



Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Dated: April 2, 2013

February 7, 2013, Management Committee Webinar Draft Summary

CONVENE Webinar: 9:00 a.m.

1. Approve November 5, 2012, revised draft meeting summary – Angela Kantola sent the Committee a revised draft summary on February 5, 2013. The Committee made an additional modification to item #4; Angela posted the final summary to the listserver.
2. Draft *Basinwide Strategy* – Tom Chart e-mailed a progress report on and next steps for finalizing the Nonnative Strategy to the Management and Biology committees on November 15, 2012 and a revised draft Nonnative Strategy to these same committees on January 13, 2013. The Recovery Team met in late November and received preliminary information on downward trends in the Green River Colorado pikeminnow population, especially in the Yampa River. This and Pat Martinez’ summary of the ecological impacts of large, nonnative predators on pikeminnow really raised the Team’s concern and they concluded we can’t move forward on downlisting until we get better control of nonnative fishes. Tom Pitts convened a second meeting of the Yampa River Discussion Group on January 7 with water users (River District, UYWCD), TU, Bassmasters, Tri-State, CPW, City of Craig, City of Steamboat Springs, and Recovery Program representatives invited and in attendance. Discussion included what the Program has accomplished in the upper Yampa, what still needs to be done, and the need for increased communication with the public about the problem. Dan Birch there encouraged honoring our Yampa PBO commitment to inform the public about what’s changed and why nonnative fish have become such a hot-button issue. Tom Chart agrees, but believes we first need to reach Program consensus on the major issues (highlighted in the Strategy). How does the Program become unified on our level of commitment and resolve on this issue? Tom Pitts said he convened the Discussion Group because we’re not meeting nonnative fish control needs in Yampa and we need to determine how to provide a sportfishery compatible with endangered fish. The water users are very concerned about the potential for nonnative fish impacts to jeopardize ESA compliance for federal and non-federal water projects. If fish status declines due to failures to control nonnative fish, that jeopardizes ESA compliance for fed and non-fed water projects. Yampa basin residents have a long history of working together to solve tough issues. Results of the nonnative fish workshop and the impact of nonnative predators on downlisting/recovery has heightened water users’ concerns. They agree we need to come together and step up our efforts so that nonnative fish do not interfere with ESA compliance. Tom Pitts concluded by saying that the bottom line is we’re not winning on nonnative fish and we need to be more aggressive and control the problematic species at the source to the extent possible (John Shields concurred). Pat Martinez said the Yampa River seems to have the highest densities of nonnative predators and has experienced a chronic decline of native fishes. The Yampa also is “exporting” northern pike to other reaches (e.g., Little Snake River in Wyoming, Green River). Efforts to restore wetland habitats in these areas are being impacted because northern pike use these habitats and potentially increase. Tom Chart said controversial issues highlighted in the draft strategy include the notion of eradication, which ties in with

the notion of “black list” species. That some species don’t fit in the basin anywhere is a tough issue, but to reach our goal of recovery, we’re going to need a corollary goal of eradicating smallmouth bass and northern pike. Tom said he’d like to have this conversation with the Management Committee and the States’ fish chiefs (or higher, if the States so recommend) and he does want to hear the fish chiefs’ concerns. Other controversial issues include using must-kill policies; coordinating to send a similar message about nonnative fish and illegal introductions basinwide; and the notion of native fish conservation areas. John Shields agreed we will need the States’ fish chiefs’ buy-in and that a meeting is in order. Tom Chart said we’re returning to the need to make it clear nonnative fish are currently the greatest threat to recovery. Harry said he thinks a meeting with the fish chiefs would be a good place to start. The assumption that the states need to be convinced how bad the nonnative fish situation isn’t necessarily correct; they know where we are with this issue. The concern is with the actions in the Strategy, which weren’t modified based on comments that the States’ fish chiefs made on the first draft of the Strategy. Krissy Wilson supported what Harry said, noting they had a meeting last May wherein the States’ fish chiefs had put together comments on the first draft of the Strategy. The Program hasn’t formally responded to those comments and the current draft Strategy doesn’t address all of them. Even if the Program office responds that they considered the comments but don’t agree and describes the science behind their position, Harry said that would be a valid response. Colorado doesn’t necessarily share the opinion that things like black lists, must-kill policies, and native fish conservation areas are critical to controlling nonnative fish. In contrast, Harry said he thinks we would see a more immediate biological payoff by getting nonnative fish out of Elkhead Reservoir. Tom Chart said he wants to have the conversation about this in the context of the whole Recovery Program, not just nonnative fish management. John Shields said he thinks we need to have this conversation before we make changes to the RIPRAP; Tom Chart agreed. Tom Chart said he’d like to focus on the controversial issues highlighted in the Strategy in a meeting with the fish chiefs and the Management Committee. Tom Chart said he’s encouraged by the fact that the conversation has changed and we’re discussing things we couldn’t have two years ago. John Shields agreed, but pointed out that we are currently still failing on nonnative fish management. >Pat Martinez and Tom Chart will work with Harry, Krissy, and John/Pete to describe desired outcomes of a meeting with the fish chiefs and the Management Committee and get the meeting scheduled. Harry said he thinks everyone would readily acknowledge that we haven’t met our goals we said we’d meet in nonnative fish control and in endangered fish recovery. For the States, we need to make the clear, scientific case that if we succeed with nonnative fish control, we believe we will get to recovery.

3. Recovery plans update – Tom Chart said he came out of the Recovery Team meeting with the clear recognition that the states need to be part of the Team in light of the nonnative fish concern, and so letters of invitation are being sent to the States. Leslie asked Tom to consider inviting Western’s biologist to participate. Tom said they may consider it with humpback chub and Leslie countered that she doesn’t think Western’s interests are limited to humpback. Tom said the Service will consider the request, but is trying to keep the teams focused on the technical aspects. Clayton said Western would like the Service to consider inviting Shane Capron to join the team(s) and clarified that Kirk LaGory doesn’t represent Western. John Shields asked if there’s something the Service could share with the Management Committee related to the recovery team meeting and population status, as Tom Chart has described (e.g., related to preliminary population estimates for the Yampa River

and presentations at the nonnative fish workshop and to the Upper Colorado River Commission, etc.). >Tom Chart will provide the team summary and appropriate presentation(s) to the Committee. >Tom also will share recovery plan review schedule. Tom Chart described the two pages in the briefing book that discuss where we are with recovery. It's more of a narrative for each of the four species than in previous years and characterizes the timeframe for recovery (e.g., Colorado pikeminnow downlisted by 2018 and 2020 for the other three species, in order to be able to delist by 2023).

4. FY 13 Work Plan update – Angela Kantola said the Biology Committee and the Program Director's office reviewed and approved a number of changes to the FY13 work plan, primarily associated with nonnative fish management projects. Additional funds for FY13 came available through the reduction of Service overhead on Reclamation-funded projects (~\$177K); discontinuing project #158 (~\$100K, assessment of larval Colorado pikeminnow presence/survival in Green River backwaters under nonnative fish exclusion experiments) until review of the final report; and other minor adjustments. These funds were directed toward additional nonnative fish removal in the Yampa, White, Green, and Colorado rivers. A passive PIT array also has been funded for the Green River Canal at Tusher Wash to evaluate endangered fish entrainment before and after installation of an electric barrier. In light of the potential for sequestration of Federal funds (which could reduce the Fish & Wildlife Service FY13 contribution to the Recovery Program by up to 10%), the Program Director's office has left ~\$115K of FY13 funds unobligated for the time being. A decision will be made by May as to whether these funds are needed to compensate for sequestration, should be directed toward contingency projects, or should be carried forward to FY14. Tom Pitts said he supports this approach, as did other members of the Committee.
5. Flaming Gorge flow requests – Clayton Palmer said Reclamation hosts the FGTWG each year where the action agencies and the Service review hydrological conditions compared to the ROD/flow recommendations. The Program has opportunity to request research flows, preferably by the end of February. We've followed a process of Biology Committee and Management Committee review/approval of that request. In addition to that, Clayton said he'd like to clarify that the same process would be followed for any summer, fall, or winter flow research requests. Clayton noted that a draft letter is out for the Biology Committee's consideration that reserves a right to comment on summer base flows at a later date. Tom Chart said without a specific research request, in recent years, the Program has defaulted to the Service's request for base flows based on its interpretation of the flow recommendations in Muth, et. al (at the FGTWG). With regard to the Program's internal process, if Western and the Service had different opinions on summer base flows, then Clayton wants to be sure that's discussed at the Biology Committee, just like the spring flow request (the process hasn't been quite as formal for the rest of the year). As defined in the 2006 ROD, the membership of the FGTWG is biologists and hydrologists from the action agencies (BOR, WAPA and FWS). The Committee agreed the Program can make research requests for flows in addition to spring flows and if it does so, this will be via the same Biology Committee/Management Committee review and approval process (either in the February request or at a later date). (John Shields noted that it's almost impossible to discuss base flows in February.)
6. Proposed process for determining power replacement and other Program participant contributions – See Attachment 4 and assignment #2 in Attachment 2, and the February 6 e-

mail from John Shields. John Shields said he attempted to describe the two key questions that the Cost Subcommittee wanted to bring to the Management Committee: 1) how to address Aspinall; and 2) how to address loss of electrical capacity. Clayton summarized the Subcommittee's request and Argonne's ex-post analysis of replacement power costs at Flaming Gorge. An Aspinall analysis would be complicated by the Black Canyon water right, but an ex-post analysis of replacement power costs should still be possible (in the future, since reoperation of Aspinall only began in 2012). Clayton said Western plans to put the analysis through Argonne's peer review process and then bring it to the Management Committee. Leslie said she thinks the replacement power costs by themselves would be an incomplete story without also addressing lost electrical capacity; however, experience at Glen Canyon indicates this is a very complex and time-consuming analysis, so we need to be careful about the deadline we set (Clayton agreed, though he thinks we can get it down to a routine once we've done it the first time). Clayton thinks we can get to an estimate in time for next year's briefing book, but it will depend on other priorities (like LTEMP); >Clayton will let the Committee know if they can do that. With regard to Aspinall, Clayton said Reclamation's position is that Aspinall was not reoperated for endangered fish until 2012. Leslie said we'll need to reach agreement on underlying assumptions for the Aspinall analysis. Tom Chart said he thinks this is a worthwhile effort (noting the analysis so far has generated estimates that are considerably less than the ceiling authorized in legislation) and hopes this work will become fairly routine after we've gone through the process once.

Later in the meeting, the Committee noted >other contributions that still need to be documented: some from water users and also some from Colorado's Species Conservation Trust Fund. These need to be described in a table and provided for Management Committee review/approval before they're included in the pie chart.

7. Legislative update – John Shields said as everyone has heard, the non-federal program partners successfully sought amendment to PL 106-392 to extend the period of annual funding at current levels from FY12 to FY19. Contrary to expectations that no bills would be “hot-lined,” in the midst of its New Year's Eve “fiscal cliff” negotiations, the Senate approved H.R.6060 without amendment. Tom Pitts said this is a direct payoff of all the work Program participants have done to let Congress know how important the Program is and the strong grassroots support. The President signed the bill into law (P.L. 112-270) on January 14, 2013. The legislation requires another report to Congress at the end of FY18 and authorizes continued use of power revenues through the end of FY19. It also reduced the amount of allowed indirect cost recovery rate on funds transferred to the Service to not more than 3% and limited Federal employee travel for advocacy purposes. GPO has not yet produced the “slip copy” of the law, but John Shields will send it out as soon as it's available.
8. D.C. Trip planning – The briefing trip is scheduled for March 19-22. The Congressional staff appreciation luncheon will be from noon to one on Friday, March 22, in Room 122 of the Cannon Building. Bill Miller of Miller Ecological Consultants, who represents the Southern Ute Tribe in the San Juan program, likely will be the luncheon speaker, perhaps placing emphasis on Colorado pikeminnow. Others may be invited to the luncheon, as well (WGA, Kris Polly, etc.). John will distribute a draft trip itinerary within a few days. The President's budget will be at least a month late, which likely will mean little time to get Governors' letters of support. A block of rooms has been reserved at the Holiday Inn. Eight

people will participate in the trip and will be splitting up to talk to various delegation members in the short time available. Robert King said he's working on scheduling one meeting of the Utah delegation (John said Thursday morning would be preferable). John and Tom recommended the group try to visit OMB. Tom Chart thanked Debbie Felker for her work on the briefing book and noted the next draft should be out to the group next week.

9. Flow recommendation approval process, draft uniform review process for all Program technical reports – Tom Chart said that the Biology Committee has reviewed the draft and provided helpful revisions, as have Management Committee members. The Water Acquisition Committee reviewed the draft and had no comments. The Program Director's office will proceed to clean up the document, finalize it, and get it posted to the web within the next couple of weeks.
10. White River flow recommendations and management plan update – Jana Mohrman said the Program office is updating a draft flow recommendation, but it will not be finalized until the management plan is. A working group has been assembled to develop the Management Plan it includes representatives from Colorado, Utah, TNC, WRA, the Water Users, the Program Office, and, hopefully, the River District. Elements of the proposed work plan for the White River Management Plan (still subject to scheduling and funding) are:
 - Update draft flow recommendations – Program Office
 - Propose future water development scenarios for analysis – Work Group
 - Propose tools for scenario analysis, currently considering Colorado's State Mod, Utah's ModSim or USGS gages - Work Group
 - Develop scope of work and manage scenario analysis, supported by consultant funded by Colorado – Program Office (Colorado submitted an application for funding from the Species Conservation Trust Fund and thinks they will get some of the requested funding).
 - Review scenarios and propose management measures – Work Group
 - Formulate proposed management plan, supported by consultant funded by Colorado – Program Office
 - Review management plan – Work Group, USFWS
 - Finalize management plan/flow recommendations – Program Office shepherds review
 - Develop PBO based on management plan – USFWSTom Pitts commented that: 1) the flow recommendations seem to have been developed by The Nature Conservancy based on hydrologic analysis and greater linkages to the biology need to be made (Michelle Garrison agreed); and 2) we'll need a much broader review of the management plan, including from folks in the White River basin (e.g., the White River Roundtable). Robert Wigington suggested the River District can help us reach out to folks in the basin. Robert agreed that most of TNC's work has been to bring consistency to the hydrology in the flow recommendations and recognizes it will need to be integrated with the ecology. Jana said Matt Breen and Tildon Jones are still updating the biological portion and Tom Pitts noted we will need to determine a trigger for the PBO; it may be an agreement similar to what was done on the Yampa. The Committee can expect continued updates on this topic.
11. Capital Projects update – Brent Uilenberg shared 2012 and 2013 capital project information (below). The remaining cost ceiling is \$16.5M, which is good news. Tusher Wash costs are now estimated to be ~\$6M less than previously estimated, since an e-barrier will cost much less than a screen. Reclamation now anticipates Tusher Wash funds would be obligated in

2014, with construction occurring the following winter. 2013 capital expenditures are estimated at just under \$2.3M for the Upper Colorado program (primarily for OMID). OMID construction likely will be a 4-year effort, concluding in 2016 (or a 3-year effort concluding in 2015 if San Juan APS fish passage is changed/delayed). The Program should have the benefit of part of the OMID facilities in 2014. The OMID O&M agreement is complete except for Reclamation's signature, which will happen after the environmental assessment for the OMID canal operation project (scheduled for March). John asked about resolution of water quality issues at Ouray NFH; the Program Director's office will post an update, if any.

12. Review previous meeting assignments and sufficient progress action items – See Attachments 2 and 3.
13. Implementation Committee conference call agenda – The Implementation Committee has a conference call on March 5, 2013, 9:00 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. John Shields said Pat Tyrrell is stepping down from the Committee in an attempt to broaden the State Engineer's participation in the Program and has appointed Greg Lanning to the Committee. (Note: Noreen Walsh, the new Regional Director for the Service's Mountain-Prairie Region, is the new Committee chair.) Proposed agenda items for that conference call include:
 - a) approve September 19 meeting summary,
 - b) PDO update
 - c) update on Basinwide Strategy,
 - d) update on enactment into law of annual base funding extension legislation,
 - e) update on upcoming D.C. briefing trip,
 - f) discussion of the upcoming review/approval of RIPRAP revisions/assessment (delegate to Management Committee)
 - g) discussion of the upcoming review/approval of FY14-15 Program Guidance (delegate to Management Committee)
 - h) capital projects update
 - i) sequestration update: any impacts to Service base or Reclamation capital funding
 - j) review of 2012 sufficient progress items,
 - k) update on 2013 sufficient progress schedule and strategic communications plan,
 - l) schedule September meeting.
14. Schedule next meeting, webinar, or conference call – The Management Committee scheduled a webinar from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. on April 2 to review draft RIPRAP revisions/assessment and FY14-15 Program guidance (technical committee reviews will be complete by March 8 and Management Committee members should plan to communicate with their technical committee representatives about any concerns). The Management Committee will recommend that the Implementation Committee delegate approval of the Program Guidance and RIPRAP revisions/assessment to the Management Committee on April 2.

ADJOURN: 2:25 p.m.

Attachment 1: Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee Webinar, February 7, 2013

Management Committee Voting Members:

| | |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Brent Uilenberg | Bureau of Reclamation |
| Michelle Garrison | State of Colorado |
| Tom Pitts | Upper Basin Water Users |
| John Shields | State of Wyoming |
| Bridget Fahey | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| John Reber for Melissa Trammell | National Park Service |
| Patrick McCarthy | 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 |
| Angela Kantola | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |

Others

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Krissy Wilson | Utah Division of Wildlife Resources |
| Robert Wigington | The Nature Conservancy |
| Harry Crockett | Colorado Parks & Wildlife |
| Jana Mohrman | U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service |
| Dave Speas | Bureau of Reclamation |
| Jerry Wilhite | Western Area Power Administration |
| Beverly Heffernan | 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. 2/7/13: Tom Chart noted this also would now apply to Dave Soker. However, given the difficulty of naming federal facilities, the Committee agreed to take this off the assignment list after this meeting.*

2. ***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. For the 2012 Program Highlights, we used 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. 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 the 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 power cost levels 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. 6/26/12: Work group held conference call 4/27/12; Argonne working on power replacement costs, water users working on their additional costs, San Juan also working on their additional costs. 6/22/12: Clayton provided the group a description of how they'll conduct the economic analysis of Flaming Gorge dam reoperation. 1/24/13: Updated numbers for power replacement costs or water user contributions were not available in time for inclusion in the 2013 briefing book. The Cost Subcommittee held a call on January 9 and identified the need to outline the process for arriving at fully substantiated power replacement costs going forward. If more substantiated power replacement costs are to be included in the 2014 briefing book, the numbers will need to have been fully vetted and agreed upon by the Management Committee sub-group (and perhaps the Management Committee as a whole) and go through the peer review described by Western by mid-December 2013. Les Poch provided new runs of the power model and an assessment of the economic impact of reoperating Flaming Gorge Dam for endangered fish species for the period 2001 – 2011 and*

those were discussed with Cost Subcommittee members on January 24 and 25. 2/7/13: See agenda item #6. Clayton Palmer will think we can get to an estimate of power costs in time for Management Committee approval by mid-December 2013 (to meet the deadline for the 2014 briefing book), but it will depend on other priorities (like LTEMP); >Clayton will let the Committee know if they can meet the deadline for next year's briefing book. Other contributions which still need to be documented include those from water users and also some from the Colorado's Species Conservation Trust Fund. These need to be described in a table and provided for Management Committee review/approval before they're included in the pie chart.

3. **Brent Uilenberg and Dave Speas** will discuss the possibility of using “activities to avoid jeopardy” funds on the Elkhead screen repair completed in 2012. *Reclamation will review available funding sources when this is billed in early CY 2013 (potentially \$80K, though the bill hasn't been submitted yet). 2/7/13: Dave Speas said a number of priority projects like the Lake Powell work, as well as threats of sequestration, make this highly unlikely. Tom Chart said neither going back to the contractor or an insurance claim panned out. Shields suggested the good news on capital funds might suggest we could consider capital funds for this, since it was a construction deficiency; Brent agreed this is a possibility if no base funding remains at the end of the year.*
4. *The **Program Director's office** will finalize the basinwide strategy that Pat's been working on (the PDO will provide a more specific date - hopefully, in time to affect RIPRAP changes in 2013). *Revised document sent to Management and Biology committees on January 13, 2013. 2/7/13: See agenda item#2. Tom Chart and Pat Martinez will work with Harry, Krissy, and John/Pete to describe desired outcomes of a meeting with the fish chiefs and the Management Committee and get the meeting scheduled.*
5. **Tom Pitts and other key Committee members** will contact Reclamation to encourage them to renew the Green Mountain Reservoir Municipal Recreation Agreement expiring at the end of August. *2/7/13: Brent Uilenberg said he thinks they're still discussing the possible term (if they can't do a 5-year agreement in time for this summer, they'll do a 1-year amendment). Brent will check on the status.*
6. **Tom Chart** will distribute the recent Colorado Pikeminnow Recovery Team meeting summary to the Management Committee along with appropriate presentation(s) regarding Colorado pikeminnow status. **Tom** also will provide the recovery plan review schedule.

Attachment 3

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

February 12, 2013

| General – Upper Basin-wide | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| # | Recommended Action Items | Lead | Due Date | Status |
| 1 | The Service will make a recommendation for how to ensure that all new petroleum pipelines have emergency shutoff valves and will investigate the use of the Pipeline Integrity Management Mapping Application (PIMMA) to address existing pipelines potentially needing shutoff valves (e.g., pipelines upstream of or near critical or other important habitat). | FWS | 12/31/12 | Service may consider asking industry to assist via Section 7 consultation. 2/7/13: Tom Chart said pipeline location information is available (PIMMA), but the Section 7 process may be the best way to address the need for shutoff valves on existing pipelines (perhaps asking project proponents to address existing pipelines when they consult on new projects). Harry said one way CPW has addressed energy impacts is by commenting on BLM RMPs; is the Service or Program commenting on the RMPs? Certainly, we should be sharing comments. Tom agreed this is another avenue. John Reber said NPS has considered endangered fish and recommended shutoff valves in their comments. Tom Chart said he thinks EPA also is working on this. |
| 2 | The Program Director's office is working with the Nonnative Fish Subcommittee and signatories to the Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures to address comments on the draft <i>Upper Colorado River Basin Nonnative and Invasive Aquatic Species Prevention and Control Strategy</i> . Following "internal" review by the Recovery Program's Biology and Management committees, the Program will seek external peer review prior to accepting the <i>Strategy</i> as final. | Program | Date TBD; will go to BC earlier than previously indicated. | A subgroup of the I&E Committee will refine comments on the I&E section of the <i>Strategy</i> and then have a conference call with the Nonnative Fish Subcommittee. An update of steps leading to completion was provided to the Management and Biology committees on November 15, 2012. The Management Committee asked that the Program Director's office streamline the document somewhat and accelerate the schedule. A revised, draft Nonnative Strategy was sent to the Management and Biology Committees on January 13, 2013. A meeting will be scheduled with State fish chiefs and the Management Committee to discuss controversial issues. |
| 3 | The Service recommends that the Recovery Program carefully review the applicability of proposed screens for nonnative fish on a case-by-case basis and scrutinize screen designs, including projected operation and maintenance costs in the future. And, that the Recovery Program fully recognizes that screens are only a component of a multi-faceted nonnative fish control strategy (e.g., one that adheres to the NNF Stocking Procedures, promotes compatible sportfisheries, and prevents new nonnative fish threats). | <i>Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures</i> signatories | Ongoing | |
| 4 | Revised Integrated Stocking Plan needs to be completed. | PDO | 12/31/12 3/31/13 | Draft sent to <i>ad hoc</i> group 4/13/12; conference call held 5/9/12. Revised draft to <i>ad hoc</i> group 9/27/12; comments due Oct. 31. : The Program Director's Office will provide a revised draft by February 28, 2013. |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|---|
| 5 | The Program Director's Office will monitor results from ongoing humpback chub population estimates (Deso-Gray 2010-2011; Black Rocks and Westwater 2011-2012 and monitoring (Cataract Canyon annual CPUE; Yampa River information gathered through nonnative fish management projects). The Program Director's Office convened a panel to discuss humpback chub genetics and captivity and identify actions necessary to ensure the survival and recovery of humpback chub and an implementation plan for those actions in 2011. 200 age-0 Gila will be brought into captivity from Black Rocks/Westwater in 2012 (relates to broodstock development once fish are determined to be humpback chub). | PDO, Service, UDWR | Deso-Gray data reported annually; Black Rocks draft final report due 8/1/13; Westwater draft final report due FY13. | Results reviewed annually. Bringing age-0 <i>Gila</i> from Black Rocks into captivity was planned for fall 2012, but deferred until spring due to high mortality risk from low flow conditions. |
| Green River | | | | |
| 6 | An RFP for a 2012-2013 mortality study and literature review is anticipated in April 2012. Meanwhile, Program participants are investigating the potential for an electrical barrier at the head of the canal as one option to reduce or eliminate entrainment (and thus, "take") of fish in the canal. | Tusher Wash <i>ad hoc</i> group. | | No response to RFP; dropped. Biology Committee discussed in July and October and endorses electric barrier option, which is being pursued. |
| 7 | Red Fleet Reservoir has been recommended for reclamation (rotenone). A microchemical analysis of otoliths from both the reservoir and the river is underway to better understand the contribution of walleye to critical habitat from this potential source population. | UDWR | | Otoliths processed; draft report in review; data will be included in draft final C18/19 report due October 1, 2012 (behind schedule due to PI illness). Red Fleet very low and UDWR plans to rotenone in 2014 with funding assistance from Program. |
| Yampa River | | | | |
| 8 | CWCB is scheduled to complete accounting of past depletions using the StateCU model by the spring of 2012. The depletion accounting report will include a discussion of the need for flow protection (which would require a peak flow recommendation). The Water Acquisition Committee will continue to discuss the need for a peak flow recommendation. | CWCB, WAC | June 2012 12/31/12 | Depletion accounting for Yampa & Colorado rivers will be based on 2005 consumptive use (irrigated acreage based on satellite images and some aerial photography). CWCB is double-checking irrigated acreage, will have it verified by the Water Commissioner (hopefully by December 31, 2012), and then can run the model. 2/7/13: Michelle said the contractor began work this week on the irrigated acreage portion. |
| 9 | CSU will complete the programmatic synthesis of smallmouth bass removal efforts , providing a comprehensive evaluation of the Program's removal efforts as well as a thorough assessment of escapement from Elkhead Reservoir (draft final report due to Recovery Program 8/31/2012). The Recovery Program will review the final report on escapement from Elkhead Reservoir and determine appropriate adaptive-management response. CSU also is conducting a programmatic synthesis of northern pike removal efforts (2011-2012) to evaluate current removal efforts in the context of northern pike life history throughout the | CSU, Program, CPW | Draft final smallmouth bass synthesis report due 10/1/12 (behind schedule). | The programmatic synthesis report will consist of three parts and each will be separately peer-reviewed. Part 1, Elkhead escapement has been peer reviewed. Part 2, Population Dynamics is due October 1, 2012, and Part 3, Projection Tool, will follow shortly thereafter. The three parts will then be finalized in one document. The NNFSC continues to evaluate opportunities and priorities for applying appropriate responses to source populations. Water users are meeting with local water and sportfish interests to build on preliminary results. |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| | Yampa River drainage (draft final report due to Recovery Program 6/30/13). | | | |
| 10 | Native fish conservation areas are being evaluated as part of the draft basinwide nonnative fish strategy. Subsequently, applicability to the Yampa River will be evaluated. | Program, CPW | | See item #2 re: <i>Basinwide Strategy</i> . |
| 11 | CPW has detailed its ongoing and anticipated pike management actions throughout the drainage in its 2010 'Yampa River Basin Aquatic Wildlife Management Plan (CDOW 2010).' CPW will tabulate these activities for the Program Director's Office and, based upon Program Office feedback, will provide management objectives and actions for any waters within the drainage that CPW and the Program Office mutually agree are inadequately addressed by the 2010 Plan. | CPW | | Pending. Tabulation complete and was to go to PDO by September 30, 2012. Joint recommendations from PDO and CPW for how to address any inadequacies will be made at the NNF workshop. 2/7/13: Harry will have this completed before the March 7 Biology Committee meeting. |
| White River | | | | |
| 12 | A working draft <i>Flow Recommendations for the Endangered Fish of the White River, Colorado and Utah</i> was sent to the Biology and Water Acquisition committees and GRUWAT on July 1, 2011. Conflicting comments were received. A revised draft is expected by midsummer 2012. Work on a PBO is anticipated subsequent to report approval. | PDO | Summer 2012. 12/31/12. | Pending. Good progress is being made and TNC is providing assistance. PDO, TNC, and water users (CO and UT) met 12/10/12 to review recent hydrologic analyses, which served as a preliminary response to water users' comments on the draft flow recommendation report. Participants recommended development of a White River Management Plan (including some level of future water development + recovery actions to offset depletion effects). The Management Plan will likely entail some StateMod runs. |
| 13 | Program scheduled to begin specific effort to remove smallmouth bass in 2012. CPW will propose plans to removing bag limit for smallmouth bass (and possibly other nonnative sport fishes) in the 400 yards below Kenney Reservoir that still has limits in 2013. Recovery Program supports multi-agency effort to designate White River as native fish conservation area. | CPW, UDWR | | White River smallmouth bass removal conducted by Service & CPW; additional electric seining also conducted. CPW has prepared an issue paper on the bag limit for Commission consideration in this regulation cycle. (Regulation expected to be finalized in November and go into effect in March 2013.) |
| Colorado River | | | | |
| 14 | Recovery Program participants will consider options and opportunities for meeting flow recommendations on a more consistent basis after completion of 10,825 agreements. | Program | | All agreements are expected to be in place by December 31, 2012. Ruedi (West slope) agreement completed; Granby (East Slope) is still being negotiated. |
| 15 | The CWCB will provide the depletion accounting for 2006-2010 for the Upper Colorado River using State CU in the spring of 2012. If the amount of consumptive use, location of use, and timing of use is not the same as in the past, they would then put that information into StateMod to show how those changes affect the river. | CWCB | June 2012 | <i>See item #8.</i> |
| 16 | Completion of CFOPS Phase III should be out in draft in August | Water users | September | 2/7/13 – With the completion of 10,825, Tom Pitts can provide a |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|----------------|---------------------|---|
| | 2012 and report completion anticipated by September 30, 2012. | | November, 30, 2012. | new draft deadline next week. |
| 17 | In 2012, additional passes will be devoted in the reach of the Colorado River from Rifle to the Beavertail to remove invading northern pike. CPW will conduct a reconnaissance in floodplain & canal habitats to identify potential sources of this species. Sampling will also be conducted from Silt to Rifle to remove northern pike. | FWS, CPW | Service, CPW | Additional passes completed. A critical new ramp was constructed that improves access. CPW has been working with landowners to get permission for reconnaissance work; some underway. Work will continue in 2013. |
| Gunnison River | | | | |
| 18 | Every effort should be made to ensure that the Gunnison River remains a native fish stronghold. The topic of precluding new species introductions also will be addressed in the draft Nonnative Fish Strategy. | Program | | See item #2 re: <i>Basinwide Strategy</i> . |
| Dolores River | | | | |
| 19 | The Nonnative Fish Subcommittee will review response options and propose action item(s) to be reviewed with the Dolores River Dialogue and Lower Dolores Working Group and potentially added to the RIPRAP in 2013. | NNFSC, others. | January 2013. | CPW is implementing emergency order removing all bag and possession limits on smallmouth bass in Miramonte Reservoir and has announced plans to rotenone the reservoir in fall 2013. |

DRAFT

Determining Replacement Power Costs

Power replacement costs are recognized as a non-federal contribution in the Recovery Programs' authorizing legislation and it's important that Congress see the substantial non-Federal cost sharing in the Recovery Programs. We have estimates of power replacement costs used in the authorizing legislation, but have never tracked actual costs. In 2012, a "Cost Subcommittee" of the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program's Management Committee, along with Western Area Power Administration and Argonne began a process for determining replacement power costs¹. The goal was to agree on a fully substantiated number for inclusion in the "budget pie" in the 2013 *Program Highlights* briefing book (see the green slice of the first pie on page 18 of the [2012 briefing book](#)). However, a number of questions and issues still need to be addressed (see below); therefore, work to determine replacement power costs will continue in 2013, with the goal of arriving at an agreed-upon number (and methodology for determining future costs) by mid-December 2013 for inclusion in the 2014 briefing book. For the 2013 *Program Highlights* briefing book, we will use the 2012 figure plus an estimate of 2013 costs.

Questions/Issues to be Resolved

Hydrology concerns raised by Reclamation (apparently resolved during recent meetings; Argonne will make the re-run the model as discussed with Reclamation and re-calculate). Dan Luecke also has noted that the numbers in the draft Flaming Gorge replacement costs table don't seem to match the hydrology. Will the new runs for 2011 exclude any costs not due to endangered fish operations (e.g., operations to protect the dam and meet spring drawdown target)?

Including Aspinall – The current draft table of replacement costs only addresses Flaming Gorge. How should Aspinall be included and beginning in what year? What about the complicating factor of the Black Canyon water right? Can we determine what operations prior to the ROD would actually be attributable to ESA? Pages 4-9 to 4-11 of the Blue Book are a basis for not including Blue Mesa in the Aspinall assessment until after implementation of the ROD. Per Clayton Palmer, Reclamation's position is that Water Year 2012 was the first year in which an operation to try to meet the ESA flow recommendations was implemented. It was an extremely dry year and likely will not show a consequential impact. Clayton recommended that Argonne focus on completing the Flaming Gorge instead. Future years will require an estimate for an Aspinall power contribution to recovery.

Including "marketable capacity" analysis (CREDA). Data do exist for further evaluation of possible lost electrical capacity. The original funding bill was backed by a peer -

¹ This is an issue of replacement power costs, not of lost revenue.

reviewed study that included an estimate of capacity loss. This will require further study.

2001 “anomaly” - Western had to pay very high costs for replacement power on the market in 2001. From CREDA’s standpoint, that’s a real cost (whether or not it was an economic anomaly).

Process/Timeline

| DATE | ACTION |
|--------------------|--|
| 1/18/13 | Cost Subcommittee et al., submits comments on this draft process |
| 1/25/13 | Program Director’s office sends draft process (list of issues and timeline) to Management Committee for review |
| 2/7/13 | Management Committee reviews draft process |
| February 2013 | Process finalized. |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | Cost Subcommittee et al., reviews and approves draft replacement power costs |
| | Management Committee reviews and approves draft replacement power costs and methodology for calculating future costs. |
| | Peer review of draft replacement power costs and methodology for calculating future costs (Argonne Technical Memorandum) |
| Mid-December 2013 | Final Management Committee approval of replacement power costs and methodology for calculating future costs |
| Early January 2014 | Agreed-upon replacement power costs submitted for included in 2013 <i>Program Highlights</i> briefing book. |