexibility of alternatives would help. Clayton said Western is willing to help (provide staff, etc.) to develop these kind of flexible alternatives. Tom Pitts suggested that instead of a letter from the Committee, the Program Director provide a simple, factual summary (e.g., from the RIPRAP text) on what the Program is doing and plans to do in the Gunnison, planned evaluation of flow recommendations, etc. Bob said he can include a portrayal of the Program's adaptive management approach in that summary. Randy offered to help Bob Muth with this draft. >Bob will draft this summary for the Management Committee chair to send to Reclamation (Ed Warner said Reclamation would then send that out to the entire Aspinall mailing list). Western may or may not take the issue of flow recommendation reinterpretation to the Biology Committee. John Shields suggested that with regard to language about flexibility of alternatives and irretrievable commitment of resources, Colorado or others may wish to suggest that within the EIS process. Tom Iseman said he can agree with that, as well as to the proposed summary of facts (as opposed to the Management Committee sending that message).

9. Elkhead contract modification – Brent Uilenberg said he and Bob met with CRWCD on a draft modification to the repayment contract and came to agreement on modifications and a final repayment cost. The total due is \$12.7M; with the payments already made, that leaves a balance of \$5.2M plus \$200K interest, plus +\$30K/month interest beyond November 11, 2008. This is well within what the Implementation Committee authorized. The Committee agreed. The difficult part will be *when* Reclamation gets their budget. Now the contract will need to go through legal review.
10. Options for Grand Valley Project hydropower unit operation – Brent said the Grand Valley Water Users and the Orchard Mesa Irrigation District will have first right of refusal to assume operation. If they're not interested, Reclamation would do an open request for proposals. Operation by Reclamation would be the choice of last resort.

Updates

- a. Flaming Gorge releases – Bob Muth said he and his staff are working with UDWR and the committees to craft the Program’s request for Flaming Gorge flows to support the [study of razorback sucker emigration from the Stirrup floodplain](#).
- b. Coordinated Facilities Operations Study – Tom Pitts discussed this requirement of the Colorado River Programmatic Biological Opinion. The objective is to provide up to an additional 20,000 acre-feet/year to enhance peak flows in the 15-mile reach, without substantial cost to water users. It appears there is potential for enhancing peak flows. The report is being written and a meeting with the State Engineer’s office will be part of the second phase of this study.
- c. Proposed whitewater park at Palisade – No change in status from December meeting.
- d. Capital projects
 - i. Myton Diversion rehab – Terry Hickman said Reclamation is finalizing design plans, and then materials will be stockpiled until October, when construction will begin (with completion by April 2009). All the permits are in place. Reclamation sent a bill to NFWF for the Section 7 portion in December. >Angela will check with Rebecca on progress.
 - ii. Status of Price-Stubb passage construction – Brent Uilenberg said he believes there will be \$100-200K in additional costs due to additional grouting required (for a total project cost of \$10.1 - \$10.2M).
 - iii. Follow-up on earlier discussions about Tusher Wash screening - Brent Uilenberg said Thayne Hydro and Green River Canal Company are discussing replacement of the dam. The raised height would change the screening or weir design, creating potential delays. If our legislative extension (beyond 2010) and additional ceiling are forthcoming from Congress, this won’t be a problem. >Brent will draft a background paper on this for the Washington, D.C. briefing trip.
- e. Nonnative fish management – Tom Chart reviewed recent activities.
 - i. December 18-19 nonnative fish workshop – The goals of the workshop were to examine 2007 results and compare those with previous years, recommend changes for 2008, and recommend a process to evaluate the Program’s ability to reduce the threat of nonnative fishes on a river-wide or population scale. Findings: For northern pike, we are able to affect the population with our current level of removal. Most pike reproduction appears to occur upstream of Critical Habitat on the Yampa River. A cost/benefit analysis is needed to evaluate the current buffer zone approach versus expanding/shifting efforts upstream towards sources. For smallmouth bass, it’s too early to evaluate our effort at the population level. We’re seeing very promising results in the Echo to Split Mountain reach (14 removal passes) on the Green River. We need to assess tag loss, however. We are working to determine the level of effort

needed to reach a 65% exploitation rate throughout the Upper Basin. Tom outlined recommendations from the workshop and noted that the Biology Committee has established a Nonnative Fish Management Subcommittee.

- ii. FY 08 activities – Tom said changes to the Program’s nonnative fish management activities for FY 08 are fairly minor compared to 2007. For northern pike, we’ll focus more removal on spawning / nursery habitats between Craig and Hayden. CDOW continues pike control and habitat restoration work on upper Yampa River and impoundments. For smallmouth bass, we’ll increase the number of passes at Lily Park; pick up a couple new reaches on the Yampa (~20 miles); and assess tag loss (~\$30-40K increase). Native fish response efforts will be expanded into Lily Park where native fish may be more abundant (~\$15K increase). There will be new starts at Desolation/Duchesne River (collaboration with the Ute Tribe); and in Cross Mountain Canyon (~\$50K increase). Finally, the Program Director’s office will kick off the second-level synthesis, although an RFP may be necessary down the road (~\$25K).
- iii. Synthesis reports – Complete: #115 (Lodore, Bestgen); #140 (Yampa River native fish response, Bestgen); and 126 (Colorado River SMB, Burdick). Nearing completion: #109 (Green River NP, Hedrick); #98b (NP Upper Yampa, Finney); #110 (Yampa Canyon SMB and Channel catfish, Finney/Fuller). First draft reviewed / being revised: #123 (Green River SMB, Goddard). Awaiting first draft: #125 (Mid Yampa SMB, Hawkins); #98a (Yampa River: NP and SMB, Martin). >The Program Director’s office will draft a letter for John Shields to send to the Larval Fish Laboratory (report #125) and the Colorado Division of Wildlife (report #98a) alerting them to the seriousness of continued delays and potential consequences if these two reports are not completed soon.
- iv. Nonnative fish stocking procedures - Revisions are underway and the document has been condensed to serve better as a guide to management agencies. Outstanding issues: the Service is interested in addressing illicit introductions and cleaning up the Lake Management Plan Review Process (feedback loop). Tom noted that Utah’s 2008 fishing proclamation now requires anglers to kill any bass caught in the Green River.
- v. Yampa strategy – This responds to the Implementation Committee’s October 13, 2006 directive. Rich Valdez produced a first draft in April 2007 which has been considerably revised via an *ad hoc* Committee in communication with the Biology Committee. A final draft was posted to the listserver on February 5, 2008 and on the Biology Committee’s February 15 agenda for discussion / approval. Elements of the strategy are information and education, prevention, early detection and reporting, information and data management, mechanical removal, and research and development. Tom Iseman asked about the level of detail the strategy provides and said he would review the strategy further and provide Tom Chart with any additional comments.

- f. Duchesne River – Bob Muth said there’s a proposed 2008 scope of work to do nonnative fish work on the Duchesne and in adjacent areas of the Green River, and he believes the habitat work could be built into that scope. Terry Hickman said they support that.
- g. Recovery goals – Bob Muth said the recovery goals have been revised based on Service review and are expected to go out for stakeholder review by March 2008. The Service anticipates publishing a Federal Register notice announcing that the revised goals are available for public review by summer 2008.
- h. FY 08-09 Work Plan status, updates – Angela Kantola said Reclamation’s Salt Lake City office has begun work on FY 08 funding agreements. With regard to FY 08 work plan modifications, Angela said nonnative fish management activities and scopes of work are being revised on the basis of recommendations from the nonnative fish workshop and subsequent discussions with the Biology Committee and CDOW; the Program Director’s office and Reclamation are discussing ways of making full repairs needed to the Grand Valley hatchery facility; and Bob Muth is working with the San Juan Program regarding their providing a portion of the funding for the cyprinid key. Angela noted that the 2007 report recommendations summary, draft revised RIPRAP (tables, text, and budget table), draft 07-08 RIPRAP assessment, and revised FY 08-09 budget summary tables were posted to the listserver in three messages on Friday, February 1 (with I&E portions still pending). Technical committee comments on the draft RIPRAP revisions, RIPRAP assessment and 2008-2009 work plan modifications are due to the Program Director and to the Management Committee no later than February 22, 2008. The Water Acquisition and Information and Education committees likely will want to schedule conference calls to review these documents; the Biology Committee will do so at their February 15 meeting. Then, the Management Committee will review the documents at their March 31 meeting (and presumably will have the Implementation Committee’s proxy to approve them). Management Committee members are encouraged to discuss these documents with their technical committee representatives before March 31.
- i. FY 09 agency contributions - Angela Kantola distributed copies of the FY 09 depletion charge and annual budget adjustments table, which she also posted to the listserver on February 5. John Shields noted that footnote #5 should show \$697K. Angela agreed.
- j. Reports status – Angela Kantola distributed an updated reports due list. At their January 17 meeting, the Biology Committee approved Bob Burdick’s report "Removal of Smallmouth Bass and Four Other Centrarchid Fishes from the Upper Colorado and Lower Gunnison Rivers: 2004-2006" (126) At their February 15 meeting, the Biology Committee will consider Sam Finney’s revised Upper Yampa River synthesis report (98b) and the middle Green River northern pike synthesis report (109).
- k. Proposed fall 2008 Colorado River science symposium – A conference call is being held tomorrow to discuss the meeting tentatively scheduled for December 2-4 2008 in Flagstaff, AZ. Up to 500 people are expected to attend and formal conference proceedings will be published.

11. Upcoming Management Committee tasks, schedule next meeting – The Committee will need to meet in March to approve the draft RIPRAP assessment and revisions. The Committee will meet in this same location on Monday, March 31 (Denver, Country Inn and Suites) from 9:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

ADJOURN 4:00 p.m.

Assignments

Carry-over from previous meetings:

1. The **Service** will meet to consider if it would be acceptable to screen the irrigation water and not the low-head hydropower water at Tusher Wash or if there are other ways (e.g., a weir wall) to achieve our objectives for screening Tusher Wash. *Discussions underway.*
2. **Tom Pitts** will arrange for a presentation to the Management Committee on the 10,825 af Ruedi water replacement options when the Phase II report is complete.
3. The **Program Director's office** will provide a more specific recommendation regarding establishing a basinwide recovery/conservation oversight team for the endangered fishes.
4. The **Service** will provide written notification that they believe recent humpback chub sampling in the Grand Canyon has verified the GCMRC model (after they've reviewed the final report on concurrent sampling). *Pending receipt of final report.*

New assignments:

1. **Angela Kantola** will post the revised December 6, 2007, meeting summary to the listserver. *Done.*
2. The **Program Director's office** will post information about the cooperative conservation award to the fws-coloriver listserver.
3. **Bob Muth** will check with D.C. to see if it's appropriate to place a "recipient of 2007 DOI cooperative conservation award" sticker on the front of the briefing book; **John Shields** will work on getting the stickers made.
4. **Bob Muth and Tom Iseman** will work to find out if any changes have been made to the draft report to Congress so that the environmental groups can submit their support letter. *No major changes have been made or are likely to be made to the report.*
5. **Bob Muth** will let the Committee know if the Secretary's report to Congress is submitted prior to March 1.
6. **John Shields and Tom Pitts** will provide draft wording for the appropriation request forms to the other non-Federal partners. *Done.*

7. **John Shields** will send out the first draft D.C. briefings schedule February 7. *Done.*
8. **Tom Pitts** will draft a 2-page briefing document on the proposed legislative amendments and send it to the Management Committee.
9. **Management Committee members** will make sure their Implementation Committee members see the briefing book and the report to Congress prior to the Implementation Committee meeting.
10. The **Program Director's office** will draft the Implementation Committee meeting agenda and send it out for Management Committee review next week.
11. **Bob Muth** will draft a simple, factual summary on what the Program is doing and plans to do in the Gunnison Basin, including planned evaluation of flow recommendations, etc. Bob will include a portrayal of the Program's adaptive management approach in that summary. Randy Seaholm has offered to help Bob. Once approved, **John Shields** will send this summary to Reclamation and **Reclamation** will send it to their entire Aspinall mailing list.
12. **Angela Kantola** will check with Rebecca on progress of transferring the Section 7 funds to the Myton project. *NFWF processed this payment on January 14, 2008, so it should have been wired to Reclamation as part of the end of January cycle.*
13. **Brent Uilenberg** will draft a background paper on the Tusher Wash screening for the Washington, D.C. briefing trip.
14. The **Program Director's office** will draft a letter for John Shields to send to the Larval Fish Laboratory (report #125) and the Colorado Division of Wildlife (report #98a) alerting them to the seriousness of continued delays and potential consequences if these two reports are not completed soon.

Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee, Denver, Colorado
February 6, 2007

Management Committee Voting Members:

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

Nonvoting Member:

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

Recovery Program Staff:

Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Chart	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others:

Ed Warner	Bureau of Reclamation
Margot Zallen	Department of the Interior, Solicitor's Office
Jana Mohrman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Terry Hickman	Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Shane Capron	Western Area Power Administration
Alex Davis	Colorado Department of Natural Resources
Randy Seaholm	Colorado Water Conservation Board
Bekee Megown	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation (via phone)
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service (via phone)