



Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Dated: February 16, 2012

February 13, 2012 Management Committee Webinar Draft Summary

CONVENE: 9:00 a.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper – The agenda was revised as it appears below.
2. Approve October 12, 2011 meeting summary – The draft summary was posted to the listserver by Angela Kantola on 10/18/12 and included again with this draft meeting agenda. The draft summary contained a tracked change and comment related to the Flaming Gorge EIS and “backcasting” of the action alternative. The Committee reviewed and accepted this change. >Angela will post the final summary to the listserver.
3. Legislative and Congressional activities
 - a. The non-Federal Program participants’ recent communique to Congress – John Shields said Ian told him he has begun to review this and generally believes it is what they had hoped to see. John told Ian the non-Federal Program participants would like to have a conference call to discuss next steps when they’ve completed their review.
 - b. Legislation outlook and meetings with and among Reps. Bishop and McClintock – No news on this front; can Utah help move this forward? >Colorado will ask Rep. Tipton’s (and perhaps other Colorado representatives’) office(s) to reach out to Rep. Bishop. Ted Kowalski recommended emphasizing the positive impacts the recovery programs (and thus, the legislation) has on jobs. Leslie noted that the Committee will be having more hearings on the ESA this spring. John suggested we focus on our own legislation rather than potentially being de-railed through connection with these hearings.
 - c. How the legislation may address “cutgo” requirements – Ian told John that the subcommittee expects the programs to look into what’s in the resources realm for “cutgo” offsets. John broached the idea of bringing additional funds to the table via the MOA signed by the upper Basin states; however, John’s previous suggestions along this line were not well-received by the States. (A meeting to discuss the MOA revenues is targeted for early April.) Camille Calimlim has emphasized the need to move forward with legislation very quickly. John proposes inviting Rep. McClintock to the congressional staff appreciation luncheon on March 16 and to have a direct discussion with him about the legislation at that time (Camille and Ian thought this was reasonable). Rep. McClintock and Kira Finkler would both be invited to speak at the luncheon. The Committee decided that a public forum for a discussion with Mr. McClintock might not be the best approach; >John will try to arrange a meeting with just a few people (if McClintock is in town). Tom Pitts affirmed that Colorado and New Mexico water users had significant concerns about using MOA funds for the Recovery Program. Tom suggests we rely on subcommittee staff to address cutgo. The

current proposal is to have the three water users representatives from the Recovery Programs meet with Rep. McClintock to discuss their need for the legislation prior to the March meetings. Leslie asked if they've considered including the power representatives; >Tom Pitts thought this would be a good idea and will get back to Leslie.

- d. Scheduling a Congressional conference call after the legislation is introduced – A call may need to occur before introduction of the legislation.
4. Washington, D.C., briefing trip – John has provided a draft itinerary and briefing book to trip participants. So far, no meetings are scheduled for Tuesday, in light of participants' travel schedules. Melissa asked if a meeting has been scheduled with the Park Service; John said he's still working on that – perhaps ~11:15 on Monday. John also will forward a luncheon invitation card to trip participants. Chances are good for a meeting with the entire Utah delegation as the main topic of their once-a-month meeting. Debbie Felker reported that the briefing book goes to the printer on Friday; Debbie will e-mail the final pdf to the Committee. With regard to letters of support to place in the book; the President's budget comes out today and letters can be written as soon as the non-Federal program participants have access to Reclamation and Service budget breakouts. The D.C. hotel reservation deadline is today.
5. Budget Update (FY 2012 and 2013) – Angela Kantola reviewed the FY12-13 budgets (the spreadsheet was included in the e-mail of draft RIPRAP materials). As discussed at the recent Biology Committee meeting, additional funds for FY12 were identified in January (due to higher than expected carry-over of FY11 FWS Program management funds, UDWR's discovery of carry-over funds, and final definition of projects eligible for power revenues in FY12). As a result, the Program Director's office recommended restoring several nonnative fish management project budget cuts, purchasing several electrofishing units to standardize the Program's electrofishing fleet, and some other items. Scopes of work were revised and reviewed by the Biology Committee, which generally approved most of the changes (with the exception of the purchase of flat-plate antennas at this point for detecting razorback sucker presence on the Green River spawning bar because some members felt the system might be too simplified to be effective). Angela said the FY13 budget is very tight, but balances with reasonably-expected carry-over funds from FY12. The Program Director's office recommends that the Management Committee accept the Biology Committee's recommended changes to the FY12/13 work plan. Tom Chart thanked the PI's and the Biology Committee for their work to revise scopes of work and the Management Committee also formally thanked the Biology Committee for their very hard work on this. Clayton Palmer said Western has offered to assist with funding for georeferencing the aerial photos via Argonne (Western would pay for the Green River areas that connect with floodplains); Jana said Kirk LaGory is working on drafting a budget. Clayton said Jerry Wilhite (Western's Biology Committee representative) will identify what Western would assist with and then Clayton would seek approval. Clayton said Western also is willing to help fund portions of the larval trigger study plan that will be conducted by Argonne. Finally, there was discussion of asking Western to help fund water quality monitoring equipment for floodplains (Hydrolabs); Western is willing to ask their management for funding for this. Dave Speas noted that Vernal FWS found loggers that are less expensive than Hydrolabs for their SOW, but contributions of Hydrolabs would still be

helpful. Tom Chart thanked Clayton and said >his office will work with Jerry and Clayton on these items. The Management Committee approved the work plan revisions.

Capital projects – Brent Uilenberg said Reclamation had anticipated ~\$5.8M for Upper Colorado and San Juan programs; with a rescission, that amount is now \$5.750M. The Horsethief Canyon ponds are coming along well and should come in at ~\$5.5M (mostly FY 11 funds). Brent’s confidence in the water supply is increasing and he feels this is going to be a top-rated facility. The contractor expects testing the first week in May and completion and ability to stock fish in June. FY12 capital funds will go toward the Thunder Ranch setback levee repair beginning in March (and completing before spring runoff) at about \$400K. The Hogback Fish Barrier contract will be awarded this year (\$3 – \$3.5M) in the San Juan Program. This leaves ~\$1 - \$1.2M for OMID, but there have been some contract/procurement delays in Colorado. Ted said he thinks they’re making progress and anticipates the obstacles will be overcome. If Reclamation can’t award the major OMID contract this year, they may be able to run some funds through OMID for minor construction. Brent remains concerned about the proposal from CPW and Steamboat Springs for work at Walton Creek (which the Biology Committee recommended that the Recovery Program not move forward with at this time). As proposed, Brent strongly believes this project could expose the Program to too much liability with minimal nonnative fish management benefits. Becky was on the call and said she agrees there were valid reasons not to proceed with the Walton Creek project as proposed; it may be helpful for someone to reach out to Steamboat Springs to let them know that. Tom Chart has sent a letter to Steamboat in that regard and leaving the door open for future collaboration on projects that would promote endangered fish recovery and compatible sport fisheries. >Tom Chart will send the Management and Biology committees a copy of the letter. John Shields suggested it might be helpful for the >Program to send a second, brief follow-up letter to Steamboat emphasizing our desire to continue to work with them; Tom Chart agreed. >Brent Uilenberg will update the 5-year capital projects budget plan when the FY13 budget becomes available (before the D.C. trip).

6. Updates

- a. [10,825 Alternatives](#) & agreements update and Status of Ruedi legislation – Tom Pitts said NEPA compliance is in the final stages with a final EA and FONSI anticipated to go to Reclamation by March 2. Following Reclamation issuance of the FONSI, negotiations then will begin on the five contracts (no difficulties anticipated) needed to implement the 10825 alternative. The contracts could be in place this calendar year, with implementation over the next couple of years.
- b. Aspinall [EIS](#) – Steve McCall sent the Management Committee a draft of the Record of Decision for the Aspinall Unit operations EIS dated February 1 on February 6. Brent said Reclamation plans to file and distribute the final EIS in late February with a 30-day period before the Record of Decision can be signed. Any comments received can be addressed in the ROD. Reclamation still hopes to operate Aspinall under the ROD this spring. Clayton said Western has remaining significant issues that Reclamation didn’t address in the draft ROD and will be calling Reclamation to discuss those. (Leslie said the Platte River Power Authority also still has unaddressed issues.) Julie Lyke said the Service would like to see this move forward as quickly as possible; this remains a sufficient progress concern and the longer the ROD is delayed, the more difficult the

problem becomes. Also, the Service's Western Colorado Field Office continues to consult under the Gunnison River Basin Programmatic Biological Opinion. John Shields asked the Committee if they want to meet to provide collective comments on the EIS from the Recovery Program; Leslie agreed this would be a good idea. John said he hopes to see a similar process developed for Aspinall as has been developed on Flaming Gorge, (e.g., submitting spring flow request letters). Brent cautioned that as snowpack and resource needs change throughout the season, managing Aspinall releases is very much a real-time activity. In response to a question from Tom Pitts, Tom Chart said the Program would proceed with the Gunnison River study plan and collection of valuable fish community information whether or not Aspinall is operated under the ROD this year.

- c. Price River Report – Tom Chart said we've gone through a couple of iterations of the Price River position paper; Tom shared Tom Pitts' policy and technical concerns with the Management Committee on the paper in December. Tom Chart agreed that there were some disconnects in how the Service looked at the Narrows consultation and Tom Pitts' comments directed at those issues were a helpful review (and admonition for mindfulness going forward). The Service has said based on the information provided in the draft Position Paper, they won't reopen consultation on Narrows. Tom and Jana now are working on a response to Pitts' technical comments with hopes of providing something for the Biology Committee to *begin* discussing on their February 24 webinar (with another conference call or meeting likely to follow). After Biology Committee approval of the Price River report, it will come to the Management Committee for approval. Robert said historically there's not been much water in the lower Price. Tom Chart said the draft position paper currently asks Program partners to work with Utah to see if any flexibility can be found. Tom said they will put a finer point on the hydrological analysis, and understands Utah's concern about limited water. Tom Pitts said that as the fish are recovered, their tributary use will increase, but that doesn't necessarily imply we should expend Program resources outside critical habitat. Tom suggested the Program focus on what is needed to achieve recovery goals – several committee members agreed.
- d. Utah's 2011 progress on actions to protect Green River flows – Robert King said Utah has completed their water rights model based on historical data, but some additional runs based on operational data are still pending from Reclamation. Jana said the modelers are carefully reviewing details and assumptions.
- e. Program's 2012 Green River Spring Flow Request letter – Tom Chart said last year's letter talked about timing Flaming Gorge releases to the presence of razorback larvae. A draft larval trigger study plan has been developed by an *ad hoc* Committee, with comments due February 21 (and seeking BC approval February 24). That plan will be the core of the Program's spring flow request for many years to come. The plan identifies a suite of flow magnitudes and durations we'd like to test. A draft flow request letter will basically serve as a cover letter to the study plan, once approved. The plan addresses five topics of research: 1) getting larvae onto the floodplains; 2) tracking their survival; and the unintended consequences of larval trigger operations on: 3) base flows ; 4) sediment transport; and 5) nonnative fishes. Tom Chart thanked Kirk LaGory and the other *ad hoc* group members for their help with the study plan.

- f. White River flow recommendations – Jana Mohrman received comments in late November, but hasn't been able to get back to this due to other priorities of the Basin Study, annual reports, RIPRAP, etc.. Jana plans to get the next draft out by mid-summer at the latest.

- g. Recovery plan schedule and recovery timelines – Tom Czapla said they're working again with the Service's Regional Office to determine if these should be recovery goals or full recovery plans. Tom Chart said that in the meantime, he, Tom Czapla Rich Valdez and Bob Muth have been focused on revision the Colorado pikeminnow package to incorporate new information as it relates to both MVP and population trend analyses. When the group reaches consensus on the technical changes to the demographic criteria, they will schedule reviews/webinars with the Service and then with outside parties.

Tom Czapla referred to Western's concerns about the Service's humpback chub 5-year status review. On the February 2 GCAMWG TWG call, Region 2 took the position that the aggregations away from the LCR have to increase, which goes beyond the criteria included in the 2002 Recovery Goals

Clayton said Western concurs with Tom Chart's plans to bring the revised recovery goals/plans to the Recovery Program for discussion and review. Western believes that was helpful in the last go-around and wants to see it happen again. Western also will suggest the Service reconvene the Recovery Team to help determine the recovery goals/plans scientifically (especially in the case of the humpback chub in the Grand Canyon). Shane Capron agreed and asked the Service to seriously consider reconstituting the Recovery Team. Leslie said CREDA would support that request. Western is very concerned that the Service is considering 'raising the bar' on the demographic criteria, and therefore they would like to be part of process to revise the recovery goals. Tom Pitts agreed that the Recovery Program's involvement in review and development of the 2002 goals was a good process and recommends a similar process again involving both the UCR and San Juan recovery programs. Tom Czapla said that's always been their intent, but the Service is still in the process of reaching consensus among Service Regions 2, 6, and 8, and doesn't have the documents ready for review yet. Clayton suggested that the Service doesn't need to have everything figured out before they bring it to the programs to discuss. Tom Chart said they would like to provide appropriate rationale for changes to the demographic criteria and then discuss that with the programs. Julie said the Service does have procedural requirements (e.g., under the Administrative Procedures Act) to avoid undue outside influence before releasing items for public review; however the Service will be as transparent as possible. Clayton agreed, but clarified that FACA doesn't apply to the Management Committee and the Committee is an acceptable avenue of public input. John Shields said he also has concerns about Region 2 indicating in an informal venue that the former criteria are inadequate. Clayton said Western wants to better understand what the Service is thinking in terms of these criteria and suggests involving the Management Committee as was done for the 2002 goals. Tom Pitts asked if the Service can broaden the base of the recovery teams under guidelines published since 2002?

Julie said this is true. Tom said some of the folks on the current team have retired, etc., so it may be appropriate to add others. >Tom Chart said his office will discuss with the Service how to best get stakeholder input and feedback (via the Recovery Team and subsequently involvement of the recovery programs' participants prior to broad public review via the Federal Register). >Julie said the Service will work out the perceived issues with Region 2.

Shane said Western proposes both that the recovery team be reconvened and program review before broad public review. Tom Czaplá said he thinks that involving the programs (UCREFRP, SJRBRIP, GDDAMP, and MSCP) actually provides a broader review than the recovery team can offer. Shane said he thinks a recovery team of 8-10 people can better address the in-depth technical questions on demographic criteria and help provide more effective, successful recovery plan/goals. Dave Speas noted that some of the concerns seem to turn on the 5-year status review; does the Service generally not seek outside input on review of those? Julie said that the procedural obligations on 5-year reviews are less than legally-binding actions, but the Service *can* seek outside input/review of 5-year reviews. Shane said that it appeared that the Service was using criteria in the review that weren't described in the recovery goals. Tom Pitts recommended that in light of the cooperative nature of the recovery programs, it would be very good for the Service to put these status reviews out for review by the programs in the future. Tom Pitts asked that this include the still-pending razorback sucker and bonytail 5-year status reviews; John agreed this would be appropriate. Tom Chart said that could significantly delay completing these reviews; Tom Czaplá said that there would not be the same issue with demographic criteria for the razorback and bonytail reviews. >The Service will take this request into consideration, however. Tom Chart said that if they do go out for broader review, any suggested changes will need to go back out for review by Regions 2 and 8. So, there's a trade-off between getting them completed quickly (e.g., prior to the D.C. trip), or is broader review more important.

- h. Draft Basin-wide Nonnative and Invasive Aquatic Species Prevention and Control Strategy – Pat Martinez said a draft was released in late August, the Nonnative Fish Subcommittee discussed initial peer-review comments in November and decided to pull out I&E components for the I&E committee to develop a separate I&E section. The I&E Committee will discuss the draft I&E section on their webinar in March.
7. Review previous meeting assignments and sufficient progress action items – See Attachments 1 and 2.
 8. March, 5, 2012, Implementation Committee conference call – Agenda items for this call will include:
 - Brief Program Director's update (including NNF basinwide strategy)
 - D.C. Trip, legislation and budget update
 - Capital projects update (projects remaining in Upper Colorado and San Juan programs); >Brent will provide updated spreadsheet.
 - Delegating approval of RIPRAP revisions and assessment to the Management Committee
 - Recovery Goals and 5-Year Status Reviews; Program role in Recovery Goals revision
 - Southern Rockies LCC update?

- Agenda items for September 19, 2012, Implementation Committee meeting
>The Program Director's office and John Shields will prepare an agenda.

9. Upcoming Management Committee tasks, schedule next meeting – The Committee will scheduled a webinar from 9 a.m. to 1p.m. on March 21. Agenda items will include:
 - Review of draft RIPRAP revisions and assessment
 - Aspinall EIS comments from the Program (>Brent will ask Steve McCall to participate)
 - D.C. Trip review
 - Legislative update
 - Scheduling conference call to review draft elements of Service's sufficient progress memo.

ADJOURN: 1:20 p.m.

Attachment 1: Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee Webinar, February 13, 2012

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Rebecca Mitchell	State of Colorado
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Julie Lyke	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
Mike Roberts	The Nature Conservancy
Clayton Palmer	Western Area Power Administration
Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
Robert King	State of Utah

Nonvoting Member:

Tom Chart	Recovery Program Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
-----------	---

Recovery Program Staff:

Tom Czaplá	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pat Martinez	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Debbie Felker	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others

Jana Mohrman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Shane Capron	Western Area Power Administration
Jerry Wilhite	Western Area Power Administration
Michelle Garrison	Colorado Water Conservation Board
Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation
Ted Kowalski	State of Colorado

Attachment 2 Meeting Assignments

1. The **Management Committee** will consider naming a floodplain site for Pat Nelson. *The Service's Grand Junction field office is considering what might be an appropriate location. We do have a memorial to Pat on the pikeminnow bench at Walter Walker SWA.*
2. The **Program Director's office** will ask Ouray NWR to document their floodplain management recommendations in their draft FY 12-13 easement scope of work (and also ask how the Program might better participate in the Refuge's planning process). *Pending: See related discussion in the October 12, 2011 meeting summary regarding Thunder Ranch, which addresses one of ONWR's and the BC's highest priorities. PD's office has asked to discuss with Ouray NWR.*
3. **Tom Pitts** will work with **Clayton Palmer and Brent Uilenberg** and provide a list of additional Program contributions to be added to the Program's budget pie chart that appears in each year's briefing book. *In process; see discussion in agenda item #3.b.* For the 2012 *Program Highlights*, we will use the \$37.4M annualized estimate. By July 2012, **WAPA** will complete modeling and report actual power replacement costs going back to 2001. Subsequently, **WAPA** will provide annual power replacement cost for the previous year each January for inclusion in the *Program Highlights* pie charts. Those pie charts will include a footnote explaining the calculation and assumptions (the 2012 footnote will explain that these are annualized estimates which will be verified beginning in 2013). **Program participants** will identify other significant costs that have not previously reported (e.g., the Granby component of 10,825 which is estimated at \$16M, \$1.25M contributed by Colorado for GVWM and \$1.5M for OMID, CRWCD contributed property for OMID, etc.). **Tom Chart** will ask **Dave Campbell** to work with the SJCC to determine their additional costs not currently reported. *1/30/12: Tom Pitts provided additional costs to be included in briefing book pie chart; need to follow up with documentation for the record.*
4. **Brent Uilenberg** will modify the OMID scope of work to reflect the ITRC contract to design the SCADA system. The **PD's office** will post the revised SOW to the web. *Pending; Brent Uilenberg will provide a copy of the contract to append to the SOW.*
5. **Angela Kantola** will post the final October 12, 2011 Management Committee meeting summary to the listserv.
6. D.C. trips & legislation assignments:
 - a. **Colorado** will ask Rep. Tipton's (and perhaps other Colorado representatives') office(s) to reach out to Rep. Bishop.
 - b. **John Shields** will try to arrange a meeting with just a few people (if McClintock is in town).
 - c. **Tom Pitts** will get back to Leslie regarding including power representatives in the meeting with Rep. McClintock and the water users.

7. The **Program Director's office** will work with Jerry Wilhite and Clayton Palmer on FY12 work plan items which Western may help fund.
8. **Tom Chart** will send the Management and Biology committees a copy of the Steamboat Springs letter; and also draft a second, brief follow-up letter to Steamboat emphasizing our desire to continue to work with them; Tom Chart agreed.
9. **Brent Uilenberg** will update the 5-year capital projects budget plan when the FY13 budget becomes available (before the D.C. trip).
10. Recovery Goals/Plans and 5-Year Status Review items
 - a. The **Program Director's office** will discuss with the Service how to best get stakeholder input and feedback (via the Recovery Team and subsequently involvement of the recovery programs' participants prior to broad public review via the Federal Register).
 - b. The **Service** (Region 6) will work out the perceived issues with Region 2.
 - c. The **Service** will consider Tom Pitts' request to put the bonytail and razorback sucker 5-year status reviews out for the programs' review. If this is done, any suggested changes will need to go back out for review by Regions 2 and 8, thus, there's a trade-off between getting them completed quickly (e.g., prior to the D.C. trip), or is broader review more important.
11. The **Program Director's office and John Shields** will draft an agenda for the March 5 Implementation Committee meeting.
12. **Brent Uilenberg** will ask **Steve McCall** to participate in the March 21 9 a.m. – 12 p.m. Management Committee webinar.

Attachment 2

Action Items from the [2011 Sufficient Progress Memo](#)

February 30, 2012

General – Upper Basin-wide				
#	Recommended Action Items	Lead	Due Date	Status
1	Cory Williams to send revised draft sediment report to USGS editorial by June 1, then revise & send to BC/WAC for final approval by August 1.	USGS	8/1/11	Sent to BC/WAC July 22; BC/WAC review webinar scheduled for October 13. 10/13/11: Report approved with minor revisions. PDO will assemble a group of experts to assist with interpretation of the USGS' findings (\$15K placeholder in FY12 work plan).
2	The Program Director's office will work with the signatories to the Nonnative Fish Stocking Policy to develop a Nonnative Fish Strategy that squarely addresses the issue of illicit stocking (draft due 9/1/11).	USFWS-PD	9/1/11	Draft strategy sent to BC 8/29/11. Tom Chart also sent a letter to the States about illicit introductions and addressing this issue in the nonnative fish strategy. 10/12/11: Pat Martinez, the Service, and the Upper Basin met October 17, 2011 to discuss illicit introductions. The States have asked to set up the next meeting.
3	The Larval Fish Lab is scheduled to submit the draft razorback monitoring plan by May 31, 2011.	LFL	5/31/11	Behind schedule (now expected in mid-February 2012), but larval razorback monitoring is included in FY12-13 Work Plan in project #22f, #160, #163 and new larval trigger study plan proposals.
4	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 will convene 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.	USFWS-PD		The Program Director's Office has assembled an ad hoc group (three geneticists and Rich Valdez, Melissa Trammell, and Brandon Albrecht) to work on a humpback chub genetics management plan. They held an initial conference call and are reviewing a draft report with recommendations. In 2012, researchers will gather fin clips from chubs throughout the Upper Basin to determine genetic purity. Because Black Rocks / Westwater humpback chub are presumed to be the most pure researchers will secure 200 Age-0 chubs from there in 2012.
Green River				
5	The Program Director's Office will provide a draft Upper Basin Nonnative Fish Strategy for Program review by September 1, 2011. Strategy will identify actions to prevent introduction of new invasive species and also identify actions to eliminate newly-emerging invasives such as burbot & gizzard shad.	USFWS-PD	9/1/11	Draft strategy sent to BC 8/29/11. The NNF SubComm met in November to discuss revisions. I&E folks/Committee are providing input on the I&E section of the plan.
6	The Program Director's Office will provide a final draft Role of the Price River in Recovery of Endangered Fish and the Need for Flow Management for Program review by July 1.	USFWS-PD	7/1/11	Draft provided. Submitted 6/21/11 and discussed at 7/11-12/11 BC meeting. BC discussed on September 30 webinar; Tom Chart, Jana Mohrman, and Tom Pitts discussing technical issues; Tom Pitts provided comments. The Program Director's office will prepare responses to Pitts concerns and potentially a revision to the position paper for Biology Committee review in the very near future.
7	The Tusher Wash Ad Hoc Group is gathering information (literature review to be completed in summer 2011, and a	Tusher Wash Ad Hoc Group		10/12/11: PD's office asked Reclamation if description / specifications of the current Tusher hardware could help us

	potential mortality study, if needed and funding available) to develop a screening recommendation.			understand if it can be retrofitted. PD's office is working to draft a request for a proposal (or similar) for a mortality study and literature review . The potential for using an electronic barrier on the canal also is being investigated.
Yampa River				
8	The Water Acquisition Committee will review mechanisms of current flow protection under the RIPRAP for both the Yampa and Colorado rivers to determine if additional mechanisms or instream flow filings are needed at this time (this will be reviewed every 5 years). As part of this review, the Committee will discuss the need for peak flow protection (which would require a peak flow recommendation).	WAC		7/19/11: WAC began discussing this; tabled until next call. MC: WAC needs to make call on whether instream flow filings currently necessary AND add language to RIPRAP to allow review before 5 more years, if needed. Also need to consider whether additional mechanisms for flow protection are needed. 10/12/11: Language has been proposed for WAC consideration; and was included in 2012 draft RIPRAP revisions .
9	CWCB will create a Consumptive Uses & Losses Report for 1975-2009, compare those to the old 1975-1998 numbers, and compare their new estimates for 1975-1998 to 1999-2009. The StateCU model will be completed by June 1, 2011; Subsequently, meetings will be held with TNC to discuss StateMOD. CWCB, the Service, and the Water Acquisition Committee also should discuss whether we are able to adequately document depletions.	CWCB, FWS, TNC, WAC	6/1/11	8/11/11: CWCB intends to produce this report by spring 2012 .
10	CSU will complete the programmatic synthesis of smallmouth bass removal efforts (2012) which will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the Program's removal efforts as well as a thorough assessment of escapement.	CSU-LFL	8/31/2012	Draft final report due to Recovery Program 8/31/2012.
11	CSU will conduct a programmatic synthesis of northern pike removal efforts (2011-2012) which will evaluate current removal efforts in the context of northern pike life history throughout the Yampa River drainage. The Service supports the Program Director's Office recommendation that there be additional emphasis on northern pike control above Hayden.	CSU-LFL	6/30/13	Draft final report due to Recovery Program 6/30/13.
White River				
12	The Program Director's Office will submit a draft flow recommendations report to BC/WAC by July 1, 2011. Program participants have initiated efforts to develop a White River Management Plan that likely will lead to a programmatic biological opinion.	USFWS-PD	7/1/11	Draft report submitted July 1, 2011. Jana updated Biology Committee on comments received (some of which are conflicting) during September 30 webinar. Comments were received from the Service, environmental groups, Reclamation, Tom Pitts, and Utah's Divisions of Water Rights and Wildlife Resources. Addressing comments has been delayed while Jana Mohrman works with Reclamation to put Program flow recommendations in appropriate format for the Basin Study. Jana is dealing with conflicting comments on both the peak and base flow aspects of the draft recommendations; next draft anticipated mid-summer 2012.
Colorado River				
13	Recovery Program participants will consider options and	Program	Pending	

	opportunities for meeting flow recommendations on a more consistent basis after completion of 10,825 EA and agreements.			
14	Recovery Program participants will complete the final CFOPS report by September 30, 2011.	Program	9/30/11	2008, 2009, and 2010 CROS reports that will allow completion of the assessment of the potential benefits of CFOPS distributed. Draft to WAC expected mid-March 2012.
15	The Service will document condition of a surrogate species (white sucker) below the Grand Valley Irrigation Company return pipe (begins July 2011).	USFWS	2011	This work had to be deferred to 2012 due to high flows . Results and recommendations will be documented in the 2012 annual report.
16	CDOW and the Recovery Program have coordinated with Parks so that the 2011 unscreened outlet release will be scheduled in the summer when oxygen is depleted at depth to prevent fish escapement. The Recovery Program also will coordinate with Parks to revise the scope of work accordingly (to assure that unscreened outlet releases only occur when oxygen levels are ≤ 2 mg/l).	CP&W	2011	In progress and SOW revised.
Gunnison River				
17	The Aspinall Study Plan will begin to be implemented in FY11. Reclamation will complete the final Aspinall Environmental Impact Statement by December 31, 2011.	Program/Reclamation	2011	SOW at http://www.coloradoriverrecovery.org/documents-publications/work-plan-documents/sow/10-11/rsch/163.pdf . Final ROD expected in early 2012 prior to spring runoff.