

**Management Committee Webinar Summary,**

**February 17, 8:30 am - 12 pm MT,**

**Summary of a Special Session Discussion on the Recovery Program's Green River Flow  
Request, February 26, 2021, 8:00 am – 9:30am**

**CONVENED: 8:30 AM MST**

1. Introductions & requests to modify agenda—Tom Chart introduced Maria Boroja who is sitting in for Marj Nelson. Agenda was revised as reads below.
2. Program Director's Update
  - a. Federal Register updates—FWS published the proposed rule for humpback chub in January 2020. After the proposed rule comment period, FWS completed government to government consultation with the Navajo Nation in July and received their comment letter in September. Kevin then immediately submitted a draft final rule for Regional Office review; it is now with the Solicitor and other regions. Razorback sucker proposed downlisting rule is in review at HQ. With a change in administration, new leadership is reviewing outstanding packages. These are priorities for regional leadership, who are watching the progress closely. Melissa asked about where in the process the two packages are relative to each other. Tom indicated since the proposed rule for humpback chub has undergone public comment, it is about a year ahead of razorback sucker. Tom also mentioned that Colorado pikeminnow recovery planning has been initiated.
  - b. Sufficient Progress & RIPRAP—Tom Chart updated the group that Regional Director Noreen Walsh recently signed the 2019-2020 Sufficient [Progress Memo](#). The PDO has included the Gunnison and Yampa River PBOs reviews and the depletions accounting report for the 15 MR in that package. The 15 Mile Reach (15MR) PBO is also undergoing review, looking at results since the PBO was written. The review went through technical review last summer, and Don Anderson and Tom Chart have been working through comments. Tom said it would go to the Management Committee for review. The depletion accounting is complete for years 2006-2015, thanks to Colorado, and represented an important piece of this review. Tom thought the 15MR review could be included with the next Sufficient Progress, or as a standalone document. Tom Pitts asked if the 2015 PBO review was a FWS document. Tom Chart said it is produced by the Program and submitted to FWS. Tom Pitts expressed a desire to have the PBO review completed independently before the next

Sufficient Progress is due. Tom Chart agreed and said that would be our goal. Tom Chart reported that the PDO's intention is to conduct the RIPRAP review this year the same way as last, which was done by having each partner review it independently and submitting comments via email to the PDO. The PDO is assembling the RIPRAP documents, which will be sent out soon. Tom Chart encouraged Management Committee members to coordinate with their respective counterparts on the technical committees as they review the documents.

3. FY22-23 Budgets – Julie shared the spreadsheet she sent to the Biology Committee (BC) and recognized the MC's desire to be given a general summary of what the changes might look like. Julie explained the idea was to make the difficult decisions on budget cuts early in Program Guidance before having PIs write scopes of work that may need to be revised later. Julie focused on the Reclamation funding portion, which has not increased with inflation in recent years. Some of the shortfall has been covered using FWS carryover. Julie said we are not requesting approval of the workplan, which is still in development. Final approval will occur in July, as has happened in the past, once scopes of work are received. Tom Pitts asked about funding security for FY2022-23. Kathy Callister said they are going through the appropriations process, but the President's budget release (typically occurs in February) has been delayed with the change in administration. The Dingell Act allows for appropriations through FY2023. Julie indicated the numbers in the proposed budget table came from discussions conducted at 4 meetings with the BC. The general approach includes maintaining budgets without inflation increases and strategic cuts recommended by the PDO and ultimately agreed to by the BC. There are comments in each cell where changes are explained. Some SOWs require inflation based on contracts, and that is indicated where applicable. Blue = substantial changes proposed from original 2022 estimated budgets. Dark Green = inflation allowed. Julie reiterated that work planning continues to be a difficult process, and we tried to apply cuts as strategically as possible. Tom Pitts asked if this table included capital funding. Julie explained it does not. Jojo asked if there was a good summary describing the percentage cuts from each element. Julie said that could be done, and suggested using the column labeled "2021 original recommendation" as the basis for determining cuts. >Jojo requested such a summary (pasted below and distributed in the workplan table). Jojo asked how the survey results data went into this proposal. Julie said the survey was an attempt to get BC input, but turned out to be less informative than hoped. The questions were probably not explicit enough to solicit the input needed, and results were spread broadly without clear agreement. Tom Pitts asked if Julie could subtotal the costs for each element. >Julie will include those subtotals and distribute to the group.

Element	Sum of FY2021 Original Recommendation	Sum of FY2022 Program Guidance	Sum of FY2023 Program Guidance
MON	\$ 2,024,705.67	\$ 1,800,445.03	\$ 1,732,261.20
HAB	\$ 603,890.16	\$ 621,506.83	\$ 596,842.83
I&E	\$ 69,538.21	\$ 69,538.21	\$ 69,538.21
ISF	\$ 697,581.56	\$ 666,661.06	\$ 679,907.55
NNF	\$ 1,937,359.06	\$ 1,765,241.92	\$ 1,765,241.92
PRM	\$ 1,559,269.19	\$ 1,596,411.71	\$ 1,596,411.71
PRP	\$ 1,625,896.49	\$ 1,612,324.49	\$ 1,612,324.49
(blank)			
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>\$ 8,518,240.34</b>	<b>\$ 8,132,129.25</b>	<b>\$ 8,052,527.91</b>

	FY21	FY22	FY23
MON	100%	89%	86%
HAB	100%	103%	99%
I&E	100%	100%	100%
ISF	100%	96%	97%
NNF	100%	91%	91%
PRM	100%	102%	102%
PRP	100%	99%	99%

4. Post-2023 Workshop – Tom Chart recognized that the last year has posed challenges to finding a Post-2023 path forward. The IC expressed a desire to finalize a proposed solution soon at their meeting in January. After previous MC meetings ([September 2019](#), page 10) and input, the Program came to a proposed \$9.7M estimate (that became \$10.7M when adding Program Management) to use as a working estimate. Subsequent deliberations have focused on this number. The PDO most recently worked to develop proposed programs around reduced costs (\$9.7M and \$8.7M). The PDO did not make any determinations on Sufficient Progress under these reduced programs, since the threats and assessments of those change over time as new information and developments emerge.
  - a. Annual and Capital budget options and consequences – Julie gave some background on the document distributed to the committee. The PDO thought about what might be lost as the program decreases from \$10.7M to lower levels. Each coordinator made those reductions within their respective program elements and identified what the results might look like. Julie cautioned that exact funding amounts for each element or project are difficult to predict since the program has been adapting to emerging threats since its inception. The instream flow current budget is ~\$700k, and increased

to over \$1M with the suggested Post-2023 actions, based on the high priority given to this element. Habitat is currently at ~\$600k, increasing to almost \$1M with the Post-2023 selections. Propagation is currently ~\$1.7M, and it increased ~25% going to Post-2023. It is difficult to make cuts to this element since it funds hatchery facilities that require a certain amount just to operate regardless of production. Julie indicated that there are additional propagation needs coming in the future, and we have been working to address those without constructing an entirely new facility. Nonnative fish management is ~\$1.8M currently and increased ~40% moving towards Post-2023. Information and education had some large increases in the Post-2023 estimates, and we attempted to preserve those in this exercise. Monitoring did not increase much in the Post-2023 estimates, and did not change much in this exercise. Research was identified as a standalone area in the Post-2023 recommendations, which is exciting, since we don't currently conduct much true research. Julie stressed that this exercise is intended to support the funding discussions and provide context. Tom Pitts appreciated the effort and thanked the PDO staff. He felt it is most productive to focus on funding strategies rather than the details of this exercise. Steve Wolff questioned the level of agreement and support for a \$10.7M program, and asked the MC for their input on what the number should be. Melissa Trammell pointed out that the recent polling using Menti indicated support for this amount, and in some cases higher levels. Jojo questioned the decisions made in determining where cuts would be made to reach the \$8.7M and \$9.7M programs, based on the Post-2023 selection tool and priorities indicated from that exercise. Leslie James said she spent a lot of time with colleagues in filling out the original selection tool to come up with their recommendation. She would currently support something closer to the \$8.7M level. Todd Adams reiterated comments from the other committee members. Tom Chart felt like the funding group had been requesting a lower amount, but then the Menti results were surprising because they indicated some strong support for a larger program, as Melissa recognized. Patrick McCarthy echoed Melissa's sentiments, and cautioned we should not underestimate what could be needed to maintain and continue progress to date. He recognized the input given from the technical committees and the need to address feasibility. Tom Chart proposed we come to agreement in one arena, whether it is funding amounts or strategies, and work on the other aspects from there. He suggested focusing on hydropower funding. Tom Pitts was reluctant to identify a total funding amount at this point until we can agree on amounts each entity can commit. He recommended we discuss the capital/annual funding mix, and separate each for conversations. The group clarified the previously identified amounts and exercises are primarily considering the annual funding. Dave Speas asked whether the funding amounts in the PDO summary identified funding sources and the mix of those. Tom Chart indicated it did not, since that discussion is ongoing.

- b. Funding strategies--Tom Chart shared the Menti polling results specific to the hydropower questions. There was relatively large support to consider hydropower revenues as a nonfederal contribution. Shane Capron said WAPA is viewing those as federal funds currently. Leslie James said there are implications depending on how those funds are characterized. Tom Chart asked for clarification on whether the \$12.5M sustainable Basin Fund hydropower amount was based on identifying them as constructive returns. Shane confirmed that and raised concerns about costs associated with implementing the GREAT recommendations. All of the experiments in the upper and lower basins have impacts to the Basin Fund and influence the available hydropower funds. Steve Wolff stressed the need to come to agreement on the mix of hydropower revenues versus appropriations in light of all the information we have received. Tom Chart pointed out that the funding mix could influence the term of the Programs' reauthorizations. Tom Pitts expressed concern about the reliability of hydropower revenues given the recent hydrology analysis. Tom Pitts also expressed a need to find annual funding from other sources regardless of the hydropower amounts, and previous suggestions that we should not rely on additional appropriations. Michelle Garrison said the funding group has always operated under the assumption that hydropower revenues would decline over time. Kathy Callister predicted there is a low probability of increased appropriations, and appropriations are also not entirely "reliable" given Congressional debate and the frequency of continuing resolutions. She felt this would require prioritization of where funds should go in a continuing resolution situation. Shane clarified the \$12.5M is sustainable over the next 10 years despite fluctuations in the Basin Fund, and WAPA would review that amount every 5 years. Steve asked if WAPA does a risk assessment of instituting a cost recovery charge. Shane said they do, and they are currently updating those analyses. He also explained prices have been fluctuating quite a bit recently. Leslie added that other power customers are already indicating shortages for this summer, and they are buying power, driving up demand and prices. Tom Chart indicated the two upper basin programs are currently receiving a total of \$8.4M, and asked if these programs reduced their funding request from hydropower, could a lower amount be sustained over a longer period. Shane thought the decisions for how to split hydropower revenue likely depends on USBR. WAPA could try to estimate funding amounts that might be sustainable over a longer term. Steve Wolff asked about balancing reduced hydropower revenues with the difficulty in obtaining new appropriations. Kathy Callister thought the current Dingell Act authorization helped in considering current funding levels as an existing appropriation. Tom Chart asked Kathy about how the programs might be prioritized within Reclamation's budgets in the face of possible reduced appropriation amounts. Tom Pitts pointed out this has not been an issue for annual funding (which has mostly been hydropower), but that capital amounts have been reliable in the past. He expressed concerns in

increasing the appropriations request for annual funding. Steve Wolff expressed a need to answer questions related to duration of sustainable funding and reliability of all funding sources. Tom Pitts suggested both Programs request some proportion of the available hydropower revenues (e.g., \$5.5M would be commensurate with the current distribution of these funds). This would amount to approximately \$3.7M in hydropower funds for the Upper Colorado Program and about \$1.8M for the San Juan Program. Even at this level of hydropower contributions that would result in a shortfall of approximately \$3M at current funding levels and much more at projected Post 2023 program costs. The San Juan Program would likely experience a more severe reduction from this proposal, since the majority of their funding comes from hydropower. Julie asked if there was any realistic solution without additional appropriations. Steve thought not. Tom Pitts does not rule it out, but we would need a solid proposal with cost sharing included before requesting such an increase. Leslie agreed with Tom Pitts. Tom continued that the amount would need to be identified in the authorizing legislation, which would increase the likelihood that it would be requested as an annual appropriation. Steve mentioned that determining which agency requests the appropriations is important as well. FWS currently receives appropriations to support some activities, and that is likely to continue. Melissa indicated NPS was pursuing some amount of appropriations, but that amount would not be enough to cover the gap. Leslie stressed the need to come to some agreement on much of this as the group works on the reauthorization and extending the report to congress. Julie tried to summarize the discussion into two options: 1) rely primarily on USBR funding, starting with the current \$10M in Dingell, with perhaps \$2.5M from WAPA or 2) asking for more of the hydropower revenues and seeking a reduced appropriation to cover the remainder. Jojo didn't see the differences between those options as that clear because they both rely on hydropower funds. Melissa asked if anyone has approached the AMP about the hydropower split. Steve indicated those discussions are ongoing within the AMP budget group. Tom Chart added that FWS indicated to Reclamation that all the programs needed to be involved in the decision on how to split hydropower funds. Tom Pitts felt we need to use WAPA's timeline commitment as the basis for these agreements. Steve pointed out that assumes we rely on hydropower revenues. Tom Pitts asked if there was agreement on whether hydropower is part of the Post-2023 mix. Brent thought the characterization of whether hydropower is federal or not affects their utility, especially as it relates to cost sharing. Tom Chart asked if WAPA and Reclamation need to report back to the group with whether a longer term amount can be identified and the distribution between programs. Kathy said any such request would need to come in writing. She added Reclamation is open to discussing other proposals. Shane said he could bring the question to his agency. Julie pointed out it is difficult to ask for specific information from any agency without more detail on amounts, sources, and timelines.

Tom Chart agreed. Tom Pitts thought the group had previously agreed on the following: the two upper basin programs would request \$5.5M in hydropower funds, and the states are contributing to annual funding only in the Upper Colorado Program. Julie asked if the committee can agree on the \$5.5M hydropower request for 9 years upon which to build. Patrick asked if that was \$5.5M annually from the \$12.5M in hydropower revenues. The \$5.5M would cover both the Upper Colorado and San Juan programs. Jojo said this discussion underlines the interrelated nature of these pieces. She thought we need to confirm that the AMP and San Juan program are on board with this idea before moving forward. Todd Adams agreed and continued that even with the baseline Julie described, we still need to identify the overall amount and the gap we are trying to fill. Tom Chart said if we are asking for some portion of hydropower revenues we should communicate that as a program request to Reclamation soon. He asked if there was any disagreement in the MC about requesting \$5.5M for the upper basin programs. Some partners agreed that should be our working request; no one opposed. Steve thought any appropriation request to cover the hydropower shortage would be a single request to cover the AMP and the upper basin programs. Tom Pitts said that the programs need to bring a full funding proposal covering all sources with any request for hydropower revenues. Brent explained assuming \$5.5M split according to current percentages, the UCRP would receive \$3.67M. Next, adding state and FWS funds, assuming a \$10.7M program, there remains a \$5.1M gap (with an \$8.7M program there is a \$3.1M gap) needed to be filled by other sources, including Reclamation appropriations. Brent feels a discussion using these anchor points and real numbers would be helpful. Tom Pitts said we need to include the San Juan Program in this. They both pointed out a need to address capital funding as well. Tom Pitts suggested the group bring these estimates to the partners and see who is willing to contribute and to what amount. Tom Chart thought we would need to confirm with Reclamation that the programs can rely on a hydropower amount identified by the partners. Kathy was concerned because Reclamation is already working on the FY23 and FY24 budgets. Julie asked how we move this forward in a productive manner. Melissa said the NPS proposed appropriation would be \$1.8M, if approved. >Tom Pitts suggested Tom Chart, Steve, and Brent put together the table of funding amounts for MC consideration, in the next week. Colleen asked if this would just cover the Upper Colorado Program. Tom Pitts and Steve thought it would need to include the San Juan Program. Tom asked if something could be assembled as a proposal for the CC to consider. Melissa Mata will work with the others on this.

5. Green River flow request—Tom said he would work through the comments and send it to the group. He asked if WAPA would consider a post-hoc economic analysis of the cost of the smallmouth bass flow spike experiment. Shane said they would like their estimate

(provided in their comments) included in this year's letter, and said this is done in other experiment request documentation for Glen Canyon experiments. Leslie James agreed. Tom Chart apologized for running short on time to discuss. He committed to sending a revised flow request letter that responds to comments received and a doc that summarizes the PDO's responses to comments [done 2/18/21]. The MC requested a follow up discussion that was later scheduled for 2/26/21.

February 26, 2021 – MC Teams call 8:00am – 9:30am:

Attendees: Steve Wolff, Kathy Callister, Ryan Christianson, Jojo La, Leslie James, Chris Keleher, Todd Adams, Melissa Trammell, Michelle Garrison, Shane Capron, Patrick McCarthy (joined for the final few minutes). Others – Dr. Kevin Bestgen, Tom Chart, Tildon Jones, Julie Stahl, Kevin McAbee, Derek Fryer, Don Anderson, David Speas.

Tom reviewed the general content of the flow request letter focusing on a flow-spike rather than larval triggered spring flows should hydrology remain drier than average. Tom noted many comments were received regarding the original text about the priorities, so the PDO added additional language to clarify the intent. Tom thanked the MC for the reviews that have been submitted and noted that most editorial suggestions were accepted in the current draft. Steve Wolff asked if the MC would approve on this call or by the end of the day. Tom recommended working through the document as a group, the PDO will finalize the text and get it out within a few hours requesting approval by email by end of day.

Tom reviewed changes submitted by Leslie referencing resources and the adaptive management component of this letter.

Tom was interested in focusing on the paragraph including WAPA's estimate of the cost implications of the flow spike experiment. Steve asked if there was any flexibility to move water around between different seasons. Derek noted that it seems like with the additional snow, there may be some flexibility that could change the implications of the flow spike. Tom asked what spring release volumes WAPA used to conduct the cost analysis. Derek said those conversations could be had at the FGTWG meetings. Tom said the language in the letter recognizes some of Reclamation's Record of Decision flexibility in the spring operation and goes as far to encourage FWS to support a trade between spring and summer operations to assist in the recovery of the fish based on current information. Derek suggested that adding greater clarity on that tradeoff in the letter would be helpful. Tom said that more specificity could be added. Tom asked about the cost estimate included as well and asked if adding flexibility around seasonality would affect the cost estimate provided in the letter. Derek said it was absolutely possible and that operating at one lower hydrologic category during the spring would change the experiment from a cost to a benefit, so decisions around spring flows matter. Leslie asked when the FGTWG would meet and when the Flaming Gorge Workgroup will meet. Derek said the

FGTWG has a kick off meeting on March 3. Leslie said if spring flows are going to be affected, those decisions need to be made soon. Leslie supported Ryan's comments on this section. Melissa Trammell said if the flow-spike takes about 30,000 ac-ft of water, it could be spread out over a longer period of time, not just in spring or just in summer; the basis for WAPA's cost estimate. She asked for clarification from Derek about the cost/benefit switch. Derek said preliminary conversations do indicate that financial savings were possible depending on how decisions are made. Jojo La said the cost of nonnative fish management has been very large in our annual budgets, which is causing her to try to reconcile the cost estimates presented in this memo. Jojo asked if it was appropriate to add the annual mechanical removal cost of nonnative fish in the Green River. Kevin said \$1.5-\$2M is spent on nonnative fish management across the basin.

Todd noted that HCR 1 passed both houses and has been signed by the Governor, he noted the importance of including that in future discussions with the FGTWG.

Tom re-iterated that there is a lot of uncertainty about how flows will play out over the next few months and with recognition that WAPA just told us the experiments could actually result in an economic benefit. He asked if WAPA would consider a post-hoc analysis to be reported next year. Shane said WAPA would prefer to leave it in based on the model that was produced. The flows in the model were taken out of July, August and September and noted there were not a lot of options of where to take the water from. WAPA said the estimate is based on current pricing and that pricing may go up over time. Shane said cost estimates are provided to the GCDAMP when they are making their decisions. Steve asked if this was a potential maximum or if it could be higher. Shane said it is an estimate, with higher risk on the higher side. Shane said they also modeled taking water from the spring peak, which had financial benefits, but they have not heard that Reclamation will support that. Tildon asked if Reclamation or WAPA could tell us what the assumptions were in regards to spring peak implementation in those models. Derek said 'Moderately-Dry' would make a power plant release of 7-days. Tildon said the Muth *et al.* recommendations would recommend 8300 cfs for a week to meet the flow targets. Tildon suggested that those durations at that flow level may not require full power plant releases. Derek said there was a lot of uncertainty around what was required under Muth *et al.* for minimum flow volumes in Reach 1. Derek said operating in the spring under Dry conditions would allow for quite a bit of flexibility. Tom committed to clarifying text later in the document to make the request more clear. Tom noted that spring operations are important, and noted the Service has demonstrated flexibility with respect to the larval triggered operations. Tom expects the same flexibility is available under the ROD to implement the experiments as they are prioritized by the Program. Derek agreed that having those conversations in the FGTWG is important. Melissa asked if there was any possibility to use storage for the flow-spike. Ryan wasn't sure but agreed to investigate. He noted that to date, Reclamation has been operating to balance flows at the end of the year. Leslie asked if the assessment occurred before or after the storms that occurred in recent weeks. Shane said it was from before the storms. Leslie asked if Flaming Gorge management would be affected by experiments at Glen Canyon. Shane said he didn't think Glen

Canyon experiments would affect Flaming Gorge with the possible exception of bug flows which may cause some complications. Shane noted that dry weather conditions were impacting the options on the table.

Tom noted Derek's concern regarding the study plan around the flow-spike which recommended using the coldest water possible for the flow-spike. Dave Speas said there is a procedure that Reclamation has to go through to use the selective withdrawal structure. Dave said the FGTWG will have to work through this issue in coming months. Dave noted a cold flow spike could be bad for smallmouth bass, but it could also be bad for native species. Melissa raised the concept of cool water rather than cold water. Kevin Bestgen said no matter what selective withdrawal option was used, a flow spike will result in river cooling by at least a few degrees just because of the increasing flow levels and the shorter transit times. Tom believed it was important to put 'cooler' but potentially not 'coldest' in the flow request letter. Dave Speas provided some draft language via chat that was later included in the final request. Melissa asked if hydropower receives a benefit from meeting elevated baseflows. Shane agreed that they likely benefit from faster ramp down rates and higher base flows, which is why WAPA has been asking for a comprehensive analysis around hydrology. Shane said it is particularly challenging in 'Moderately-dry' to 'Dry' conditions. He noted the model assumes the +40% in base flows, i.e. those operations are included in their modeling baseline. Flexibility has been incorporated in some way since 2008, but in 2016, revised base flows used seasonal flexibility. Tildon said asking for the full +40% has not been used consistently. Melissa said the reductions would be impacted by the Yampa River. Shane said the model had conflicting values which resulted in many assumptions about how to implement these flows. Shane asked if the experiment was going to occur in June or July as he was expecting it to occur in June. Tom said in the letter we consistently protect a window of 'mid-June to early July' and the importance that this experiment is biologically triggered.

Tom checked with the MC on deletion of the final full paragraph in the letter, which referenced the hydropower impact analysis and the effect of the experiments on Lake Powell elevations. The MC agreed to deletion of that paragraph.

WAPA noted they will abstain from voting on this letter, but they did not want to block consensus on it. Steve asked for feedback on WAPA's support for the request as the discussions in the FGTWG play out. Leslie will abstain as well.

Tom asked Derek to provide an update on the hydropower analysis. Derek said they have the numbers from Reclamation and are working through variable scenarios. WAPA needs to contract with Argonne National Labs to complete the analysis. He expected that a draft will be available in August. Tom recognized that there is a cost associated with implementing these experiments, but there is also a cost to recovery in not doing them. Tom said once the draft impact analysis is available, the PDO will work to present that back to the Management Committee.

Tom will circle back with Tom Pitts, Patrick McCarthy and Maria Boroja (acting Service representative). Melissa approved the flow spike and noted its importance, especially in a year of

dry hydrology. Dave Speas said that based on literature he suspects these flow-spike experiments will have a high likelihood of success at having an ecological benefit and noted their importance in the basin.

Leslie thanked Tom for his willingness to incorporate everyone's comments. Tom appreciated everyone's attention to this letter. All MC members [w/ exception of CREDA and WAPA abstained] approved the revised draft letter as final by close of business on February 26, 2021. The final Recovery Program 2021 Green River Flow Request was transmitted electronically to Regional Director Wayne Pullan and others later that same day.

6. Utah HCR 1--Todd Adams indicated Utah HCR 1 has passed the floor vote in the Utah House and also passed the Senate committee vote, and it looks likely to pass the Senate floor vote. Utah Department of Natural Resources continues to work with Rep. Chew and the various stakeholders to address the concerns in the resolution.

**ADJOURNED: 12:05 p.m.**

#### **Approvals outside of meeting time: Starvation VE and Red Fleet additional payments**

**On Friday, February 26<sup>th</sup>, Ryan Christianson sent an email proposal to the MC, which was approved.**

The Red Fleet fish screen did not perform as designed when tested after construction last year at rare, higher flow rates. The engineering contractor (Franson) recommended some changes and Reclamation's Force Account has provided a cost estimate (attached) for those modifications. The cost estimate is for \$96,000, but Ryan requested approval to fund these modifications for up to \$120,000 to account for administration and any unforeseen costs. With the lower than expected contract cost for the Ridgway screen, funding is available in this years budget for this modification.

Reclamation's Force Account can perform this work starting April 13<sup>th</sup>.

**On Tuesday, January 26<sup>th</sup>, Ryan Christianson sent an email proposal to the MC, which was approved.**

A Value Engineering (VE) study is being considered to evaluate design options for a fish screen at Starvation Reservoir. The cost is estimated to be \$25-30k to conduct the study. Ryan asked for approval of up to \$40k of capital funds (Reclamation appropriations), to account for any slight overruns, additional approval won't be necessary.

## **Attachment 1: Meeting Attendees**

### **In Attendance:**

Steve Wolff, chair	State of Wyoming
Todd Adams	State of Utah
Michelle Garrison	State of Colorado
Jojo La	State of Colorado
Tom Pitts	Water Users
Patrick McCarthy	The Nature Conservancy
Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Assoc.
Shane Capron	Western Area Power Administration
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
Ryan Christianson	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Kathy Callister	Bureau of Reclamation
Maria Boroja (Acting for Marj Nelson)	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Chart (non-voting)	Program Director, Upper Colorado Program

### **Upper Colorado Program Office Staff:**

Kevin McAbee	Nonnative Fish Coordinator
Julie Stahl	Deputy Director
Don Anderson	Instream Flow Coordinator
Melanie Fischer	I&E Coordinator
Tildon Jones	Habitat Coordinator

### **Interested Parties:**

Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation
Derek Fryer	Western Area Power Administration
Chris Keleher	State of Utah

Colleen Cunningham

Bart Leeflang

Katie Duncan

Brent Uilenburg

Ed Warner

Melissa Mata

Greg Johnson

Paul Badame

State of New Mexico

Central Utah Water

Colorado AG's office

Bureau of Reclamation, retired

Bureau of Reclamation

San Juan Program

State of Colorado

State of Utah