



Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Dated: March 24, 2014

March 20, 2014, Management Committee Webinar Summary

Participants: See Attachment 1

CONVENE: 8:39 a.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper – Tom Chart welcomed Henry Maddux as the new Committee chair. The Committee ratified Henry's selection as their chairperson.
2. Approve February 11, 2014, revised draft meeting summary – Comments on the summary (primarily editorial) were received from Kevin McAbee and Melissa Trammell. A revised, track-changes draft summary was provided on March 10 with the draft meeting agenda. The Committee approved the revised summary; Angela Kantola will post it to the listserv (*done*).
3. Review/approval of draft RIPRAP revisions and assessment – Angela Kantola said revisions and recommendations were drafted by the Program Director's office (posted to the listserv February 6) and revised by the technical committees (posted to the listserv March 17). The Implementation Committee has given the Management Committee their proxy to approve these documents.

RIPRAP text:

On March 18, Tom Pitts submitted comments on the February 6 version of the RIPRAP text and said the description of Program actions in Section 2.0 is redundant in many cases with the descriptions in Section 3.0 of the program actions by subbasin. Tom proposed eliminating the discussion of Program actions in Section 2.0 and describing all program actions in Section 3.0, re-titling this section "Discussion of Subbasin Recovery Actions." Section 2.0 would be limited to providing a general description of Program elements. In Section 3.0, Tom also proposed adding subtitles in the subbasin discussions for each recovery element being implemented in the subbasin and placing the description of the recovery actions for each recovery element under those subtitles. Tom suggested these changes would eliminate redundancies, possibly shorten the document, and make it more readable and understandable.

On March 19, Robert Wigington responded that although there is some redundancy in Section 2.0 of the RIPRAP text, it provides useful explanation and historical context on flow management and protection that would be lost if it were separated by basin. The paragraphs in Section 2.0 should be updated as needed, but not deleted wholesale. "Description of Recovery Actions" would be a better title for Section 3.0. Many of the specific edits in both Section 2.0 and 3.0 seem fine on quick glance, but it's not clear the rest of the re-organization would be worthwhile. The RIPRAP tables already fully describe basin-by-basin recovery actions. Robert suggested the Committee focus more on the substance of the RIPRAP text narrative than its organization. The text as previously structured and updated has sufficed for many years. Robert said they don't see the benefit (and see some drawbacks) to a major overhaul.

Tom Chart thinks many of Tom Pitts' editorial changes and comments on general clean up can be incorporated, including adding information about selenium remediation on the Gunnison and Green rivers.

Angela said the items Tom Pitts' suggested striking from the instream flow part of Section 2.0 are likely the ones Robert does not want to strike, and she agrees. Henry supported changes to add clarity. Patrick McCarthy said they don't want to retain confusing language and welcome editing for clarity and to be concise, but they do think the instream flow history in Section 2 is helpful. >Patrick and Robert Wigington will try to provide some editing for clarity/brevity and get that to >Angela to distribute for a round of Management Committee e-mail discussion and then subsequent approval via e-mail.

With regard to the note about canal salvage on page 27, Angela said she checked with Dale Ryden and Travis Francis and 2013 was the 12th consecutive year that canal salvage was performed. It has been done for 12 straight years (in varying intensities) on the GVIC canal and for 11 of the last 12 years on the GVWU canal (for some reason it wasn't done in 2004 on the GVWU canal).

Angela Kantola reviewed a few of Tom Pitts' specific recommended changes. With regard to the "in support of" versus the suggested "in compliance with" language, Angela will check to see what the Section 7 agreement said. Perhaps "as required by the Section 7 Agreement..."

Regarding Taylor Draw Dam, Michelle suggested there is nothing specific to add this year and Melissa was fine with that.

RIPRAP tables: No changes.

>Angela Kantola will incorporate text changes (after receiving input from Robert Wigington and Patrick McCarthy), make any changes needed to the tables, and send the package back to the Committee in track changes for final round of comment/approval.

Annual depletion charge budget adjustment update:

Related to Section 1.4 of the RIPRAP text, which addresses estimated Program costs, is the annual depletion charge budget adjustment update (Attachment 3), which was provided to Program participants with the revised agenda for this meeting. >Angela Kantola will send out a revised version in October when Reclamation's FY15 contribution is known.

4. Sufficient progress (Attachment 4) and nonnative fish action items status report – Tom Chart said he doesn't have much to report since the Committee's February 11 meeting and the Implementation Committee's March 6 webinar. With regard to nonnative fish and synthesis reports, Project #161 on smallmouth bass has 3 reporting components: Elkhead escapement (completed); synthesis of life history dynamics sent to the Biology Committee for review yesterday, along with peer review comments; and a population modeling projection tool, which has been released and for which Kevin McAbee and André Breton have been holding instructional/introductory meetings with principal investigators and a subset of the Biology Committee. A similar synthesis report is pending for northern pike and is now slightly behind schedule. With regard to nonnative fish action items, Colorado Parks and Wildlife and the River District are working on Elkhead plans, with implementation postponed until 2015. Tom Chart intends to convene the Biology Committee via webinar prior to their scheduled June meeting to provide an update on this.
5. Update on Ridgway Reservoir smallmouth bass escapement prevention planning – Harry Crockett provided an update on short (via operations and harvest) and long-term (potentially screening) plans to prevent illegally-introduced smallmouth bass from escaping Ridgway Reservoir (on the Uncompahgre, a tributary to the Gunnison River). If escapement were to occur, fish could be flushed into the Gunnison, where habitat is suitable for bass colonization (habitat in most of the upper Uncompahgre is not well suited for bass). Harry said Colorado, the Program Director's office and Reclamation had an excellent meeting with Tri-County regarding their cooperation to avoid spills this year if possible. Tom Pitts asked if a specific plan is

in place to prevent a spill and implement other smallmouth bass control actions. Harry said he thinks we have the Board's strong verbal commitment to avoid a spill to the best of their availability. Brent Uilenberg said that Reclamation hydrologist, Erik Knight, has been working closely with Tri-County with the intent of avoiding a spill this year. Harry said Colorado also is looking into medium and long-term approaches, including regulation change to encourage angler harvest, potential harvest incentive, and mechanical removal (rotenone probably is not a viable option). Harry said the Region is concerning considering a draft issue paper regarding regulation change(s) (e.g., no bag limits or must-kill [the latter would be complicated by law enforcement issues, including waste of game, prohibiting an action that may happen inadvertently, and precedent concerns, all in the face of questions about actual biological impact]). Tom Pitts suggested a lake management plan is likely needed for Ridgway; in any case, we need something in writing that outlines the plan for controlling smallmouth bass there. Harry said Colorado isn't required to write a lake management plan waters where stocking complies with the Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures. Stocking in Ridgway has consisted primarily, if not exclusively, of salmonids. With regard to a screen or barrier, Harry said a permanent screen downstream looks less viable than originally thought (and >\$1M). The preferred screening option, if it can be done at all, may be an in-reservoir net (Colorado is evaluating options). The Commission considers regulation changes only in the fall. Tom Pitts asked if ponds upstream of the reservoir comply with the Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures, and how those Procedures are enforced. Harry said any pond that has smallmouth bass would not be in compliance with the Procedures. The state largely relies on voluntary compliance by privately owned ponds, but Harry believes Colorado is looking into whether upstream ponds may be a source of smallmouth bass. Tom Pitt asked if Harry thinks people are aware of the Procedures; Harry said Colorado advertises in several west slope papers this time every year. The State permits the private aquaculture industry and permits require aquaculturists to provide only fish the landowner is allowed to stock. The industry is very aware of the rules. That said, anyone can order fish over the internet. Tom Pitts said he appreciates all Harry is doing to promote nonnative fish control. Henry asked if Colorado would need Commission approval for an incentive program and Harry said no, though there are internal concerns regarding precedent [even beyond fish], complexity of administration, and funding. Tom Pitts asked that >Kevin McAbee draft an action plan for smallmouth bass control in Ridgway, including all the options and contingencies; Henry agreed this would be helpful. Tom Chart agreed but recognized that Colorado already has drafted something along these lines. Tom Chart said he understands Colorado has a set of criteria regarding what constitutes an emergency regulation and he thinks smallmouth bass in Ridgway would constitute an emergency. Harry said an emergency regulation still requires Commission action, but it expedites it (can happen outside the once-a-year fishing regulation changes consideration). So far, Colorado has not agreed this rises to the level of an emergency regulation.

6. Recovery planning update – Prior to the March 6 Implementation Committee webinar, Tom Pitts sent a proposal from the water users and Western offering an alternative to the Service's current approach to revising the single species recovery goals. In light of the time it takes to prepare these plans and the decision to delay consideration of downlisting Colorado pikeminnow, they asked the Committee to consider supporting their proposal, requesting that the Service: combine recovery plans for bonytail, razorback sucker, and humpback chub into one multi-species plan; expand and diversify the Recovery Teams; and incorporate a Stakeholder Team. The Implementation Committee discussed the proposal and determined additional discussion was warranted. On March 18, Tom Chart and Tom Czaplá sent a memo to the Management and Implementation committees to assist in those discussions and provide the Program Director's Office initial thoughts on the proposal. They agreed that a combined recovery plan is not contrary to guidance, but recommended that the committees consider:
 1. The recovery guidance calls for "Recovery Strategy" and "Recovery Goals and Criteria" that are unique to each species. We would essentially be developing a Recovery Plan with the same components repeated for each species.
 2. Even though on the surface, many of the threats, management actions, etc. appear similar among the three species, they are not; and distributions, life histories, etc., differ greatly among the species. If a multi-species package was pursued, it would essentially be several separate plans under one cover.

3. Combining the three species into one plan might expedite the process, likely: (a) information that supports threats analysis and recovery narrative would be greatly diluted or result in a 300-400 page document, and (b) establishing and defining recovery units, recovery goals and criteria for each species could get confusing, given the overlap and distinctions.
4. A multi-species approach would delay revision of the humpback chub recovery plan (the next plan scheduled for revision). Therefore, the Service likely would need to seek a similar recommendation from the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive Management Program.

In light of these issues, Chart and Czapla's memo recommended:

1. Proceeding as planned to separately revise the humpback chub recovery plan. The Service could consider combining the bonytail and razorback sucker into one multi-species recovery plan when new information warrants those revisions (however, concerns outlined above would still apply to combining those two species' recovery plans).
2. Asking the authors of the multi-species proposal how the Colorado pikeminnow recovery team could / should have been expanded. Further, if the Implementation Committee supports the multi-species proposal, then individual recovery teams should be assembled to address the species-specific issues in a multi-species plan.
3. That recovery plan revision likely would benefit from adding a Stakeholder Team to participate in development of management actions, timelines and costs.

Tom Pitts said the underlying concern is getting the fish downlisted and delisted in a timely manner and maintaining our credibility with Congress. Congress understands we're in the business of recovery and that we have timelines and authorization that goes along with those timelines (2019 and 2023 for base hydropower and capital funds, respectively). We need revised plans to know our downlisting and delisting targets and when we'll reach them. For example, if we deferred the razorback sucker and bonytail plan revisions until we have more information, what would we put in the *Program Highlights* document regarding expected downlisting and delisting dates for razorback sucker and bonytail?

Clayton Palmer discussed the Glen Canyon Dam EIS. Currently, there are no agreed-upon guiding demographic criteria for humpback chub in the Grand Canyon and these are needed before LTEMP ROD is completed. Therefore, Clayton shares Tom Pitts' concern about the pace of completing these plans. Leslie texted in that she also shares Clayton's concerns. Clayton said Western needs some time to consider and react to Tom Chart's response and will suggest a follow-up Management Committee webinar in 3 weeks to a month.

On March 19, Bart Miller sent an e-mail saying the conservation groups don't support veering down a multi-species path. Such a new course would raise difficulties and concerns over lumping/splitting distinct species, which, in turn, could confuse funding, and prioritization for management actions. Further, the Clark & Harvey paper (cited by proponents) actually concludes that multi-species plans are less effective than single-species plans. For these and other reasons, the conservation groups support doing the plans separately. As for expanding the Recovery Teams, Bart said the conservation groups have concerns that that could delay, rather than speed, development of planning documents. They support the concept of adding a Stakeholder team. Bart said they would be happy to elaborate through a discussion with the Implementation Committee. They believe this issue should be resolved by the Implementation Committee, and hope the Committee might find a way to talk within the next month, potentially allowing people to designate a proxy if schedules are tight.

Patrick McCarthy asked about the relationship between the recovery plans and delisting and downlisting, noting that it seems Tom Pitts and Clayton are saying that if the recovery planning is accelerated, that should accelerate recovery (delisting and downlisting), as well. Patrick thought Congress' concerns last year were directed more at the pace of progress toward *recovery* as opposed to the pace of *completing*

revised recovery plans. Tom Chart agreed with Patrick and said he thought focusing on actions to speed recovery was where we should be directing our efforts. Tom said we're all distressed at the information we're receiving on Colorado pikeminnow populations and thinks we need to focus on threat removal. Getting the species to demonstrate self-sustainability over the long-term is our goal, and this aligns with the draft Colorado pikeminnow recovery plan and the 2002 recovery goals. Bridget said the Service shares the goal of down and delisting as quickly as possible. From both a Regional and National perspective, the Service recognizes a trade-off between recovery planning and implementation and chooses to direct resources toward implementation providing we've met requirements for recovery plans. When it comes to down and delisting decisions, recovery plans are not binding. They're the best info at the time they're written, and we may find ourselves meeting some but not all criteria. In that situation, if the Service believes downlisting or delisting is warranted, it can explain how we still think we've reached recovery and explain the reasons. This situation doesn't constrain a credible, warranted down or delisting action. With regard to the expected downlisting and delisting dates we communicate to Congress, if there's no new information then we simply give the dates by which we think we can meet the goals in the existing plans/goals. Bridget would like the Program to focus on recovery implementation and threat removal because revising recovery plan documents doesn't necessarily lead to on-the-ground biological outcomes. Tom Pitts said he doesn't think writing recovery plans would take away from implementing recovery actions. Clayton said that how many adult humpback chub need to be maintained for 5 years in the Grand Canyon isn't clear and seems to depend on who is interpreting the recovery goals. Clayton said the Toms' response to the multi-species recover plan proposal may be a good way to go, but given its departure from past plans, Western would like time to reconsider and reconvene. Bridget said the Service does agree to quickly moving forward to revise the humpback chub recovery plan. Tom Pitts re-emphasized his concern about needing to specify anticipated downlisting and delisting dates (e.g., for razorback and especially bonytail) *before* we get close to the end of the Program's authorization in 2023. Tom Chart said the razorback and bonytail 2002 goals are still good working documents, and should be referenced in all discussion of those species. At this point in time, the Program Director's office thinks we lack sufficient new demographic (a razorback sucker population estimate will be calculated for the first time this year) or threat removal information to warrant revising the 2002 Recovery Goals for those species. Although the life history of these two species is different, the approach we've taken to their recovery may be similar enough to warrant a combined recovery plan when we have information to warrant an update. Tom Pitts said he supports the stakeholder team; Tom Chart said he just wants to be sure their role is fully clarified. Henry asked if deferring further discussion for three weeks to a month would delay anything with the pikeminnow plan or work started on humpback chub. Tom said it generally wouldn't. The Service needs to send out the letters inviting participation on and convening the humpback recovery team, but could move ahead with that in the interim. With regard to who sits on recovery teams (species experts), Clayton countered that the State representatives were invited due to their nonnative fish management responsibilities as opposed to specific Colorado pikeminnow expertise. With regard to adding a stakeholder team, Bridget said we need to make the roles and responsibilities very clear. If we pursue this, Bridget, recommends stakeholder teams be small and focused. In her experience, adding a stakeholder team tends to slow the process somewhat. In many ways, Bridget sees the Management and Implementation committees in the role of a recovery implementation (stakeholder) team. Henry said he thinks this has been an informative discussion and asked if the group is willing to provide time for comments and then take up this conversation again in 3-4 weeks. Patrick asked if there will be simultaneous discussion of the Implementation Committee's recommendation and which Committee will make final recommendations. Tom Chart said he thinks it is appropriate that the Management Committee fully explore this proposal, but Tom Pitts' request was for an Implementation Committee action and that the ultimate decision should be made by that committee. If folks have additional comments on the proposal or the response, it would be helpful if they submitted those in advance of the next MC webinar, May 5, 2014.

7. D.C. Trip planning – Tom Pitts said the group is scheduling meetings and working out conflicts. Participants include three Tribal representatives from the San Juan Program (Cathy Condon, Darryl Vigil, and Stanley Pollack). Mike Green, Randy Kirkpatrick, Bill Miller, Darin Bird, Henry Maddux, Steve Wolff, Pete Cavalli, Tom Pitts and Patrick McCarthy. Leslie James will participate on Thursday and Friday. Bill Miller and Pete Cavalli provide important biological representation. Tom said they're preparing the non-Federal Program participants request supporting the President's budget. Some years past, support letters were sent to the Appropriations committees, but those are generally no longer feasible; however Tom will solicit them from non-Federal constituent groups (environmental, water users, tribes, and states where possible). The meetings are scheduled for April 8-11. Tom has been updating the itinerary and will try to get a new one out tomorrow. Patrick thanked Tom Pitts for taking the lead on this and thanked Henry and others who are setting up the Congressional meetings. Tom Chart echoed that appreciation.
8. Continued discussion of draft letter on risks associated with energy development in or in close proximity to endangered fish critical habitat – Tom Chart discussed changes reflected in the revised draft Kantola sent the Committee. The Program Director's office is asking: 1) for final Management Committee approval of this draft that incorporates the comments received; and 2) that Management Committee members seek approval from their Implementation Committee representative and report by April 18. Following that, the Program Director's office we would prepare the letter for Noreen's signature. However, Leslie James expressed concerns about potential unintended political consequences (the letter could make the Program *appear* to be getting into oil and gas [and, therefore, economic development] issues). As written, the letter targets oil and gas, but the Program might have similar concerns about any kind of development. >Leslie will send specific comments to the Program Director's office. Tom Chart reminded the committee that this letter was requested by Utah DNR chief Mike Styler on the September 2013 Implementation Committee webinar. Michelle said Colorado is seeking comments back from Mike King on the draft, so they also would like a little more time. Henry noted the letter's purpose is to get the Division directors together and explain our concerns; therefore, if the letter gets bogged down, we might consider an alternate approach with a letter just saying this is a concern we'd like to discuss with them. Tom Chart agreed. The Committee will discuss this again on their next webinar on May 5, 2014.
9. Flows and Water Acquisition Committee update – Jana Mohrman said so far 2014 looks like an above average water year throughout most of the basin. The March 1 forecast predicts runoff in the moderately wet category (first time for Aspinall since the ROD was signed in May 2012), meaning 40 days at half-bank and 10 days at bankfull flows. The prediction could change, of course (actual spring operations will be based on the May 1 forecast). Technical work (modeling) on Green River flow protection is ongoing. The Geomorphology work group chaired by Kirk LaGory has drafted a White Paper, which includes recommendations on how the Recovery Program could validate sediment transport expectations of its spring flow recommendations. More specifically the work group will meet on Friday, March 21, to discuss data that could be collected this spring on the Gunnison River to take advantage of wetter than average runoff. The objective would be to test incipient motion (prepares spawning habitat) thresholds. Tom Pitts said the impetus for this group is refining first-cut flow recommendations and investigating uncertainties identified in those recommendations (flow recommendations need to be firmed up to pass muster for State legal protection required for downlisting). Tom Pitts is concerned that the sediment monitoring timelines proposed in the draft White Paper may be contrary to our recovery timelines. The Water Acquisition Committee is meeting via webinar on April 15 from 9 a.m. to noon. Tom Chart noted that forecasted flows at the Palisade gage for April look favorable, i.e. it does not look like there will be a repeat of the 'April Hole' situation this year. Tom Pitts said the water users agree we need a process to monitor this and will make suggestions before April 1. Jana said Ron Thomason and Max Schmidt have both offered suggestions and folks are interested in cooperating. Brent said they have a coordination meeting scheduled for next week (March 26).

10. Flaming Gorge spring flow request – Tom Chart sent the draft flow request letter to the Biology Committee on February 26, requesting any comments by March 4. Tom subsequently sent a revised draft letter to the Management Committee on March 18. In this draft, he clarified that if spills occur, they will only occur if hydrology dictates (and then Program would need to determine how to respond to burbot concerns). The FGTWG kick-off meeting is scheduled for this afternoon, March 20, 2014. The Committee had no additional comments and approved the draft. Clayton asked that Western be copied on the letter and Tom Chart agreed.
11. Update on Colorado State Water Plan – Michelle Garrison said the Basin Implementation Plans are the current focus and are due in draft in July. The next step will be incorporating those into the statewide plan. The White River group is considering the idea of a carve-out for future development. The Gunnison group is focusing on risk management and Compact issues. All existing flow recommendations and existing instream flow rights (and some additional ones in certain basins) are being incorporated. Michelle can share the draft basin plans with this group in July, if interested, which the group was. Jana asked about modeling for the Colorado and Gunnison plans and Michelle said they should have what they need from the state model, which already incorporates flow recommendations.
12. Capital projects updates – Brent Uilenberg gave an update.
 - Tusher Wash – The draft EIS from NRCS being reviewed by Reclamation and the Program Director’s office. Additional PIT antennas will be installed in the canal on March 23. Reclamation is considering a barrier with a possible electric component as a permanent solution to entrainment into the Green River Canal. Kevin McAbee said they expect a Biological Assessment for the NRCS portion of the project in the very near future so the Service can complete a biological opinion before summer. Brent said we’ll also get information on how the Hogback Fish Weir is working this irrigation season. With that data and the data Tusher data through this irrigation season, should have the information needed to know how to proceed on the barrier.
 - OMID – Work on canal structures will be completed next week and will result in some water savings this year and help maintain baseflows. The Phase 2 (regulating reservoir) construction contract is anticipated for August or September with completion in fall 2015. Reclamation is meeting with OMID regarding Phase 3 options, and likely will do Canal 1 & 2 interconnect pipeline and miscellaneous structures (construction 2015-2016). Following that, Reclamation can determine funds remaining for laterals replacement where landowners volunteer to participate.
13. March 6 Implementation Committee webinar follow-up – Nothing further.
14. Review previous meeting assignments – See Attachment 2.
15. Schedule next meeting, webinar, or conference call – The Committee tentatively scheduled May 5, 1 -3 p.m. MDT (if Mark Sturm can participate for Melissa Trammell). Topics will include multi-species recovery plan proposal, draft energy letter, and D.C. trip follow-up. Given the difficulty, the Management and Implementation committees are having scheduling meetings and webinars, Angela Kantola suggested shifting to a standing, recurring meeting time model, beginning 6 months out. Leslie James and others agreed that would be a good idea. >Angela Kantola will draft a schedule for consideration and send a Doodle poll to schedule both the next Management Committee webinar and face-to-face meeting. Suggestions are welcome from Management Committee members as to future venue(s) for an August face-to-face meeting, which was held for many years previous in Cheyenne, WY.

ADJOURN: ~12:30 p.m.

Attachment 1: Participants

Colorado River Management Committee Webinar, March 20, 2014

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Michelle Garrison	State of Colorado
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
Steve Wolff	State of Wyoming
Bridget Fahey	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
Patrick McCarthy	The Nature Conservancy
Clayton Palmer	Western Area Power Administration
Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
Henry Maddux	State of Utah

Nonvoting Member:

Tom Chart	Recovery Program Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
-----------	---

Recovery Program Staff:

Tom Czapla	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Kevin McAbee	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others

Robert King	State of Utah
Jana Mohrman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jerry Wilhite	Western Area Power Administration
Krissy Wilson	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation
Andrew Gilmore	Bureau of Reclamation
Harry Crockett	Colorado Parks and Wildlife

Attachment 2 Meeting Assignments

1. **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 & 2013 *Program Highlights*, we used the \$37.4M annualized estimate. **Western** contracted with Argonne to model and report actual Flaming Gorge power replacement costs going back to 2001. Subsequently, **Western** 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.) *(done)*. **Tom Chart** will ask **Dave Campbell** to work with the SJCC to determine their additional costs not currently reported. *A Cost Subcommittee was established and met several times via conference call to review the proposal for and results of the power replacement costs analysis. 1/29/14: Water user and Colorado additional costs added and documented in Kantola's Briefing Book Pie Chart Data spreadsheet. Power revenue replacement costs "placeholder" from previous years retained until Argonne report finalized and approved (currently in revision). 3/20: Tom Pitts said that a few adjustments on water user contributions will need to be made, but seem to have the totals and process for updating pretty much squared away.*
2. **Michelle Garrison** will discuss with Ted Kowalski (and get back to Brent or Bob Norman) on the proposal of having the Programs ask the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) to obligate \$200K of Colorado's San Juan NFWF funds by putting an "Upper Basin" label on them and then invoicing against that \$200K for Upper Colorado NFWF capital expenditures (e.g., Tusher \$40K and others) in the future. **Michelle** will discuss with Brent and Ted *(done)*. *3/20 - The New Mexico agreement expired and NM is working on renewing, after which this could move forward.*
3. D.C. Briefing Trip: **Tom Pitts** will provide names to Tom Chart's office to reserve a block of hotel rooms in D.C. *Done.* **John Shields** will check to see if a room is available in the Capitol Visitor's Center for a luncheon on Friday, April 11. **Tom Pitts** will hold a conference call among trip participants soon and will take care of letters from the water users. *3/20: John reserved.* **Melissa Trammell** will invite additional Park Service folks in Washington, D.C., to the meeting scheduled with the Park Service.
4. **Committee members** will provide comments on the draft energy development letter by February 28. *3/20 – Will discuss on next webinar May 5, 2013. Committee members should submit additional comments two weeks in advance (Leslie James plans to submit comments).*
5. **Patrick McCarthy** and **Robert Wigington** will provide edits for clarity/brevity on the RIPRAP text (based on Tom Pitts' comments) and get that to **>Angela Kantola** to distribute for a round of Management Committee e-mail discussion and then subsequent approval via e-mail. Angela Kantola will incorporate these and other text changes, make any changes needed to the tables, and send the package back to the Committee in track changes for final round of comment/approval.
6. **Angela Kantola** will send out a revised version of the annual depletion charge budget adjustment update (Attachment 3) in October when Reclamation's FY15 contribution is known.
7. **Kevin McAbee** and **Colorado Parks & Wildlife** will draft an action plan for smallmouth bass control in Ridgway, including all the options and contingencies.

8. **Angela Kantola** will draft a schedule for consideration and send a Doodle poll to schedule both the next Management Committee webinar and face-to-face meeting. Suggestions are welcome from **Management Committee members** as to future venue(s) for an August face-to-face meeting, which was held for many years previous in Cheyenne.

Attachment 3

COLORADO RIVER RECOVERY PROGRAM

¹FY 2015 DEPLETION CHARGE AND ANNUAL BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS

March 3, 2014

ITEM	FY 2014	FY 2015
² DEPLETION CHARGE:	\$20.24	\$20.54
³ AGENCY ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS:	FY 2014	FY 2015
⁴ Bureau of Reclamation (maximum power revenues)	\$5,357,119	\$5,437,476
⁵ Fish and Wildlife Service	\$1,224,152	\$1,242,514
Colorado	\$212,286	\$215,471
Utah	\$149,125	\$151,362
Wyoming	\$47,211	\$47,919
ANNUAL/O&M TOTAL:	\$6,989,893	\$7,094,742

NOTES:

¹Adjustments for 2015 (except for Bureau of Reclamation annual contributions) are based on a 2013 Consumer Price Index increase of 1.5% over 2012 (source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; <http://data.bls.gov/cgi-bin/surveymost> [Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers, Series Id: CUUR0000SA0, Not Seasonally Adjusted, Area: U.S. city average, Item: All items, Base Period: 1982-84=100], released January 16, 2014).

²The balance (unaudited) reported by NFWF in the depletion charge ("Section 7") account was \$675,797.02 as of December 31, 2012.

³FY 2015 depletion charge and budget adjustments become effective October 1, 2014. Agency annual contributions shown are the established contributions; actual contributions may vary somewhat.

⁴Maximum power revenues adjusted for inflation will be calculated using CPI released in October 2014, per PL 106-392. (See Dec. 13, 2004, Management Committee meeting summary for an explanation of the difference.). Figure shown is estimate only, based on January 2014 CPI of 1.5%.

⁵The actual Service FY 15 contribution is expected to be about \$1,237,962 (\$720,293 recovery funds [if not reduced due to sequestration] and \$517,669 hatchery O&M). The actual Service FY 14 total contribution is anticipated to be \$1,489,841 (\$633,858 recovery funds [reduced due to sequestration] + \$517,669 hatchery O&M + \$268,314 Ouray NWR Johnson Bottom RBS recruitment + \$70,000 Tusher Wash fish passage contribution).

Attachment 4

Action Items from the [2013 Sufficient Progress Memo](#)

March 20, 2013

#	Recommended Action Items	Lead	Due Date	Status
General – Upper Basin-wide				
1	Swiftly complete & fully implement an effective, comprehensive <i>Upper Colorado River Basin Nonnative and Invasive Aquatic Species Prevention and Control Strategy</i> .	PDO, States	2013	MC approved 2/11/14.
2	Develop RIRPRAP addendum identifying a subset of specific, tangible actions from the Basinwide Strategy to be accomplished in the next 3 years, including: increased control efforts directed to sources of nonnative predators; adequate rapid response to recent and future “outbreaks”; and a strong outreach campaign that sends the message to the public that only nonnative fisheries that are compatible with endangered species recovery are acceptable.	PDO, States	2013	Addendum approved by States and accepted by USFWS; progress to achieve actions being tracked at Biology and Management committee meetings.
3	Determine how to investigate age-0 and age-1 humpback chub mortality (especially in Black Rocks/Westwater and Desolation canyons) as recommended in the Research Framework. If funds available, Program may develop a 2014 SOW to investigate age-0 and age-1 humpback chub mortality.	Program		CSU's recent robust population estimate analysis more clearly indicates that declines in the Westwater and Black Rock humpback chub populations are due to lapses in recruitment, i.e. adult survival rates have remained stable. PI's agree that reinitiating an Age-0 monitoring component is advisable; PDO will be working to add this work to SOWs.
4	200 age-0 <i>Gila</i> will be brought into captivity from Black Rocks/Westwater when conditions allow.	FWS	2013 2014	Flow conditions inadequate again in 2013; will try again in 2014.
5	A currently funded study at CSU combining Westwater and Black Rocks data sets and exploring alternative population models may shed some light on this issue from a stock assessment perspective.	CSU	2014	Mostly complete: initial results of combined WW/BR report provided during Bestgen presentation on 10/10/13 BC webinar; appropriate portions to be included in individual Black Rocks and Westwater reports.
6	Support research to determine dose response information (for selenium and other forms of contamination, e.g. petrochemicals, heavy metals, and endocrine disruptors) related specifically to the endangered Colorado River fish as well as necessary remediation.	Program	Ongoing	Falls mostly outside Recovery Program, but raising awareness in Colorado pikeminnow recovery plan and hope to leverage work by USGS and EPA.
Green River				
7	Closely coordinate Tusher Wash e-barrier (or other barrier) construction with NRCS's rebuild of the Tusher diversion structure.	PDO, USBR	2014	Construction tentatively scheduled to begin fall 2014, but realistic timeframes still being developed. Alternative presented to BC in January 2014 to provide an electrified weir wall with a fish return in the Green River Canal, downstream of the hydropower facility is being considered. PIT antennas installed March 2013 detected high level of entrainment of razorback sucker and Colorado pikeminnow; additional antenna will be installed in 2014 to further define fish movements.
8	Red Fleet Reservoir has been recommended for reclamation (rotenone) in 2014. 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	2014	UDWR formulating plans to reclaim in 2014.

9.

Yampa River				
9	Complete accounting of past depletions using the StateCU model (Due date from YPBO - 1 st report July 1, 2010; 2 nd report July 1, 2015). The depletion accounting report will include a discussion of the need for flow protection (which would require a peak flow recommendation). The models will be updated through 2010 or 2011.	CWCB		(Also applies to Colorado River.) A contract for the irrigated acreage assessment was awarded in February 2013. Another contract still needs to be awarded to update the dataset. Colorado has given high priority to the Yampa and Colorado river basins portion of this work. .
10	Complete programmatically synthesis of smallmouth bass removal efforts , providing a comprehensive evaluation of the Program's removal efforts (draft reports due June 15 [Part 2] and August 15 [Part 3]). The Recovery Program will review the final report on escapement from Elkhead Reservoir (Part 1, completed May 1, 2013) and determine appropriate adaptive-management response.	CSU	2014	Part 1 of 3-part report completed; Parts 2 & 3 in review; projection tool being rolled out. See also Basinwide Strategy (item #1).
11	Conduct a programmatically synthesis of northern pike removal efforts (2011-2012) to evaluate current removal efforts in the context of northern pike life history throughout the Yampa River drainage.	CSU	3/1/14	Report due to PDO 3/1/14 (final to BC 6/15/14). See also Basinwide Strategy (item #1).
12	The Program office will work with CPW to determine if any of the pike management actions identified in CPW's 2010 'Yampa River Basin Aquatic Wildlife Management Plan management actions are not being adequately addressed and seek necessary remedies.	PDO, CPW		CPW provided initial assessment 5/1/13; PDO returned comments 5/17/13; discussion pending. See also Basinwide Strategy (item #1).
Duchesne River				
13	Rely on findings of project # C18/19 to determine how to proceed with regard to currently unknown contribution of smallmouth bass or walleye produced in the Duchesne River below Starvation and entering Green River (Ute Tribe apparently not currently conducting nonnative fish removal.)		2/26/14	C-18/19 report peer reviews completed; BC reviewed and returned for minor revisions in Jan. 2014; final draft to BC 2/26. See also Basinwide Strategy (item #1).
White River				
14	Finalize flow recommendations as part of White River Management Plan.	PDO, FWS, UDWR	Winter 2014	Per White River Management Plan schedule: develop flow recommendations Fall 2013-Winter 2014; complete Program review Spring/Summer 2014; finalize management plan and flow recommendations Summer 2014.
Colorado River				
15	Explore opportunities to continue delivering Ruedi water (or a portion thereof) to replace the release of 10,825 acre-feet of Ruedi Reservoir water that concluded in 2012.	FWS, USBR, CRWCD		
16	Complete CFOPS Phase III report.	Water Users	6/1/13	Draft expected by March 31 and final by June 1.
17	HUP call participants will continue to discuss screen operation with the goal of more frequent operation at the GVIC canal (recognized as the oldest and most problematic design). The Program will continue to evaluate ways to improve screening operations and methods, and the Program will continue to fund salvage operations of fish remaining in the canals at the end of the irrigation season.	PDO, USBR, screen operators	2014	USBR and OMID investigating mechanisms to operate GVIC Obermyer gate at lower flows.

Gunnison River				
18	Mechanically remove northern pike from Crawford Reservoir.	CPW	2014	Beginning in 2014