

**Management Committee Webinar Summary
April 19th, 12:30 am – 4:30 pm & April 20th, 9:00 – 12:30 (MST)**

CONVENE: April 19 - 12:30 PM

1. **Introductions & requests to modify agenda** – Paul Badame ran through the attendance list (Attachment 1) and welcomed all participants. The day 2 agenda was modified to allow for a couple of committee members to leave early on the 20th.
2. **Preliminary Hydrology Picture for 2022** – David Graf presented the hydrologic picture for 2022. Conditions are better than 2021 but most of the basin is still in severe or extreme drought. Water year 2022 has below average snow water equivalent. The last three years have had little spring moisture and little monsoonal moisture, which has contributed to current drought conditions. Precipitation is forecast to be below average along with above average temperature conditions in May, June, and July. April water supply forecasts from around the basin are all below average, with about 2/3 of average/median runoff conditions. David reviewed the current plan for management within the 15-MR, with water likely to be available from Green Mountain, Ruedi, Granby, and Wolford. Colorado Water Trust (CWT) has leasing options of up to 5000 AF. Historic User Pool (HUP) calls are currently ongoing to discuss the development of an April Hole. Releases of 1022 AF of carryover water began about 4/15. Another release may be needed before the end of April. In the Yampa River, David anticipates struggling to meet the 93 cfs all summer; CWT and the Colorado River District are both looking at funding additional Elkhead releases. Conditions on the lower White are also expected to be about 70% of avg. The Gunnison River has moved into a Moderately Dry hydrologic year type from Average Dry that was forecast earlier this year. Under the Moderately Dry hydrologic year type and drought rules, the peak target at Whitewater is set at 5000 cfs. The operational forecast projects an observed peak of 5700 cfs.
3. **RIPRAP Text Review** – Julie Stahl explained a revised process to review both the text and tables of the RIPRAP to improve discussion and allow more focus on the issues and planning. Julie also provided the committee an example of a trimmed down version of the RIPRAP text for consideration in the development of next year's document.
 - a. The Nature Conservancy (TNC)/Western Resource Advocates (WRA) suggestion for periodic review of flow recommendations was the first topic opened for in-depth discussions. Julie viewed the reassessment as being based on two parts: evolving biological needs and information versus assessing how well we are meeting current recommendations. Edalin Koziol said that TNC/WRA's comments first pertained to the science and ability to follow new information and second assessing the impacts of climate change and shifting hydrology in the basin. They felt that hydrologic conditions need to be used as the basis for assessment of flow recommendations and then tied back into the existing biological science. Michelle Garrison mentioned that the 15-MR PBO had the opportunity to include some of those factors in reevaluating that flow recommendation. The Committee agreed that the Water Acquisition Committee (WAC) is an appropriate place to begin reevaluation of flow recommendations. Time and personnel capacity may limit our ability to reevaluate more than one or two basin's recommendations at a time. Melissa Trammell said that

both a retrospective assessment of meeting recommendations as well as the biological responses would be good and supported the WAC taking the first shot. David Graf said that Ecological Services has laid out a schedule for the review of the Colorado and 15-mile reach recommendations and the WAC is set to start that soon. They will look at both the supply side as well as the biological. Dave Speas commented that the Biology Committee (BC) should be part of periodic reviews and Chris Keleher said he thought it would be good if the BC helped set up a prioritized list of recommendations to be reviewed.

- b. Julie Stahli reviewed an example shortened RIPRAP text “module” that covered the Restore and Protect Habitat section (2.2) for the Green River. The primary goal was creating something that would lend itself to a productive conversation and that avoids reviewing too many extraneous details. Julie asked the group for comments on their use of the RIPRAP text and desired purpose. Chris Keleher said that he has struggled with the historic RIPRAP text and felt that this revision would be helpful and lead to a better discussion. Ryan Christianson said he had similar issues and that he currently doesn’t really utilize the text version, instead he does a brief review of the tables. Melissa Trammell liked that this new version focused on the future versus the historical recounting. Marj Nelson asked if the historical info could live in an appendix. Julie noted that there are several options for how and where to maintain the historical portion of the existing RIPRAP text and emphasized that older versions of the RIPRAP will always be available. The committee supported continuing with the new version for the 2023 RIPRAP. >**The PDO** will continue working from the Julie’s Green River Habitat section as a general template.

Break

4. **Flaming Gorge Updates** – Julie Stahli and Chris Keleher thanked all the partners for the work that has gone into the DROA (Drought Response Operations Agreement) conversations over the last six months.
 - a. **Tentative Operation Plan 2022 from FGTWG (Flaming Gorge Technical Working Group) and FGWG (Flaming Gorge Working Group)** – Tildon Jones explained that we will likely be in a ‘Moderately Dry’ category for both Flaming Gorge and the Yampa River. Under those conditions, our priorities for experiments were a smallmouth bass flow spike, then Colorado pikeminnow baseflows, and then LTSP flows. Tildon showed a graph provided by Reclamation comparing both without DROA flows and with DROA flows, which puts additional water into the spring peak, a flow spike and then elevated baseflows for Colorado pikeminnow that extend from summer through the winter.
DROA update – Michelle Garrison said the drafting team is continuing to work on the final DROA plan. The draft plan should be posted by 4/20 for review by partners and the public. The Upper Basin States will meet on Thursday or Friday (4/21 or 22) to approve the plan and then the plan will go to the Secretary for approval in the following week. The goal is to have approval by early May to support releases from Flaming Gorge (FG). The FGTWG noted that only two of the experiments would have been likely without DROA (a spring peak and a flow spike). Michelle called attention to the baseflows which extend through the winter and into 2023 to move a total of 500,000 AF down to Lake Powell. The lower basin states thought that more

water would have been moved more quickly (e.g., by Sept or Dec 2022). Michelle sees benefit for WAPA in these elevated base flows but acknowledged that the impacts to WAPA have been substantial. She encouraged everyone to look for the plan to be released by Reclamation. Chris Keleher asked about the futility clause in DROA. According to the DROA, operations are assessed as effective or futile based on whether, and to what extent, the Drought Response Operation (DRO) will reduce the risk of Lake Powell falling below the Target Elevation during the next 12-month period, as projected by the most recent 24-Month Study. Michelle said in short, if the gap at Powell is too big to fill, then releases from upper basin reservoirs are not considered. Garrison further explained that any releases from the upper basin reservoirs should be considered in conjunction with altering release timing at Glen Canyon Dam (GCD). Michelle noted many discussions occurred about whether increased FG releases alone could change the probability of Lake Powell falling below the Target Elevation; it was only deemed 'not futile' when combined with reducing the release out of Powell by 500 KAF. These combined efforts significantly decreased the probability of Powell falling below the Target Elevation.

Leslie James mentioned the effects of supply chains in the system that are preventing development of solar power across the west, which is impacting replacement power availability this summer. Keeping electricity flowing this summer is a concern for power producers. In addition, the CRSP rate was increased, and rate design was changed substantially, putting the risk and obligation for replacement generation not available from the CRSP units on to the CRSP customers, including 54 tribes whose benefit from the federal power resource is declining significantly.

Shane encouraged rereading the ROD which describes the intent to meet flow objectives, but where possible to minimize those peak flows for hydropower, which applies to the ranges described for the moderately dry category for Table 2 in the Larval Trigger Study Plan (LTSP). Melissa Trammell said that table was derived to show under what flow conditions different wetlands would connect, not to cap the flows. Melissa also noted that we don't know what will be needed based on the Yampa River flows and that bypass was also considered in the next hydrologic category. Shane disagreed that the intent of table 2 of the LTSP was only to identify wetlands that would be targeted, but that they were also explicitly described for hydrologic category which was an important factor to WAPA regarding impacts to hydropower during those lower flow years.

5. **Approval to purchase additional Elkhead water** – David Graf reviewed the proposal to spend NFWF funds to purchase Elkhead water to enhance the flows in the Yampa River. Based on the hydrologic conditions, he is requesting that the MC approve up to \$76,400 to purchase 2,000 AF of additional water if needed in 2022 to support baseflows. David also stated that we are only invoiced for water used and that will be accounted for at the end of the water year. Tom Pitts approved the purchase by email. The MC approved the purchase from NFWF funds.
6. **RIPRAP Table Review – Green, Yampa, Duchesne, and White River Tabs** – Julie Stahli reviewed the tables and noted current comments and responses from the Program

Director's Office (PDO) remain in this version for the committee's review. After the MC review process and acceptance, the PDO will delete column F (FY21) and replace column K with column L to create the 2023 RIPRAP. Edalin asked about "in-progress" status of rows 32-36 developing models to analyze the historic and future scenarios in the Green River tab. They had no specific issue but wanted more details on the status, >**Chris Keleher** said he would confer with folks in Utah to get that information. Edalin made the same comment for row 49 of the Green River tab. Julie reviewed some of the (! marked) accomplishments within the GR tab like the LTSP flows and implementation of the bass flow spike. Kevin McAbee highlighted the success of the bass spike flow by comparing the 2021 smallmouth bass capture rates to those from a similarly dry year in which we saw record high bass capture rates. Edalin Coziol asked about Yampa rows 5, 12, and 20, what are the timelines for revisiting these flow management documents? Julie noted the "ongoing" status for revising flow regimes in the Yampa is currently there as a reminder and is scheduled to be revisited in 2026.

7. **Aspinall Update** – David reviewed some of the proposals put forth for DROA flows out of Aspinall. Reclamation considered a few options that were possible within the Aspinall ROD. The DROA releases considered were approximately 50 KAF. Michelle said the current plan calls for no DROA releases from Aspinall at this time; that decision may be reconsidered in September. Blue Mesa Reservoir is currently at 25% capacity and does not have enough storage to contribute to the DROA process. Inflows at Blue Mesa this year will determine whether future DROA releases are considered.
8. **RIPRAP Table Review – Colorado, Gunnison, Dolores River Tabs** – The 15 Mile Reach PBO review was finalized and is now available. The Matheson wetland had its first full year of operation and successfully released 4 age-0 razorback suckers. Northern pike were eradicated from Mamm Creek pits through long term mechanical removal and from Mack Mesa Lake via mechanical removal and draining. The Ridgeway fish exclusion screen was completed - more details were provided the following day during the capital projects update.
9. **RIPRAP Table Review – General and Stocking tabs** – Derek Fryer asked about row 114-next steps for HBC translocation into Dinosaur National Monument (DNM) and establishing a Desolation Canyon broodstock. Kevin McAbee summarized that the plan established a set of steps for moving towards a reintroduction into DNM. The first step is to get fish into captivity, then propagating them. Reintroductions and the specific details of that step would come later once fish have been collected. Kevin continued by explaining the fish collection step was added to the workplan as part of the existing Project 129 SOW for humpback chub monitoring in Desolation. The field portion is covered under the SOW, but the planning identified a need to move fish midway through collection trips, rather than at the end of the weeklong trips. This is to avoid fish stress from prolonged holding in boat live wells. This will require a helicopter for fish transport, one for each of three passes. UDWR is estimating costs through an existing contract the agency has in place for other work. Kevin will approach the MC later with a request to approve these expenses and asked whether an email approval process is acceptable to the committee once we have more precise estimates of cost. Joe Trungale asked about row 19 and why the status is listed as "dropped." David Graf said he believed that was an old RIPRAP holdover and that the process for addressing conditional water rights relinquishment is handled by State water administration or water court processes (CO). Michelle Garrison explained further that the

old conditional water rights do not need to be reassessed and are not hindering recovery. Julie Stahli highlighted some of the accomplishments denoted with “!” shorthand (see table). Joe asked about the work planned in Browns Park to address white sucker in the wildlife management area ponds. Paul Badame said those plans are on hold due to cost overruns and increasing estimates to accomplish the work. Kevin McAbee added that this was a Utah Division of Wildlife Resources (UDWR) funded project that they initiated independently. Julie then highlighted work on the glossary and the removal of column A from all tabs which contained notation that related to early versions of the RIPRAP text.

ADJOURNED at 3:40 PM MT

CONVENE: April 20 - 9:00 AM

10. **Colorado pikeminnow Recovery Plan Part 1** – Tildon Jones provided an introduction and review of the Recovery Planning effort to date. Tildon thanked the species and ESA experts who helped develop the document to date. Recovery Planning and Implementation is the new process Service is using to develop and implement species recovery. Step 1 is the Species Status Assessment (SSA), Step 2 is the Recovery Plan, Step 3 is the RIS (Recovery Implementation Strategy). Tom Pitts asked which part of the process is formally adopted. Marj Nelson clarified that the SSA and RIS are built to be more flexible and adaptable. The Recovery Plan is formally adopted by the Service and responds to the requirements in the ESA. The 2002 Recovery Goals are over 20 years old and more than 100 pages. The new plan is much shorter because biology and detailed recovery activities are now contained in the SSA and RIS, making them more flexible. Tildon reiterated that Recovery Plans are guidance documents, a road map to help partners conserve listed species. It is meant to describe what we think is needed to get from current status in the SSA to recovered status. They are *not regulatory documents or contractual agreements*. Tildon reviewed the revision process and development of the Recovery Plan and the major components. The plan will be distributed to the MC after this meeting. Tildon said the goal for today’s meeting is to frame the conversation around time and cost estimates for recovery, which is scheduled later in the agenda. Chris Keleher asked if it will be a larger team that will work on developing the RIS. Tildon responded that the RIS is wide-open, and adaptable over time so the Program can continue to use and adapt that piece over time. Melissa Trammell asked if post-2023 estimates were relevant in development of the RIS time and cost estimates. Tildon said using the estimates we currently have is an option that we will discuss with the MC later in the agenda. Leslie James asked if we need to develop the RIS specifics before we can develop cost estimates. Kevin agreed that some of those details may be helpful, but we do have the broad categories of conservation actions needed to look at recovery. We may be building those pieces together. Tom asked if the time and cost estimates are meant to describe the time and cost to achieve recovery. Marj clarified that the time and cost estimates will be developed by each recovery action; this will be discussed in more detail later this morning. Colleen asked what the review timeframe would be, and Tildon responded that he will be sending the draft out very soon, with a month turnaround time. He will also be speaking to the San Juan Recovery Program’s Coordination Committee at their next meeting. The plan review can happen offline. Colleen thanked Tildon and said that this timeframe would allow for organizations to provide compiled comments.
11. **Post-2023 Updates** – Garrison and Stahli
 - a. **Funding Group update and schedule** – Michelle reviewed that the funding group continues to meet. The proposal put forth from Tom Pitts was presented in November. The Regional Directors from Interior gathered and responded to that proposal. The States are now gathering to respond to the response. DROA is consuming a lot of time for the states at this point, but it is a priority to meet and discuss post-2023 funding. The draft Report to Congress will continue up the chain without the funding agreement details. The agreement can be added to the report if it is available. Leslie James noted that she will need some time to approve any potential legislative language through her board, so there are several approval steps remaining.

- b. **Progress on remaining tasks** – Julie Stahl reviewed the list of remaining tasks. Task 9 down to the end of the list still needs to be done; including a decision regarding NEPA compliance and a potential EA. Tom Pitts expressed concern for NEPA to delay our progress toward agreement and reauthorization of the Program. Chris Keleher thought that NEPA would be triggered by reauthorization of the Program.
 - c. **Report to Congress update** – Julie Stahl reviewed the most recent change to the Report to Congress and asked the MC for approval of the report. Tom Pitts noted that funding arrangements are not required to be included in the report, but it is desirable. Tom Pitts and Chris Keleher raised the concern about the length of the report to congress. In contrast, Tom Pitts mentioned that a key Congressional Committee staffer appears to expect a lengthy and very detailed report citing the Great Lakes report which weighed in with hundreds of pages and a 54-page summary. >**Tom Pitts** or others from the committee will reach out to the staffer for more clarification regarding their expectations for this report. The report has gone through solicitor review in both the Service, and Reclamation. Julie offered the option to send the report out for Service Director’s approval in both Region-6 and Region-2 to avoid further delays. If there are later amendments, then only those changes will need Service review versus the entire report. **Tom Pitts motioned to approve the Report to Congress, all committee members approved.** >**Julie Stahl** will rework the language concerning non-federal partner in-kind contributions.
12. **D.C. Trip Report** – Chris Keleher was impressed with the level of participation from both the Upper Colorado and San Juan programs. Partners have received support and constructive feedback from the Congressional staffers they have met with. Tom Pitts said 24 briefings occurred the week of March 28th. Subcommittee meetings are still on-going, which will be followed by meetings with the DOI bureaus. Tom acknowledged the participation of the four Tribes, which have been making great presentations on the benefits of the programs in meeting Tribal Trust responsibilities. Tom reiterated the importance of the downlistings for both humpback chub and potentially razorback sucker. They briefed staffers on the funding requests and the post-2023 discussions. Substantial turnover has occurred within the Congressional offices and annual briefings are essential to maintain funding and support. Chris and Tom supported moving these meetings to a virtual format, which saves time for both staffers and Program partners. Tom said he will be asking for more help in scheduling in future years.

Break

13. **Capital Projects Update** – Christianson (20 min)
- a. **Ridgway Screen Completion** – Kevin McAbee reviewed the importance of Ridgway Reservoir and the illegal introduction that occurred approximately 10 years ago. The water users have been preventing spills, CPW has been conducting a tournament to reduce the population and Reclamation has been working to design and build a screen to ensure smallmouth bass do not get into the Uncompahgre River and downstream into the Gunnison. Currently, the Uncompahgre and the Gunnison are both free from smallmouth bass to the Redlands Diversion dam. The screen was designed to exclude all age-1 and larger bass based on when the reservoir is likely to spill. The screen sits on top of a raised and hardened apron around the inlet of the spillway and was designed with a labyrinth pattern to increase surface area. Kevin thanked everyone

- who was a part of this process as it was a creative and unique solution. Kevin noted that after Ridgway, we have only one additional screen on our list of projects (Catamount). Kevin noted that this screen was needed because of an illegal introduction, which is why we are working with the state partners to try to make the public aware of the serious consequences of illegal introductions. Kevin thanked Ryan for his efforts and professionalism on getting this screen designed and built. Chris asked if this design has ever been used before. Kevin said some of the components have been used before, but the star pattern was an innovative solution by Matt Bryner of Reclamation.
- b. **Horsethief Pumps** – Ryan thanked the Committee for approval of \$50k of capital funds for the repairs at Horsethief. The pumps have been acquired and that the cost is likely to come in far below the approval limit. He noted that these types of things are going to come up and it makes sense to budget in for emergency replacements on an annual basis. Ryan has been tracking the capital funding projects that are anticipated to need replacement components, but the unknowns are becoming more common as our facilities age.
 - c. **Ouray/Randlett Repairs** – Water wells repairs at Randlett fall more into an O&M category than capital project. Andrew Schultz contacted Dave Speas regarding the wells that feed the hatchery. Fourteen wells suffer from scaling and other issues. This years' repairs have been dealt with through annual funding. Dave mentioned that we used to have an O&M line in the annual budget for Randlett's wells, but a more regular and comprehensive plan needs to be developed and made part of the annual budget once again. He reiterated the need for ongoing O&M as well as replacement costs for all hatchery facilities to be part of both the capital and annual funding sides of the Program.
 - d. **GVIC diversion structure** – Ryan has been working closely with GVIC to develop a plan to resolve some of the problems with river geometry causing the screen to not function as intended. The current thought is a traveling screen that will help address the trash concerns. \$6.4M has been identified for this project, however that cost may increase. Ryan has applied for Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) funding for this project, which may reduce the impact to the Program.
 - e. **Starvation** – UDWR will pay for the picket screen that was identified in the value engineering study. The Program has agreed to pay for the concrete foundation.
 - f. **Catamount** – This is the last remaining identified screening project. Ryan, Kevin, and other Reclamation staff are going to visit with the staff at Catamount next week. This reservoir is commonly full and frequently spills which offers a new challenge for construction. \$4.5M has been identified as a loose estimate.
 - g. **Stirrup Wetland** – construction is complete.
 - h. **Old Charley** – renovation of the inlet has been identified for BIL funding
 - i. **Hatchery Deferred Maintenance** – \$2M has been identified in BIL funding for improvements and deferred maintenance at Wahweap and Ouray Randlett. Electricity costs at the hatchery are high, reflecting the effects of reduced hydropower availability across the west.
 - j. **Monitoring equipment** – Upgrades and installation of a PIT antenna in the mainstem Colorado has also been identified for BIL funding.

- k. **Vinlands Power Plant (Located at the original Grand Valley Power Plant)** – \$1.5M has been identified and matched with a WaterSMART grant. The Lease of Power Privilege Contract has been executed.
 - l. **Green River Canal** – Ryan is very hopeful that implementing the cleaning at the passage and improvements to facilitate screen cleaning are forthcoming. He envisions purchasing a large excavator for the Green River Canal Company to service both the Tusher Wash Diversion Dam fish passage and the fish screen trash rack.
14. **Colorado pikeminnow Recovery Plan and RIS Part 2** – Jones
- a. **Discuss development of time and cost estimates** - Tildon Jones asked how the Committee wanted to develop time and cost estimates for the Recovery Plan. Tildon reviewed Melissa Trammell’s question from earlier and noted that we have a lot of information available from the post-2023 estimates that could be used in development of this part of the RIS. Melissa supported using the post-2023 spreadsheets as an initial first step, with identification of gaps for the MC to resolve. Chris Keleher agreed with that path. He asked how costs would be identified for a single species when all four will benefit. Tildon said that has been addressed in the ESA framework and for this assessment, we should assume that the other three species are delisted and not pro-rate the time and cost estimates. Summing all four recovery plans would not be expected to add up to the post-2023 estimates. >**Tildon Jones** will develop a first draft based on the post-2023 exercise and will bring it back to a future MC meeting based on the MCs recommendation. Tildon will work with the San Juan Recovery Program CC and ask the same question.
 - b. **Preview the draft RIS** – Tildon quickly reviewed a preliminary draft of the RIS, which he also likened to a pikeminnow specific RIPRAP. Activities are broken into sub-basins and each action and activity relate back to the Recovery Plan Actions. Tildon will send the revised SSA, the draft Recovery Plan, and the early draft of the RIS to the committee.
15. **Review and approve RIPRAP** – Final edits were reviewed and then presented to the committee for approval. All committee members approved.

Break

- 16. **Administrative Tasks** –
- 17. Approve January 4 summary – Approved: All comments were incorporated and there were no objections.
- 18. June Meeting – June 23rd was selected, and the meeting will be virtual.
- 19. August/September Meeting – In person w/ virtual option – afternoon August 30 through the morning August 31 in Grand Junction with some sort of field trip. Las Colonias, Redlands, Horsethief, and Audubon were all posed as possible field trip locations.
- 20. **Program Director’s Update** –
 - a. Sufficient Progress Memo – The memo was signed and for 2021 and we will try to get back to the normal schedule for the next one. Julie reviewed what the memo means and some of the comments provided by the Service; for example, the drought should not be considered narrowly as a crisis, but as part of the basin’s current and probable future hydrology. This new set of conditions should not cause the dissolution or slow progress of the Program. Colleen asked why drought was called out versus climate change, saying that viewing impacts through the lens of drought

- versus climate change affects tools and management actions considered. Julie indicated that the flow challenges ahead will require Partners and PDO to fully engage to use all the tools available as opposed to stepping back from commitments due to changes in circumstances.
- b. **15-MR PBO Review** – The Regional Director also approved this document and the Service concurred that reinitiating the PBO is not needed at this time. The Service identified timelines (add detail) for reviewing the PBO and flow recommendations.
 - c. **Staffing updates** – Julie thanked Mike Gross for his efforts as the acting I&E Coordinator and hopes that he continues with his Program related efforts. She also introduced Paul Badame as the new Program Deputy Director and Emily Berchem as the PDO's new Administrative Assistant. The PDO also expects a new propagation coordinator to be announced soon. Kara Scheel was introduced by Michelle as the new ES Coordinator for CWCB.
 - d. **Upcoming IC meeting** – A virtual link was provided to all MC members and interested parties.

ADJOURNED at 11:55 AM MT

Attachment 1: Meeting Attendees

Management Committee Members in Attendance:

Chris Keleher	MC Chair, State of Utah
Mike Robertson	State of Wyoming
Michelle Garrison	State of Colorado
Tom Pitts – day 1 absent, day 2 present	Water Users
Edalin Koziol for Joseph Trungale (day 1)	The Nature Conservancy
Joe Trungale (day 2)	The Nature Conservancy
Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Assoc.
Shane Capron	Western Area Power Administration
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
Ryan Christianson	Bureau of Reclamation
Marj Nelson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Julie Stahl (non-voting)	Program Director

Upper Colorado Program Office Staff:

Kevin McAbee	Nonnative Fish Coordinator
Tildon Jones	Habitat Coordinator
David Graf	Instream Flow Coordinator
Chris Michaud	Database Coordinator
Paul Badame	Program Deputy Director
Mike Gross	I&E Coordinator

Interested Parties:

Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation
Colleen Cunningham (day 2)	State of New Mexico
Rob Billerbeck	National Park Service
Kathy Callister	Bureau of Reclamation
Chris Breidenbach	Colorado Attorney's General Office
Emily Halvorsen	Colorado Attorney's General Office
Todd Adams	State of Utah, Dept. Natural Resources
Lee Traynham	Bureau of Reclamation
Emily Halvorsen	Colorado Attorney's General Office
Kara Scheel	Colorado Water Conservation Board
Jacob Mazzone (day 2)	Jicarilla Apache Nation
Travis Anderson	Fish and Wildlife Service
Derek Fryer	Western Area Power