



Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Dated: April 4, 2013

April 2, 2013, Management Committee Webinar Draft Summary

CONVENE Webinar: 9:00 a.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper
2. Approve February 7, 2013, revised draft meeting summary (All, 5 min) – Angela Kantola posted the revised draft summary (dated February 13, 2012) to the listserver on February 13. Angela posted a draft revised summary addressing comments from Colorado to the listserver on March 29. Tom Pitts provided additional editorial suggestions on April 1, which Angela showed the Committee on the webinar. The Committee approved the summary as revised; Angela Kantola will post the final summary to the listserver (*done*).
3. Review/approval of draft RIPRAP revisions and assessment and draft FY14-15 Program Guidance – The Committee reviewed these documents as drafted by the Program Director’s office (posted to the listserver February 7) and subsequently revised by the technical committees (to be posted to the listserver with this agenda). (On March 5, 2013, the Implementation Committee gave the Management Committee their proxy to approve these documents.)

More general RIPRAP revisions and a “tune-up” for next year was discussed at the Biology Committee (to which Tom Pitts will add clarifying comments) and mentioned in Angela’s email of March 18. Tom has recommended that we need to decide what RIPRAP items are complete/ongoing/pending (and clarify the meaning of these terms), establish criteria for adding items to the RIPRAP and for what goes in the assessment column, and generally consider any necessary overhaul of the RIPRAP in light of its longevity and the inevitable loss of consistency and cohesiveness that occurs over time. Tom Pitts said he wants to make sure the RIPRAP remains an action plan and doesn’t become a wish list. The Service uses the RIPRAP to assess sufficient progress and ESA compliance for more than 2,000 water project, so it’s important that it be a clear and concise document of actions necessary for recovery. John Shields agreed and asked about criteria and Tom Pitts agreed we need to be clear about criteria for what goes into the RIPRAP. The Committee would like to provide ample time for Program participants to provide recommendations for improving the RIPRAP and so changed the deadline for comments in this regard from April 15 to June 1. >The Program Director’s office will alert the technical committees to this change. After comments are received, The Program Director’s office will compile and share them with the Management and technical committees along with recommendations for how to proceed.

RIPRAP text: approved as amended by the technical committees (>the PD’s office will update the table of contents).

RIPRAP tables:

General: no changes; Assmt – Gen Stocking tab: >PD’s office will add stocking records

back to 1996.

Green: The Committee asked about the note in the technical committee comments column “Gene noted the 404 permit, if received, is about a year out.” As background, Reclamation signed a ROD on the Narrows Project on January 2013. (Final EIS at <http://www.usbr.gov/uc/envdocs/eis/narrows/FinalEIS/FEIS.pdf>). Narrows is a proposed non-federal dam and 17,000af reservoir proposed by the Sanpete Water Conservancy District on Gooseberry Creek, a tributary of the Price River. The site is ~16 miles upstream of Scofield Reservoir. Narrows would require 5,491 acre-feet of water per year from the Gooseberry Creek drainage, the equivalent of 6.6 percent of the annual yield of the Price River above the city of Price. The project would benefit irrigators and municipal water users in Sanpete County. In the FEIS, Reclamation analyzed two federal actions: 1) approval or denial of a loan application under the Small Reclamation Projects Act; and 2) the licensing of SWCD's use of 304.5 acres of Reclamation withdrawn land for construction of the dam and reservoir. In the ROD, Reclamation agreed to license the use of the federal land, but not accept a loan application or fund a Small Reclamation Project Act loan. The Sanpete Water Conservancy District now is working through the process to obtain a 404 permit for the Narrows Project. Gene Shawcroft mentioned during the Water Acquisition Committee webinar that if the 404 permit is received, it is about a year out. The Committee discussed the Price River items and agreed that the >PD's office will provide wording to revise rows 48-50 and send this to Management Committee for final approval (and will reference Price River Position paper [in line 46]). >PD will fix line 73 (should reference the completed report in the merged cells).

Yampa: The Committee discussed line 82 (Yampa River Discussion Group and shift of this conversation to the Yampa River Roundtable). No changes. Tom Chart noted that prior to public meetings the Program needs to firm up our nonnative strategy. To that end, Tom, Pat Martinez and State representatives are working to schedule a meeting among the States' fisheries chiefs and interested Management Committee members (suggested MC participants - States, Environmental, Water Users, NPS).

Duchesne: Consider how to address lines 14 & 17 next year when CCAA/SHA agreement is complete.

Colorado: Dave Speas may have some comments about how items in the Aspinall Study Plan were incorporated in the Colorado and Gunnison RIPRAP tables (which he will provide by June 1 as part of general RIPRAP tune-up comments).

The Committee discussed when the Program should direct attention to flows in the Colorado River below the confluence of the Green River, i.e., in Cataract Canyon (Colorado; lines 111 and 112). Patrick McCarthy suggested that to be consistent with revised RIPRAP text, this activity would occur after an evaluation of flow recommendations in the Gunnison, Colorado, and Green rivers was complete. Brent pointed out that, in reality, the Program is very limited in its ability to manage flows in Cataract Canyon. Flood control criteria at Delta and at the head of the Grand Valley are limiting factors for spring flows. With regard to base flows, there's nothing that can be manipulated after Grand Valley return flows enter the river. Melissa Trammell added that it also will be difficult to even assess the adequacy of the flows. >Melissa offered to continue looking for what documents commit the Program to addressing this reach.

Line 87 – deleted portion about NPS & USGS flow evaluation as it's still in the planning stages.

Dolores: John Shields asked what the process is to determine if nonnative fish in the Dolores pose a threat. The concern is that this could become a source of smallmouth bass

for the Colorado River. The Dolores Work Group is active in this area. >The Program Director's office, Pat, Dave & Harry will add language to assessment column of row 7 regarding that work group and provide that to the Management Committee along with the Price River language. Tom Pitts suggested that the Miramonte Reservoir treatment be made a new RIPRAP line item.

Assuming e-mail approval of revised text for the tables related to the Price and Dolores rivers, the Management Committee approved the RIPRAP tables and text with recognition that a more thorough, overarching review and revision of the RIPRAP will occur by this time next year.

FY 14-15 Program Guidance

Text: No comments. Dave Speas said he is comfortable with the proposed scope of work format.

Tables: Angela Kantola introduced the budget table and the concern about potential impacts of sequestration on both Service funds and Reclamation power revenues. Brent Uilenberg said it's still unclear whether sequestration may apply to Program power revenues. Clayton said it was originally assumed that sequestration would not apply to power revenues, but we've been told otherwise (based on an OMB report, which >Clayton will send to the Committee). This topic is still being discussed. Potential reductions are 10% (apparently 12% in the Service) total from FY13 to 14 and 12% (apparently 14% in the Service) total from FY13 to 15. The scopes of work deadline is only a month away (May 3), so the Committee agreed to request SOWs be submitted now as per the current tables (which are not reduced for sequestration), and then the Program Director's office will make recommendations for how to reduce the FY14-15 budget for sequestration. Tom Chart said that, if possible, his office will provide *some* guidance in advance of SOW submittal. The Committee agreed that the Program must plan for FY14-15 as if sequestration will occur and approved the Program Guidance with this caveat.

4. D.C. Trip review – Patrick McCarthy thanked John Shields for the helpful trip synopsis he mailed the Committee yesterday, and for his work to coordinate the trip and the total of 34 briefing meetings. This year's four-day trip format seemed to work well for the eight-member delegation (five from the San Juan Program). Dr. William Miller's participation was critical as Program staff could not attend due to the prohibition in P.L. 112-270. Much of this year's briefing focused on thanking the delegation for their support of H.R. 6060. Also "requesting in advance" support for annual appropriations (recognizing that we won't know what those are until the President's budget is released). The group's meetings also provided an update on the Programs' progress. Much interest was expressed in the challenge of nonnative fish control and concern was expressed by some staffers about the anticipated delay in downlisting Colorado pikeminnow. They asked the reasons, whether other species might also be delayed, etc. Support for the Programs and their accomplishments remains strong. The briefing group will need to be prepared in future for more questions on return-on-investment and downlisting and delisting dates. Tom Pitts said only ~10 of the ~25 folks who committed to attend the Congressional luncheon this year were able to do so (perhaps because it was held on Friday; also, on the House side, there was a Western Caucus retreat that day.) John Shields added that the group's reception in the

Interior offices was very positive. Tom Pitts said when they met with Assistant Secretary Anne Castle and folks from Reclamation, the group commended the Grand Junction Reclamation office and Brent Uilenberg for their work in managing the Programs' capital projects. John said the President's budget is to be released April 10 and he has drafted support letters and will be communicating with non-Federal Program participants about those and deadlines.

5. Updates

- a. Capital projects – Elkhead: Brent said the \$98K Elkhead screen repair was paid for with capital funds. The River District has asked the Committee to acknowledge that the Program will not seek any legal remedy against their contractor for this repair and the Committee confirmed they had discussed that and would not seek legal remedy. The River District determined they would not seek legal remedy, either. Brent mentioned the water leased from Elkhead Reservoir in 2010 that was carried over to 2011, but never used. The District had forgotten to invoice for this amount, but has done so now and Program is paying for that from FY13 annual funds. Tusher Wash: Brent said they've received additional design work ("30% design") for the e-barrier and they will get this under contract (~\$40K) with Smith-Root through remaining NFWF capital funds. The Committee concurred with moving ahead on this. Remaining design and construction of the e-barrier would be done as a component of the overall construction of the Tusher Wash Diversion rehabilitation. Horsethief Ponds: Brent recounted that Horsethief was constructed for both the Upper Basin (5/6) and San Juan (1/6) programs and paid for with capital appropriated funds. Reclamation had recommended that the San Juan Program provide \$200K of their share through a transfer \$200K of their NFWF funds (from Colorado and New Mexico) to the Upper Colorado NFWF account. Michelle Olsen encountered some difficulties with this proposal since Colorado no longer has an Upper Basin NFWF account and Colorado thinks they would need a new contract to move the money and maybe even new state legislation. In response, Bob Norman has suggested that instead of transferring funds from the Colorado San Juan NFWF account, the Programs ask NFWF to obligate the \$200K of Colorado 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 Garrison will discuss this proposal with Ted and get back to Brent or Bob Norman. The rest of the Committee was comfortable with this proposal if Colorado approves. OMID: Brent said the next thing to contract on this project will be the check structures. They just had a very positive value engineering review and may be able to reduce some costs (e.g., by using pre-cast concrete segments for linear weirs). At this point in the fiscal year, Reclamation can probably only use the '8a Program' (Section 8(a) of the Small Business Act), from which they've had excellent past results (Kissner construction meets the '8a Program' requirements). The check gates will be much simpler than the GVWM gates.
- b. Recovery Plans – Tom Chart said the Colorado Pikeminnow Recovery Team met in November of 2012 and recognized the need to include States on the team in light of the nonnative fish threat. Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico have joined the team and the recovery and writing teams met in Albuquerque last week. They discussed the demographic criteria extensively and agreed to review what we know about population

dynamics and discuss the importance of tributaries and the upper and lower Colorado rivers. The writing team will review the recovery criteria and add appropriate detail about threat removal criteria. These assignments are due in mid-May and then the team will meet in early June to develop a more cohesive revised plan that can then receive internal Service review. Subsequently, the draft will be sent to the recovery programs for review. In the schedule he provided after the last Management Committee meeting, Tom had hoped to publish in the Federal Register by then end of the fiscal year. Now with the expansion of the Team to include State representatives, the end of the calendar year looks more realistic. >Tom Chart will provide the Committee an updated Colorado pikeminnow recovery plan timeline and summary of last week's meeting in the near future. The timeline for the other species is reflected in RIPRAP – the Service hopes to convene the humpback chub team in 2014.

6. Impacts of sequestration hiring freeze on Program activities – Tom Pitts asked if the Program Director's office will be able to hire behind Debbie Felker who is retiring May 3. Tom Chart said the Service is going through a process to get exemptions to the hiring freeze, beginning with seasonal hires for the CRFP offices. Tom Pitts asked if the Service is making the point in those exemption requests that this is an ESA compliance request; Tom Chart said yes. Tom Chart said he's also been working on a shared position with Ecological Services for an instream flow coordinator. That process started some months ago, but is caught up in the hiring freeze process and an exemption has been requested. Tom Chart said his office had been operating without this position until we had a better handle on the long-term funding legislation. Now with Debbie retiring May 3, the Program Director's office is getting into a pretty untenable situation. Tom will keep Program partners informed on the status of these positions/exemption requests.
7. Review previous meeting assignments and sufficient progress action items – See Attachments 1 and 2.
8. Schedule next meeting, webinar, or conference call – The Committee scheduled a webinar on Tuesday, May 28 from 1:00 p.m. – 4: 30 p.m. to review draft elements of Service's sufficient progress memo (to be provided to the Committee in late April), and other items.
9. Other items – John Shields said Anne Castle asked him some time ago to provide his views on whether there should be a recovery program for the Grand Canyon; John recently provided that and >will send a copy to the Committee (*done*).

ADJOURN: 1:45 p.m.

Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee Webinar, April 2, 2013

Management Committee Voting Members:

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

Nonvoting Member:

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

Recovery Program Staff:

Pat Martinez	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Czapla	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others

Harry Crockett	Colorado Parks & Wildlife
Jana Mohrman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation
Jerry Wilhite	Western Area Power Administration

Attachment 1
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 *Program Highlights*, we used the \$37.4M annualized estimate. By July 2012, **WAPA** will complete modeling and report actual power replacement costs going back to 2001. Subsequently, **WAPA** will provide annual power replacement cost for the previous year each January for inclusion in the *Program Highlights* pie charts. Those pie charts will include a footnote explaining the calculation and assumptions. **Program participants** will identify other significant costs that have not previously reported (e.g., the Granby component of 10,825 which is estimated at \$16M, \$1.25M contributed by Colorado for GVWM and \$1.5M for OMID, CRWCD contributed property for OMID, etc.). **Tom Chart** will ask **Dave Campbell** to work with the SJCC to determine their additional costs not currently reported. *1/30/12: Tom Pitts provided additional costs to be included in the briefing book pie chart; need to follow up with documentation for the record. 3/21/12: Clayton will be asking modelers/analysts to look at economic impact of re-operation of Flaming Gorge Dam beginning in FY2001. Tom Pitts said P.L. 106-392 recognizes power replacement costs as non-reimbursable; is that the same thing as economic costs? John Shields asked why not include the ~7 years of "study flows" preceding 2001. Clayton will do both, since Flaming Gorge was originally reoperated in water year 1991 (a separate table for 2001 and forward will be included responding specifically to the P.L. 106-392). Clayton also will include analysis to show the year in which FG was reoperated under the new EIS (2006 to present). John said he and Robert were asked about retail power cost levels yesterday; Leslie doesn't believe that can be reported since each individual utility has a different amount of hydropower in their mix. Tom Pitts suggested setting up a work group of himself, Leslie, Clayton, Robert Wigington, Angela Kantola and/or Tom Chart; Tom Pitts will send out preliminary materials. 6/26/12: Work group held conference call 4/27/12; Argonne working on power replacement costs, water users working on their additional costs, San Juan also working on their additional costs. 6/22/12: Clayton provided the group a description of how they'll conduct the economic analysis of Flaming Gorge dam reoperation. 1/24/13: Updated numbers for power replacement costs or water user contributions were not available in time for inclusion in the 2013 briefing book. The Cost Subcommittee held a call on January 9 and identified the need to outline the process for arriving at fully substantiated power replacement costs going forward. If more substantiated power replacement costs are to be included in the 2014 briefing book, the numbers will need to have been fully vetted and agreed upon by the Management Committee sub-group (and perhaps the Management Committee as a whole) and go through the peer review described by Western by mid-December 2013. Les Poch provided new runs of the power model and an assessment of the economic impact of reoperating Flaming Gorge Dam for endangered fish species for the period 2001 – 2011 and those were discussed with Cost Subcommittee members on January 24 and 25. 2/7/13: See agenda item #6. **Clayton Palmer** will think we can get to an estimate of power costs in time for Management Committee approval by mid-December 2013 (to meet the deadline for the 2014 briefing book), but it will depend on other priorities (like LTEMP); >Clayton will let the Committee know if they can meet the deadline for next year's briefing book. Other contributions which still need to be documented include those from water users and also some from the Colorado's Species Conservation Trust Fund. These need to be described in a*

table and provided for Management Committee review/approval before they're included in the pie chart. 4/2/13: Clayton has established a deadline of no later than the end of the FY to reach a conclusion on replacement power costs. He has a conference call with Argonne tomorrow to discuss the capacity issue. Clayton anticipates the document will be ready within about a month or so. Tom Chart asked that Clayton send it to the team before sending it out for peer review; Clayton agreed. John Shields noted they did get questions about the \$44M estimated power replacement costs on the D.C. trip. Tom Pitts said he's working on the additional water user contributions (should include \$945K CRWCD contribution for OMID reservoir site). Tom Pitts asked **Michelle Garrison** to provide information on any funds from the Native Species Trust Fund (e.g., OMID grant, the \$250K approved for the White River, CPW expenditures). For NSTF funds, it may be best to report by project once they're all expended.

2. The **Program Director's office** will finalize the basinwide strategy that Pat's been working on (the PDO will provide a more specific date - hopefully, in time to affect RIPRAP changes in 2013). Revised document sent to Management and Biology committees on January 13, 2013. 2/7/13: See agenda item#2. **Tom Chart and Pat Martinez will work with Harry, Krissy, and John/Pete** to describe desired outcomes of a meeting with the fish chiefs and the Management Committee and get the meeting scheduled; perhaps in late May (possibly the 20th or 24th in Grand Junction).
3. **Tom Pitts and other key Committee members** will contact Reclamation to encourage them to renew the Green Mountain Reservoir Municipal Recreation Agreement expiring at the end of August. 2/7/13: **Brent Uilenberg** said he thinks they're still discussing the possible term (if they can't do a 5-year agreement in time for this summer, they'll do a 1-year amendment). Brent said the plan is to get the 1-year agreement in place in April (although there won't be surplus water in light of the snowpack). This will be a Shoshone "relaxation" year in which only one unit will operate, so the check settlement won't operate. Brent said we need to quickly convene the reservoir operators to discuss this and the potentially serious situation on the Colorado mainstem this year; >Jana will work to quickly convene a call. Tom Pitts noted Reclamation is still trying to get a 40-year agreement done by August 1. Brent said irrigation diversions began in the Grand Valley this week.
4. **Tom Chart** will distribute the recent Colorado Pikeminnow Recovery Team meeting summary to the Management Committee along with appropriate presentation(s) regarding Colorado pikeminnow status. **Tom** also will provide the recovery plan review schedule. Done; 4/1/13: **Tom Chart** will provide the Committee an updated Colorado pikeminnow recovery plan timeline and summary of last week's meeting in the near future.
5. RIPRAP:
 - a. General: To provide ample time for **Program participants** to provide recommendations for improving the RIPRAP, the deadline for comments was changed to June 1. The **Program Director's office** will alert the technical committees to this change. After comments are received, the **Program Director's office** will compile and share them with the Management and technical committees along with recommendations for how to proceed.
 - b. Text: the **Program Director's office** will update the table of contents.
 - c. Tables: the **Program Director's office** will: 1) add stocking records back to 1996; 2)

Green River - provide wording to revise rows 48-50 regarding the Price River and provide that to Management Committee for final approval (and will reference Price River Position paper [in line 46]); 3) Green River – reference the completed report in the merged cells of line 73; and 4) add a new item for Miramonte to the Dolores table. **Melissa Trammell** offered to continue looking for what documents commit the Program to addressing this reach of the Colorado River below the confluence with the Green River. **Tom Chart, Pat Martinez, Dave Speas, and Harry Crockett** will add language to assessment column of row 7 of the Dolores table regarding that work group and provide that to the Management Committee along with the Price River language.

6. **Clayton Palmer** will send the Committee a copy of the OMB report that says sequestration applies to power revenues.
7. **Michelle Garrison** will discuss with Ted Kowalski (and get back to Brent or Bob Norman regarding) the proposal the Programs ask NFWF to obligate \$200K of Colorado 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.

Attachment 2

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

April 2, 2013

General – Upper Basin-wide				
#	Recommended Action Items	Lead	Due Date	Status
1	The Service will make a recommendation for how to ensure that all new petroleum pipelines have emergency shutoff valves and will investigate the use of the Pipeline Integrity Management Mapping Application (PIMMA) to address existing pipelines potentially needing shutoff valves (e.g., pipelines upstream of or near critical or other important habitat).	FWS	12/31/12	Service may consider asking industry to assist via Section 7 consultation. 2/7/13: Tom Chart said pipeline location information is available (PIMMA), but the Section 7 process may be the best way to address the need for shutoff valves on existing pipelines (perhaps asking project proponents to address existing pipelines when they consult on new projects). Harry Crockett said CPW comments on BLM's resource management plans for oil & gas development as a cooperating agency. If the Service also is commenting, we should be sharing comments; Tom Chart agrees. In the last 6 years, CPW has reviewed: Little Snake FO RMP, Colorado River Valley FO RMP, Kremmling FO RMP, Grand Junction FO RMP, White River FO BLM Oil and Gas RMP, and White River National Forest Oil and Gas RMP) and has been heavily involved in plans such as the Roan Plateau Oil and Gas Leasing Amendment. John Reber said NPS has considered endangered fish and recommended shutoff valves in their comments. Tom Chart said EPA also is working on this and is reviewing their emergency response plans for the Green River (Tom has asked them to include these pipeline crossings in that review).
2	The Program Director's office is working with the Nonnative Fish Subcommittee and signatories to the Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures to address comments on the draft <i>Upper Colorado River Basin Nonnative and Invasive Aquatic Species Prevention and Control Strategy</i> . Following "internal" review by the Recovery Program's Biology and Management committees, the Program will seek external peer review prior to accepting the <i>Strategy</i> as final.	Program	Draft sent 1/13/13	A subgroup of the I&E Committee will refine comments on the I&E section of the <i>Strategy</i> and then have a conference call with the Nonnative Fish Subcommittee. An update of steps leading to completion was provided to the Management and Biology committees on November 15, 2012. The Management Committee asked that the Program Director's office streamline the document somewhat and accelerate the schedule. A revised, draft Nonnative Strategy was sent to the Management and Biology Committees on January 13, 2013. A meeting will be scheduled with State fish chiefs and the Management Committee to discuss controversial issues and the PD's office is working to schedule that meeting.
3	The Service recommends that the Recovery Program carefully review the applicability of proposed screens for nonnative fish on a case-by-case basis and scrutinize screen designs, including projected operation and maintenance costs in the future. And, that the Recovery Program fully recognizes that screens are only	<i>Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures</i> signatories	Ongoing	See item #2 re: <i>Basinwide Strategy</i> .

	a component of a multi-faceted nonnative fish control strategy (e.g., one that adheres to the NNF Stocking Procedures, promotes compatible sportfisheries, and prevents new nonnative fish threats).			
4	Revised Integrated Stocking Plan needs to be completed.	PDO	12/31/12 3/31/13	Draft sent to <i>ad hoc</i> group 4/13/12; conference call held 5/9/12. Revised draft to <i>ad hoc</i> group 9/27/12; comments due Oct. 31. : The Program Director's Office provided a revised draft to the <i>ad hoc</i> group on by March 26, 2013.
5	The Program Director's Office will monitor results from ongoing humpback chub population estimates (Deso-Gray 2010-2011; Black Rocks and Westwater 2011-2012 and monitoring (Cataract Canyon annual CPUE; Yampa River information gathered through nonnative fish management projects). The Program Director's Office convened a panel to discuss humpback chub genetics and captivity and identify actions necessary to ensure the survival and recovery of humpback chub and an implementation plan for those actions in 2011. 200 age-0 Gila will be brought into captivity from Black Rocks/Westwater in 2012 (relates to broodstock development once fish are determined to be humpback chub).	PDO, Service, UDWR	Deso-Gray data reported annually; Black Rocks draft final report due 8/1/13; Westwater draft final report due FY13.	Results reviewed annually. Bringing age-0 <i>Gila</i> from Black Rocks into captivity was planned for fall 2012, but deferred until spring due to high mortality risk from low flow conditions. 4/2/13: CSU now has the combined Black Rocks and Westwater data and is working on a more rigorous, combined analysis.
Green River				
6	An RFP for a 2012-2013 mortality study and literature review is anticipated in April 2012. Meanwhile, Program participants are investigating the potential for an electrical barrier at the head of the canal as one option to reduce or eliminate entrainment (and thus, "take") of fish in the canal.	Tusher Wash <i>ad hoc</i> group.		No response to RFP; dropped. Biology Committee discussed in July and October and endorses electric barrier option, which is being pursued. Passive PIT-antenna was installed spring 2013.
7	Red Fleet Reservoir has been recommended for reclamation (rotenone). A microchemical analysis of otoliths from both the reservoir and the river is underway to better understand the contribution of walleye to critical habitat from this potential source population.	UDWR	2014	Otoliths processed; draft report in review; data will be included in draft final C18/19 report due October 1, 2012 (behind schedule due to PI illness). Red Fleet very low and UDWR plans to rotenone in 2014 with funding assistance from Program.
Yampa River				
8	CWCB is scheduled to complete accounting of past depletions using the StateCU model by the spring of 2012. The depletion accounting report will include a discussion of the need for flow protection (which would require a peak flow recommendation). The Water Acquisition Committee will continue to discuss the need for a peak flow recommendation.	CWCB, Water Acquisition Committee	June 2012 12/31/12	Depletion accounting for Yampa & Colorado rivers will be based on 2005 consumptive use (irrigated acreage based on satellite images and some aerial photography). CWCB is double-checking irrigated acreage, will have it verified by the Water Commissioner (hopefully by December 31, 2012), and then can run the model. Contractor began work on irrigated acreage portion (correcting the 1993 and 2005 estimates, but 2010 estimates may not be complete for use in this exercise) in early February 2013. Another contract still needs to be awarded to

				update dataset. The models were going to be updated through 2010 or 2011, but probably can be updated through 2012, though it could take a little longer. Colorado has prioritized the Yampa and Colorado river basins portion of this work.
9	CSU will complete the programmatic synthesis of smallmouth bass removal efforts , providing a comprehensive evaluation of the Program's removal efforts as well as a thorough assessment of escapement from Elkhead Reservoir (draft final report due to Recovery Program 8/31/2012). The Recovery Program will review the final report on escapement from Elkhead Reservoir and determine appropriate adaptive-management response. CSU also is conducting a programmatic synthesis of northern pike removal efforts (2011-2012) to evaluate current removal efforts in the context of northern pike life history throughout the Yampa River drainage (draft final report due to Recovery Program 6/30/13).	CSU, Program, CPW	Draft final smallmouth bass synthesis report due 10/1/12 (behind schedule).	The programmatic synthesis report will consist of three parts and each will be separately peer-reviewed. Part 1, Elkhead escapement has been peer reviewed. Part 2, Population Dynamics was due October 1, 2012, and Part 3, Projection Tool, will follow shortly thereafter. The three parts will then be finalized in one document. The NNFSC continues to evaluate opportunities and priorities for applying appropriate responses to source populations. Water users have met with local water and sportfish interests to build on preliminary results.
10	Native fish conservation areas are being evaluated as part of the draft basinwide nonnative fish strategy. Subsequently, applicability to the Yampa River will be evaluated.	Program, CPW		See item #2 re: <i>Basinwide Strategy</i> .
11	CPW has detailed its ongoing and anticipated pike management actions throughout the drainage in its 2010 'Yampa River Basin Aquatic Wildlife Management Plan (CDOW 2010).' CPW will tabulate these activities for the Program Director's Office and, based upon Program Office feedback, will provide management objectives and actions for any waters within the drainage that CPW and the Program Office mutually agree are inadequately addressed by the 2010 Plan.	CPW		Pending. Tabulation complete and was to go to PDO by September 30, 2012. Joint recommendations from PDO and CPW for how to address any inadequacies will be made at the NNF workshop. 4/2/13: Harry anticipates sending this out by the end of this week.
White River				
12	A working draft <i>Flow Recommendations for the Endangered Fish of the White River, Colorado and Utah</i> was sent to the Biology and Water Acquisition committees and GRUWAT on July 1, 2011. Conflicting comments were received. A revised draft is expected by midsummer 2012. Work on a PBO is anticipated subsequent to report approval.	PDO	Summer 2012. 4/2/3/12.	Pending. Good progress is being made and TNC is providing assistance. PDO, TNC, and water users (CO and UT) met 12/10/12 to review recent hydrologic analyses, which served as a preliminary response to water users' comments on the draft flow recommendation report. Participants recommended development of a White River Management Plan (including some level of future water development + recovery actions to offset depletion effects). The Management Plan likely will entail some StateMod runs.
13	Program scheduled to begin specific effort to remove smallmouth bass in 2012. CPW will propose plans to removing bag limit for smallmouth bass (and possibly other nonnative sport fishes) in the 400 yards below Kenney Reservoir that still has limits in	CPW, UDWR		White River smallmouth bass removal conducted by Service & CPW; additional electric seining also conducted. CPW has prepared an issue paper on the bag limit for Commission consideration in this regulation cycle. (Regulation expected to

	2013. Recovery Program supports multi-agency effort to designate White River as native fish conservation area.			be finalized in November and go into effect in March 2013.)
--	--	--	--	---

Colorado River				
14	Recovery Program participants will consider options and opportunities for meeting flow recommendations on a more consistent basis after completion of 10,825 agreements.	Program		Ruedi (West slope) agreement completed; Granby (East Slope) is still being negotiated.
15	The CWCB will provide the depletion accounting for 2006-2010 for the Upper Colorado River using State CU in the spring of 2012. If the amount of consumptive use, location of use, and timing of use is not the same as in the past, they would then put that information into StateMod to show how those changes affect the river.	CWCB	June 2012	See item #8.
16	Completion of CFOPS Phase III should be out in draft in August 2012 and report completion anticipated by September 30, 2012.	Water users	September November, 30, 2012. September 30, 2013.	Completion of CFOPS Phase III was to have been out at the end of November 2012, with the report completed by January 31, 2013. Plan to have draft by July 1, 2013, and final report by September 30, 2013.
17	In 2012, additional passes will be devoted in the reach of the Colorado River from Rifle to the Beavertail to remove invading northern pike. CPW will conduct a reconnaissance in floodplain & canal habitats to identify potential sources of this species. Sampling will also be conducted from Silt to Rifle to remove northern pike.	FWS, CPW	Ongoing.	Additional passes completed. A critical new ramp was constructed that improves access. CPW has been working with landowners to get permission for reconnaissance work; some underway. Work will continue in 2013.
Gunnison River				
18	Every effort should be made to ensure that the Gunnison River remains a native fish stronghold. The topic of precluding new species introductions also will be addressed in the draft Nonnative Fish Strategy.	Program		See item #2 re: <i>Basinwide Strategy</i> .
Dolores River				
19	The Nonnative Fish Subcommittee will review response options and propose action item(s) to be reviewed with the Dolores River Dialogue and Lower Dolores Working Group and potentially added to the RIPRAP in 2013.	NNFSC, others.	January 2013.	CPW implemented an emergency order removing all bag and possession limits on smallmouth bass in Miramonte Reservoir and announced plans to rotenone the reservoir in fall 2013.

