

Management Committee Meeting Summary
February 5, 2004
Denver, Colorado

Attendees: See Attachment 1

Assignments are highlighted in the text and listed at the end of the summary.

CONVENE - 8:00 a.m.

1. Review/modify agenda and time allocations and appoint a time-keeper - The agenda was modified as it appears below.
2. Approve December 18 meeting summary - The Committee made minor revisions suggested by Randy Peterson (under item #13, the lower basin review of population estimate methodology was an expert panel review as opposed to a workshop, and under item #9 the additional Ruedi Reservoir O&M cost be amortized over up to three years without interest). >Angela Kantola will post the revised summary to the listserver.
3. Yampa Plan, Environmental Assessment (EA), Programmatic Biological Opinion (PBO) and Cooperative Agreement - The Service's Grand Junction Ecological Service office has information for the draft PBO and biological assessment and is working on getting those to solicitor review the second week in March and hopefully out for public review by April 1 (although there is some concern that the solicitor's review could be delayed by the review of the Platte BO at the same time). >Gerry Roehm will send the December 31 version of the cooperative agreement to the Management Committee members and ask for final comments and vote of approval/disapproval back by February 17. Gerry will track responses. The EA is due out at the end of March.
4. Revisions to FY 04-05 Work Plan - Bob Muth reviewed revisions to the FY 04 work plan, which include:
 - #67 Steamboat Lake water lease - Payment of \$67,800 for FY 03 lease.
 - NEW USGS sediment monitoring - Proposal tentatively approved by Biology Committee; final approval pending submission and review of scope of work. Tom Pitts asked that this be made an item under a sub-heading of "evaluate flow recommendations." Bob agreed, and also would add #115 to that category. USGS is also providing ~40% matching funds. Angela Kantola will show the USGS match in the "other funds" column.
 - #115 Effects of Flaming Gorge releases - Budget increased to extend study one year.
 - #135a Ruedi Reservoir extra O&M costs - Brent Uilenberg and Angela Kantola recommend paying 1/3 of the extra cost (\$27K) in FY 04 and remaining 2/3 (\$54K) in FY 05, with option to extend last 1/3 into FY 06. The Committee agreed.
 - #C6-BT/RZ Evaluation of middle Green River floodplains for bonytail and razorback restoration - Former placeholder; revised based on outcome of razorback floodplain model and Green River floodplain management plan. Study reduced to one year; sites changed to include Thunder Ranch.

- #C6-RZ/BT Evaluation of survival and growth of larval razorback and bonytail stocked in middle Green River depressions - Former placeholder.
- #C6-RZ recr. Evaluation of razorback migration and recruitment - Former placeholder; remote PIT-tag sensing taken out, study approved for only one year at this time, no additional larvae to be stocked in FY 04.
- #C6-RZ entr. Evaluate floodplain drift model for larval razorback - Former placeholder.
- #109 Middle Green River northern pike removal - Former placeholder.
- #110 Lower Yampa smallmouth bass removal - Former placeholder; previously focus on channel catfish removal.
- #98a/125 Middle Yampa River northern pike and smallmouth bass translocation - Former placeholder; methods revised.
- #98b Upper Yampa northern pike translocation - Former placeholder; methods revised.
- #98c Upper Yampa northern pike tagging - New start. Tom Iseman said Trout Unlimited (David Nickum) has expressed interest in hearing more about the nonnative fish management activities and their effect on trout fishing. >Tom Iseman will post a summary of his discussion with Trout Unlimited to the Management Committee.
- #123 Green River smallmouth bass removal - Former placeholder; increased emphasis on smallmouth bass removal.
- #124 Duchesne River nonnative fish removal - Former placeholder.
- #126 Colorado River smallmouth bass removal - Former placeholder; shift from catfish to smallmouth removal.
- #22f Yampa and middle Green pikeminnow and razorback larval surveys - Modified to include light trapping at Thunder Ranch and perhaps Stewart Lake.
- #130 Cataract Canyon humpback chub population estimate - Costs slightly reduced.

Tom Pitts commended the Colorado Division of Wildlife for bringing the nonnative fish policy before their Wildlife Commission and noted that the Implementation Committee's approval of this policy is an important milestone for the Recovery Program. John Shields commended Utah, also. >The Program Director's office will write up a 1-page summary of our FY 04 nonnative fish management control activities for the Washington, D.C. trip (scale, amount of funding, etc.). A copy of the final nonnative fish management policy will be included in the D.C. briefing packet, also.

The Management Committee approved the changes to the FY 04 work plan (with the understanding that the Biology Committee will approve the final scope of work for USGS sediment monitoring).

At next week's Biology Committee meeting, Colorado will propose increasing funding for the isotope study by \$25,000 to study additional isotopes

5. Duchesne minimum flows - Sherm Hoskins asked about next steps. >Sherm will provide the Committee with more information about a pipeline being considered further up the Green (which might provide another option for providing water in the Duchesne). Tom Pitts said much will depend on the flexibility in Service's biological opinion and what we try to achieve on the Duchesne. Henry Maddux said an official draft opinion should be out by end of the month. It will probably call for modifying some of the structures (not all) and some additional gages. The opinion will contain flexibility for other options for

delivering water to the lower Duchesne. Henry said he and Larry Crist have discussed options of screening only the canal portion of Tusher Wash and using remaining funds on the Duchesne. The draft opinion, etc. will be an item on the next Management Committee agenda.

6. Lower Basin issues - Bob Muth said the Service and the Program will meet with Region 2 on February 24 in Phoenix. Topics of discussion will include Grand Canyon humpback chub population estimate methodology (multiple pass mark/recapture vs. stock assessment) and the letter that Arizona declined to sign, the expert panel review, MSCP, the RIPS WG document. Norm Henderson said that since the lower basin efforts are not a recovery program, they question the need to fund methodology required for recovery goals (~\$500K), as their scientists have said they don't need to determine a number for recovery goals in order to understand the population to meet the objectives of the adaptive management program. Somehow the lower basin work needs to be put in the framework of a recovery program for the lower basin. Tom Pitts agreed, noting that considerable resources are going into the work in the lower basin and should be targeted at, or at least consistent with, recovery. Randy Peterson endorsed the idea of an upper basin population estimate workshop followed by a joint workshop between the two basins. >Bob Muth will provide an update on the meeting with Region 2 at the Implementation Committee meeting on March 8.

7. Capital Funds

- a. Updated capital funds table from Reclamation - Brent Uilenberg distributed a DRAFT updated table dated February 5, 2004. The Yampa River line item does not contain 5% contingency or funding for a screen at Elkhead (there are no funds remaining). The \$170K in FY 06 is the credit to Colorado for the Highline Lake storage. No funds are shown for Hartland fish passage or screen because no funds remain in the authorized ceiling (and this is not in the recovery goals). Price-Stubbs fish passage completion has been extended into FY 05-06 because it will take ~9 months to process the 30K cubic yards of RIPRAP (fortunately, this material may be donated from Ute Water at a considerable cost savings). The FY 04 GVIC fish screen cost has increased by ~\$100K to reflect actual bid price. The Government Highline screen was scheduled for completion this year, but due to bidding difficulties won't be completed until FY 05 (\$750K was added to this item to reflect current construction bidding conditions). Costs for Tusher the screen were also increased in the table, but would be significantly decreased (by ~\$3M) if only 80 cfs were screened as Henry suggested might be considered. However, we would have to determine mortality rate of fish passing through power plant turbine (~90% of the water goes through the turbines) and then determine if this level of mortality is acceptable). >The Service will provide recommendations on this in the draft biological opinion. Brent noted that the total for the UC program now stands at \$64.466M (the Program is authorized for \$62M, but the legislation allows indexing the \$38.116M Federal portion). The Federal portion for FY 05 has been adjusted to reflect what's in the President's budget for the Federal portion (\$269,000 reduction). Power revenue contributions to the UC Program's capital budget will be complete in FY 04. Brent asked the

Committee to approve up to \$100K from Grand Valley Water Management and Government Highline Screen line items to move the canal gage upstream closer to the diversion dam to avoid the backwater effects created by the screen. The Committee agreed. Frank asked if someone give a presentation on the capital improvement projects to the Biology Committee next week and explain how the Biology Committee's input (e.g., recommending against taking water off the spring peak in the Yampa River to augment summer low flows) was used to determine which capital projects are being conducted. >Brent Uilenberg agreed to make a presentation to the Biology Committee.

- b. Do completion dates in the NFWF agreements match construction schedules? Brent Uilenberg said we will need funds from the states through FY 08.
 - c. State capital fund contributions - The meeting among Reclamation, Colorado, and the Program Director's office has not yet occurred. Wyoming is still awaiting an invoice from NFWF (Angela suggested this should be for \$550,000 to cover FY 03 and 04). Brent said his expectation is that the funds shown on page 2 will be appropriated by the state legislatures. John Shields said Wyoming has already appropriated their total amount (as has New Mexico). Tom Blickensderfer said Colorado agrees to the amounts, but want to discuss how it's paid (e.g. directly on Elkhead vs. to NFWF). Robert King said Utah agrees to the amounts and has mechanisms in place for annual appropriation. Tom Blickensderfer said his proposal would suggest that Colorado pay their portion of the outstanding invoice directly (so CRWCD would submit an amended invoice to NFWF). Reclamation, the States, the Program Director's office (and NFWF, if available) will discuss these items on a conference call on February 19 (1:30 - 3:30 p.m.).
 - d. Draft policy if a state can't make payment - This will be addressed on the conference call.
 - e. Proportional payments from State capital fund contributions - This will be addressed on the conference call.
 - f. Payment of CRWCD invoice - NFWF has an outstanding invoice from CRWCD for \$233,239.19 (Program's share). Under the percent structure, this invoice would be allocated: State of CO (61%)= \$142,742.38, State of UT (26%)= \$60,642.19, State of WY (13%)= \$29,854.62. However, as reflected in the "State Funds at NFWF spreadsheet," the available funds for each state are: UT: ~\$400,000; CO: ~\$6,400; WY: ~\$7,000. The Committee needs to direct NFWF how to pay this invoice. This will be addressed on the conference call.
8. Washington, D.C. Trip - John Shields distributed instructions for providing written testimony from the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee for Interior and Related Agencies (due by April 2, and perhaps as early as March 18 for Energy and Water Development). John also distributed draft letters to the House and Senate subcommittees for Interior. John told the Committee that the President's 2005 budget released Monday, February 2, contains *no* funds for the recovery base funding for the

Fish and Wildlife Service (\$700K) for this Program. The Committee discussed options for addressing this concern. >John Shields will once again draft the trip itinerary.

9. Elkhead enlargement, 404 permit application and financing - Dan Birch gave an update on Elkhead progress. They continue to work out agreements, focusing recently on those between CRWCD, Reclamation, and CWCB, which are expected to go out to Reclamation's solicitor for review in the next few days. They've also been working on the reservoir operations agreement between CRWCD and the other reservoir owners and are making progress on that. The Yampa participants have agreed in concept to pro rata sharing in reservoir operation costs (except for the costs of operating a State Park at the reservoir), which will be cast as a "fee" as opposed to a "reservoir operations share." Dan said they anticipate submitting the 404 application by the end of February (unless there are unforeseen delays in the Yampa Management Plan, which serves as the basis and need for the project). John Reber asked about screening the outlet works and Dan said he believes there have been some discussions of screening the outlet but not the spillway. Discussion of screening options is on the next Biology Committee agenda. Tom Blickensderfer said discussions of DNR's participation through CWCB funding of Elkhead has been in terms of direct payment from CWCB to the River District. Tom Iseman asked how the agreements address how the water will be managed year-to-year and about long-term ownership status of the water. Dan said CRWCD will convey the water to Reclamation who will donate it to CWCB who will hold it for the Recovery Program in perpetuity. Both a water right and a storage right would be conveyed. The Service will determine the day-to-day release pattern. There's also been a series of discussions about what would happen if the water were no longer needed for recovery at some point, and the goal is to make sure the water would still be used for instream purposes. Tom Iseman said he and Dan Luecke spoke with Ralph and Margot and emphasized their commitment to recovery in the Yampa River. Bob Muth said the PBO will make clear the Service's commitment to the Yampa.
10. Colorado's draft resolution on Elkhead - Tom Blickensderfer said Colorado has proposed that their capital fund contributions go directly to CRWCD for Elkhead enlargement instead of through NFWF. Tom Iseman asked if this proposal would change Colorado's total capital fund contribution or the total cost of the Elkhead project. Tom said no. Colorado's total capital fund obligation to the San Juan and Upper Colorado River recovery programs is \$9.146M; their direct contribution to Elkhead would be ~\$6M (whatever is agreed to remain of Colorado's capital fund obligation), with the remainder coming from Reclamation. Brent said the total cost of Elkhead is \$8.723M. >Bob Muth will discuss the proposal with NFWF on Monday to make sure they don't have any concerns. The Committee discussed the draft resolution, offered suggested revisions, and approved sending a revised draft to the Implementation Committee. >Tom Blickensderfer will revise the draft and send it to Bob Muth to send the Management and Implementation committees, who will provide comments back by February 17.
11. Encouraging increased participation in the CROPS process - Tom Pitts said he has nothing to report and asked that this be on the next meeting agenda. Brent Uilenberg expressed concern about progress toward the 10,825 af from the west slope and east slope. >Tom Pitts will get information to Bob Muth before February 18 (before February

- 10, if possible). In light of the discussions of Duchesne River diversion structures, Brent noted this precedent (i.e., funding for the 10,825 af is not being provided by the Recovery Program).
12. Reports status - Angela Kantola distributed an updated reports list. Tom Pitts asked that the Pitlick report and George's reports be added. Tom also said that he thinks if reports are late, they need to be identified as such. The Management Committee decided that reports will have "late" in the status column if the date identified in the scope of work is not met. The "revised due date" column will identify the new expected due date and the comments column will describe why the report is late. >The Program Director's office will revise the reports due list accordingly.
 13. Section 7 consultation update - Deferred. >Angela Kantola will post the updated consultation list to the listserv.
 14. FY 05 Budget - Angela Kantola distributed a table showing Program participants' FY 05 annual budget obligations, per the agreement in the Program's Blue Book. The capital funds amounts still need to be filled in, based on discussions in the upcoming conference call.
 15. Colorado Committee representation - Tom Blickensderfer said Russell George is Colorado's new Implementation Committee member. Tom and Bob Muth and Tom Pitts will try to give Russell an overall briefing on the Program prior to the Implementation Committee meeting. John Marshall is being replaced on the Information and Education Committee, but Tom did not yet know by whom.
 16. National Irrigation Water Quality Program (NIWQP) - Bob McCue provided an update on NIWQP, noting that it is funded in FY 04, but not in FY 05. The recovery goals call for evaluating impacts of selenium and reference NIWQP as the way selenium will be addressed. There is now a 303D impaired rivers designation for selenium in the Upper Basin in both Colorado and Utah, thus it would seem particularly important to the States that this work be funded. The Biological Opinion on Stewart Lake calls for monitoring and evaluation following remediation. Robert King said they've been assured that the work (but not the NIWQP program) will be rolled into the 2025 initiative, but Bob McCue said most of that is going into grants, which aren't expected to cover the work we're concerned about. >Brent Uilenberg will provide a list of projects NIWQP would have been working on in FY 05. This will be on the next meeting agenda.
 17. Agenda for March 8 Implementation Committee meeting (March 8, 2004 from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Denver). Agenda items will include: RIPRAP revisions and assessment and any changes to the FY 05 work plan; Washington D.C. briefing trip; an update on Region 6/Region 2 coordination meeting; proposal for Colorado to directly fund Elkhead enlargement; and a status report on capital projects (>Brent Uilenberg will send Angela Kantola a powerpoint presentation). >The Program Director's office will post an agenda to the listserv.

18. Schedule next meeting/conference call - Conference call February 18 from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m. >The Program Director's office will set up the call. Agenda items will include: review of RIPRAP revisions and assessment and any changes to 05 work plan (due to Implementation Committee by February 27); Washington D.C. briefing trip. The next meeting will be held in Denver on April 8 from 9:30 - 4:00. >The Program Director's office will set up a meeting room. Agenda items will include Duchesne River flows, CROPS, Gunnison EIS (the scoping meetings are February 23, 24, and 25) and PBO process, and NIWQP funding.

ADJOURN – 3:00 p.m.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. Angela Kantola will post the revised December 18, 2003, Management Committee meeting summary to the listserver.
2. Gerry Roehm will send the December 31 version of the Yampa/Elkhead cooperative agreement to the Management Committee members and ask for final comments and vote of approval/disapproval back by February 17. Gerry will track responses.
3. Tom Iseman will post a summary of his recent discussion with Trout Unlimited about nonnative fish control to the Management Committee.
4. The Program Director's office will write up a 1-page summary of the FY 04 nonnative fish management control activities for the Washington, D.C. trip (scale, amount of funding, etc.).
5. Sherm Hoskins will provide the Management Committee with more information about a pipeline being considered further up the Green River (which might provide another option for providing water in the Duchesne River).
6. Bob Muth will provide an update on the meeting between Region 6 and Region 2 at the Implementation Committee meeting on March 8.
7. In the draft Duchesne River biological opinion, the Service will provide recommendations on potentially screening only 80 cfs at Tusher Wash (in order to reserve funds to modify diversion structures on the Duchesne River to augment flows).
8. Brent Uilenberg will make a presentation on capital projects at next week's Biology Committee meeting.
9. John Shields will draft the Washington, D.C. trip itinerary.
10. Bob Muth will discuss the Elkhead funding proposal with NFWF on Monday to make sure they don't have any concerns.
11. Tom Blickensderfer will revise the draft Elkhead proposal and send it to Bob Muth to send the Management and Implementation committees, who will provide comments back by February 17.
12. Tom Pitts will get information regarding the 10,825 af from the west slope and east slope to Bob Muth before February 18 (before February 10, if possible)
13. The Program Director's office will revise the reports due list to show "late" in the status column if the date identified in the scope of work is not met. The "revised due date" column will identify the new expected due date and the comments column will describe why the report is late.

14. Angela Kantola will post an updated consultation list to the listserv.
15. Brent Uilenberg will provide a list of projects NIWQP would have been working on in FY 05.
16. The Program Director's office will post an Implementation Committee meeting agenda to the listserv.
17. Brent Uilenberg will send Angela Kantola his Powerpoint presentation for the March 8 Implementation Committee meeting.
18. The Program Director's office will set up the Management Committee conference call on February 18 from 3:00 - 5:00 p.m.
19. The Program Director's office will arrange for a meeting room near the airport for the Management Committee on April 8.

ATTACHMENT 1
Colorado River Management Committee, Denver, Colorado
February 5, 2004

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Randy Peterson	Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Blickensderfer	State of Colorado
Sherm Hoskins	Utah Department Of Natural Resources
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Bob McCue	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Leslie James for Dave Mazour	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
John Reber	National Park Service
Tom Iseman	The Nature Conservancy
Gary Burton	Western Area Power Administration

Nonvoting Member:

Bob Muth	Recovery Program Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
----------	-----------------------------------------------------------

Recovery Program Staff:

Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
----------------	--------------------------------

Others:

Frank Pfeifer	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Chart	Bureau of Reclamation
Henry Maddux	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Norm Henderson	National Park Service
Matthew Andersen	Utah Division of Wildlife
Dan Birch (via phone for item #9)	Colorado River Water Conservation District
Robert King	Utah Division of Water Resources
Gene Shawcroft	Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service