



Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Dated: March 22, 2012

March 21, 2012 Management Committee Webinar Draft Summary

CONVENE: 9:00 a.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper – Robert Wigington is representing the Nature Conservancy today and let the Committee know that TNC will be hiring behind Mike Roberts.
2. Approve February 13, 2012, revised draft meeting summary (All, 5 min) – The revised draft summary (dated February 16, 2012 and posted to the listserver the same day) was approved as written.
3. Review/approval of draft RIPRAP revisions and assessment – The Committee reviewed revisions and recommendations as drafted by the Program Director's office and revised by the technical committees. (The Implementation Committee has given the Management Committee their proxy to approve these documents.) On the RIPRAP tables, the Committee discussed language regarding: a) reconvening the Recovery Team on the recovery goals/plans; and b) Yampa flow protection needs to be resolved. On the "General" worksheet, Clayton Palmer asked to include reconvening the recovery team under item VII.A.5.d.(1) (as was done under completed item VII.A.5.a), because WAPA is concerned that Region 2 is reinterpreting the recovery goals for humpback chub. Julie said the Service hasn't had the opportunity to brief the Regional Director on this yet, but >will do so and get back to the Committee. Tom Pitts suggested that *how* the recovery goals are completed is not important for the RIPRAP, but Western believes it's important to include reconvening the team. On the Yampa worksheet, the Committee reviewed the language under items I.B.3 and 4. Dan Luecke said the fundamental change is that the need for instream flow filings or other flow protection mechanisms can be done more frequently than every 5 years, if needed. The assessment language also points out that StateCU can only look back in time, and that StateMod is needed to look forward and anticipate effects. With regard to "other flow protection mechanisms," the goal was simply to not rule out any other options for protecting flows (e.g., but without being specific, cooperative efforts, Park Service studies, Colorado Round Table work, etc.). John Shields and Tom Pitts would like to see the language in the assessment simplified, if possible. The Committee approved this in principle, with the understanding that Dan Luecke, Robert Wigington, Tom Pitts, and John Shields discuss simpler language for the assessment with WAC members via e-mail, then provide the result to the MC (>Jana will help coordinate). On the Gunnison worksheet of the RIPRAP tables, the Committee deleted the "X" in front of the Aspinall EIS item. In the RIPRAP text, the Committee discussed and agreed to retain the Critical Habitat Appendix. The Committee approved the RIPRAP pending resolution of the two items in the tables. >The Program Director's office will finalize the RIPRAP when those issues are resolved.
4. Aspinall EIS comments submitted by Program partners – The draft ROD was sent to cooperating agencies February 3 and to the Management Committee February 5. On

February 23, Reclamation mailed the final EIS and filed it with EPA on February 27. EPA filed the notice on March 9; therefore, the 30-day waiting period for Reclamation to finalize the ROD will be complete on April 10. Two letter comments have been received on the draft ROD and one on the final EIS. Reclamation may revise the ROD based on comments received, and then send the final up through their Regional and Washington offices. John Shields requested Reclamation send the ROD, if revised, to the Management Committee before it goes to Washington (though not for review), as he believes it's important for Recovery Program participants know what the final document will say. Robert Wigington said TNC expects Reclamation to respond to comments and does not believe we need another round of review. >Reclamation will let the Management Committee know of their decision on sending the final ROD to the Management Committee before it goes to Washington for signature. Melissa said she believes the Park will send a letter of support to Reclamation and she will share that with the Management Committee (done). John said he intends to submit comments on the draft. Dan Luecke urged moving this process along and reaching closure sooner rather than later (Julie Lyke and Robert Wigington agreed). Leslie said it's important that the final product be supportable and also consistent with Flaming Gorge. Clayton Palmer said that as a cooperating agency, Western has a couple of significant comments they believe haven't been addressed in the Final EIS. Dan Luecke noted that they've also had significant comments over the years that haven't been fully addressed, but recognizes that happens in these sort of processes. Leslie said their concern was the lack of discussion on *why* certain changes were made in the EIS from the time of the draft until a year or two later when a major revision to the draft was issued. Becky said Colorado would submit comments; one of their biggest concerns is that the State does not have a way to accomplish what is contemplated in the Final EIS.

5. Flaming Gorge spring flow request letter and Larval Trigger Study Plan – Tom Chart sent these to the Committee on March 9. The Study Plan contemplates a minimum 6-year study period to cover the range of hydrologic conditions. On March 12, Leslie James asked Tom Chart to add language from the 2006 ROD to the Study Plan to provide background as to why the Program is proceeding with the plan, and Tom incorporated that language in a footnote and sent the revision to the Management Committee last week. Tom said he received other minor comments, but doesn't believe they will require any substantive changes. Tom will add an executive summary and table of contents to the final study plan. John Shields asked if sampling the eight floodplain sites will provide adequate diversity of floodplain types; Tom said he thinks it will, as a minimum. Asked about the meaning of the "subsequent effects" sentence on page 4, Tom Chart said the plan contemplates bigger releases from Flaming Gorge if the timing of Yampa peak is such that it can't contribute to flows needed when larval razorback appear; therefore, water available for base flows may be affected. The Committee approved the letter and Study Plan. The Committee thanked all the folks involved in crafting the Study Plan.
6. D.C. Trip review and Legislative update
 - a. Introduction of Annual Funding Legislation – Tom Pitts said they circulated the current draft in Washington last week. The New Mexico legislation said Senator Bingaman wants to insert the new language, pass it out of Committee, and get it voted on in the Senate (and scored by OMB). Senator Udall is interested, as well. The non-Federal Program participants are comfortable with the Senate moving forward with the draft at this point.

b. Trip review – John Shields said the meetings went pretty well. Tom Pitts noted that there is still strong support for the Recovery Programs, but no one knows how to deal with “Cut-go.” John said likely some House and Senate members will send letters of support for what’s in the President’s budget. In addition, a number of staffers are interested in hearing how discussions went with the House Natural Resources Water & Power Subcommittee and the Subcommittee Chair. Robert King said Chairman McClintock asked very pointed questions (e.g., why we should support this effort, and do stocked fish count (yes, “when they grow up and have kids”). They emphasized that the Recovery Programs work because they are cooperative. Chairman McClintock said that if Representatives Bishop and Tipton introduce the legislation, his Subcommittee will not oppose it. McClintock asked them to submit in writing how they’d improve the ESA. Shields suggested to McClintock that the Service ought to have more efforts that are cooperative. He also suggested that if a DPS were designated, then he personally believes the Grand Canyon humpback chub population could be downlisted (the Blue Book mentions that this could be considered). John would like to get suggestions for ESA improvement to the Chairman in writing before April 18. (Tom Pitts said this will be a direct response to Chairman McClintock, not made on behalf of the Program. Robert Wigington said the environmental groups likely would opt-out of association with any recommended ESA policy changes.) >John Shields will draft a short summary of the meeting with Chairman McClintock. John said the overall trip report will mention their meeting with OMB, almost 30 people at the luncheon, etc. The appropriations committees said they appreciate hearing about something that’s working. The group learned more about “Cut-go” from Kiel Weaver: we’re proposing power revenues as source, which are mandatory spending; therefore cuts have to be mandatory spending, as well (addressed within the Revenue Finance Section, that is, one or the other of the Basin Funds). It appears something will have to be written into the bill regarding “Cut-go.”

7. Updates (10 min) – Brent has provided the updated capital projects work plan table. Crews are on the ground making repairs at Thunder Ranch. Tom Pitts reported that the final draft 10,825 EA/FONSI has been sent to Reclamation and is under review at the ECAO office, soon to be sent to the Solicitor and regional office for review (if not already sent). Hopefully the final EA and FONSI will be issued soon. Tom Chart said the Regional Office is reviewing the razorback sucker and bonytail 5-year status reviews. With regard to sending these to Program participants before they are finalized, Tom Chart said would prefer to get the necessary approvals from Regions 2, 6, and 8 and just finalize the reviews since they contained such a reduced level of population information compared to the Colorado pikeminnow and humpback chub reviews. Tom Chart, Tom Czaplá, Rich Valdez, and Bob Muth will be meeting soon to work on the Colorado pikeminnow and humpback chub recovery goals. The Service is taking the Recovery Program’s request to reconvene the recovery team under serious consideration.
8. Consideration of Mesa County request for funding assistance for GJ Pipe Pond floodplain site weir construction – Mesa County is providing floodplain restoration at the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s “GJ Pipe Pond” floodplain site by constructing a weir between the pond and the Colorado River as part of negotiations for extension of the Colorado Riverfront Trail and Section 7 consultation for impacts to critical habitat for the rest of the trail. Mesa County is spending ~\$71K on weir construction, but engineers recently discovered that more material and machine operating time is required due to unforeseen existing substrate

conditions. The weir project will cost \$15,000 more than anticipated and Mesa County has requested funding assistance from the Recovery Program. Water Users' representative Tom Pitts, Bureau of Reclamation representative Brent Uilenberg, the Service, and the Program Director's Office recommend using Recovery Program "Section 7" funds held by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Brent Uilenberg said this is a very fair price for the material and it's a necessary request. The Section 7 account at NFWF is the most expeditious source of Program funds for this work. Tom Chart said this is actually a levee breach that will reconnect the gravel pit to the river at a specific flow rate (Tom believes the Service is using plans provided by the Recovery Program). Brent Uilenberg said the project will create conditions so that if the river exceeds a certain elevation, it will spill into the gravel pit. >Tom Chart will revise the proposal to clarify that this is a breach and also provide the connection flow information and send that to the Management and Biology committees. John Shields recommended that we include language that makes it clear that the Recovery Program will not be responsible for any future repairs; Tom Chart agreed. The Committee approved this proposal. >Angela Kantola will begin forwarding NFWF's quarterly reports to the Management Committee.

9. Review previous meeting assignments and sufficient progress action items – See Attachments 1 and 2.
10. Schedule next meeting, webinar, or conference call – The Committee scheduled a webinar for Tuesday, April 10, from 9 a.m. – 11 a.m., with review of draft elements of Service's sufficient progress memo (to be provided to the Committee in early April) the primary agenda item.
11. Park Service work on flow studies – Melissa Trammell described the background and purpose of the work that the National Park Service is doing on the Yampa and Green river systems (summary sent to Committee on March 19). John Shields suggested coordinating with Debbie Felker as NPS discusses these things with the public. Tom Chart thinks this will be a valuable synthesis as it relates to importance of spring flows. When the Committee has its next face-to-face meeting, Tom Chart suggested asking NPS to make a presentation providing more detail about this work. Melissa said the first two reports will be done fairly soon, so they will have something to present. Robert asked if they are coordinating with the CWCB/USGS sediment dynamics at Deerlodge study, and Melissa said yes. Tom Chart noted that NPS tamarisk control efforts are improving the spawning bar at Cleopatra's Couch.

ADJOURN: 1:20 p.m.

Attachment 1: Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee Webinar, March 21, 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
Robert Wigington	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:

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

Dennis Strong	Utah Division of Water Rights
Brandon Albrecht	BioWest
Harry Crockett	Colorado Parks & Wildlife
Bart Miller	Western Resource Advocates
Dan Luecke	Environmental Groups
Jana Mohrman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jerry Wilhite	Western Area Power Administration
Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation
Steve McCall	Bureau of Reclamation
Dan Crabtree	Bureau of Reclamation

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 ask how the Program might better participate in the Refuge's planning process). *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. 3/21/12: Ouray has asked to keep the current SOW status quo as their efforts are currently focused on coordinating activities on the Grand Junction Pipe parcel (trail construction and levee breach modifications), Thunder Ranch levee repair and issues related to the Lamb easement. Ouray also is doing some salt cedar removal in cooperation/association with the trail project and will continue discussions with landowners about (potential) invasive plant control down the road.*
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. 3/21/12: Clayton will be asking modelers/analysts to look at economic impact of re-operation of Flaming Gorge Dam beginning in FY2001. Tom Pitts said P.L. 106-392 recognizes power replacement costs as non-reimbursable; is that the same thing as economic costs? John Shields asked why not include the ~7 years of "study flows" preceding 2001. Clayton will do both, since Flaming Gorge was originally reoperated in water year 1991 (a separate table for 2001 and forward will be included responding specifically to the P.L. 106-392). Clayton also will include analysis to show the year in which FG was reoperated under the new EIS (2006 to present). John said he and Robert were asked about retail level yesterday; Leslie doesn't believe that can be reported since each individual utility has a different amount of hydropower in their mix. Tom Pitts suggested setting up a work group of himself, Leslie, Clayton, Robert Wigington, Angela Kantola and/or Tom Chart; Tom Pitts will send out preliminary materials. >Angela Kantola will send out a doodle request (meeting times beginning than next week).*

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. 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. *3/21/12: done.*
 - b. **John Shields** will try to arrange a meeting with just a few people (if McClintock is in town). *3/21/12: done. John Shields will draft a short summary of the meeting with Chairman McClintock.*
 - c. **Tom Pitts** will get back to Leslie regarding including power representatives in the meeting with Rep. McClintock and the water users. *3/21/12: done; meeting scheduled for April 18; important that Rep. Tipton be present.*
6. The **Program Director's office** will work with Jerry Wilhite and Clayton Palmer on FY12 work plan items which Western may help fund. *In progress.*
7. **Brent Uilenberg** will update the 5-year capital projects work plan when the FY13 budget becomes available (before the D.C. trip). *Done.*
8. 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). *Pending. 3/21/12: Julie said the Service hasn't had the opportunity to brief the Regional Director on the request to reconvene the recovery team, but >will do so and get back to the Committee.*
 - b. The **Service** (Region 6) will work out the perceived issues with Region 2. *3/21/12: This is in reference to the perceived "raising of the bar" on the humpback chub population in Grand Canyon. Tom Chart said Region 2 is working with Dexter NFH on genetics (funded through Reclamation); Dave Speas will forward a copy of the work plan to the Management Committee (done).*
9. Dan Luecke, Robert Wigington, Tom Pitts, and John Shields will discuss simpler language for the assessment under the Yampa River depletions/instream flow item in the RIPRAP with WAC members via e-mail, then provide the result to the MC (Jana will help coordinate).
10. The Program Director's office will finalize the RIPRAP when the recovery team and Yampa depletions/flow protection issues are resolved.
11. Tom Chart will revise the Grand Junction Pipe proposal to clarify that this is a breach and also provide the connection flow information and send that to the Management and Biology committees. John Shields recommended that we include language that makes it clear that the

Recovery Program will not be responsible for any future repairs; Tom Chart agreed. The Committee approved this proposal.

12. Angela Kantola will begin forwarding NFWF's quarterly reports to the Management Committee.

Attachment 2

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

March 21, 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	Draft submitted to PD's office 3/19/12. Also, 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 Subcommittee met in November to discuss revisions. I&E folks/Committee have provided 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 proposed responses to Pitts' concerns, this was discussed by the Biology Committee on March 6, 2012. By April 20, the Program Director's office will provide a revised draft for Biology Committee review.
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. An RFP for a mortality study and literature review will go out in early April . 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 2/12: 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. (Elkhead escapement component in review.)
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 early April 2012; on track to meet September 1 deadline.
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.