

Management Committee Meeting Summary
September 16-17, 2002
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Attendees: See Attachment 1
Assignments are highlighted in the text and listed at the end of the summary.

Monday, September 16

CONVENE - 1:00 p.m.

1. Introductions
2. Review/modify agenda and time allocations and appoint a time-keeper - The agenda was modified as it appears below.
3. Approve June 27, 2002 summary - The summary was approved with two minor revisions.
>Angela Kantola will post the revised summary to the listserver. Tom Pitts asked that
>John Shields send a memo to Program participants regarding the review process the Committee agreed to at the June meeting for information and education materials.
4. Recovery Program updates
 - a. Recovery goals - Bob Muth said the Notice of Availability was published in the Federal Register on August 28. Bob noted that he approved an amendment to the contract with Rich Valdez to complete the recovery goals (additional \$11K from Section 7 funds). Bob said Tom Czapla and Rich Valdez met with GCMRC to discuss ways to increase sampling in the lower mainstem Colorado River through Grand Canyon to get better humpback chub population estimates (a summary of that meeting was sent to the Committee). John Shields urged that we hold a workshop on conservation plans soon.
 - b. Price Stubb Diversion Dam - Brent Uilenberg said they released a draft EA for the rock ramp alternative (or for an alternative that will accommodate hydropower if Jacobsen comes up with a project before construction begins). The public comment deadline is September 23. Brent now expects this project to get back on schedule. Brent added that Reclamation hopes to have a contract for the Grand Valley Project Diversion Dam passage construction awarded for the winter of 2003 and 2004. He expects Grand Valley to ask the Committee for compensation for hydropower losses during construction (perhaps ~\$100K).
 - c. Tusher Wash screen - Sherm Hoskins said he spoke with all three parties and they assured him they believe they can work out an agreement in about a month.
 - d. Lease agreement for Grand Valley water management pumping plant - Tom Blickensderfer said he needs to work with the AG's office to get the legalities of

the lease worked out. Brent said Reclamation had a problem getting a valid appraisal, but now expect to have one by the end of this week.

- e. Grand Valley Irrigation Company fish screen and contract - Brent said the facility was completed in March and operated through June when flows dropped too low. Bob Muth said he sent a letter to Phil Bertrand (GVIC manager) outlining the Program's expectations and commitments regarding GVIC and subsequently met with Phil at the site. Bob will meet again with Phil and Reclamation soon to discuss ways to improve screen operation. Brent said they are working on a few remaining issues: 1) payment on construction from the contractor (GVIC was a subcontractor); 2) O&M costs; 3) permanent vs. portable generator; and 4) modeling to improve operation (to achieve more uniform approach velocities across the screen). Bob said he's confident these issues can be resolved. >Brent will post photographs of the structure to the listserver.

- f. Gunnison River flow recommendations - Bob Muth said the Biology Committee reached agreement at their August meeting on draft peak flow recommendations and instantaneous peak flow targets for the Gunnison River for Chuck McAda to incorporate in the full report. Randy Seaholm said he believes CWCB is still quite concerned with the instantaneous peak targets above 14,000 cfs that would cause flooding for the City of Delta. Randy said they're also concerned with the volumes required to meet the flow recommendations and how the flow recommendations will mesh with the Black Canyon reserved water right filing. The Gunnison River will play an important part role in developing Colorado's compact entitlement. Shane Collins said Western is still concerned about the scientific basis for peak flow targets. Tom Iseman and Randy Seaholm echoed that concern. Bob Muth acknowledged remaining uncertainties, but said those will be addressed through further research. Tom Iseman asked if the Service still intends the flow recommendations to represent what we best understand the fish need (with water availability, etc., to be considered within the EIS process). Brent Uilenberg said he believes we need to let the science say what we best believe the fish need and then proceed to work out implementation based on available water. (As an example, Brent commended the Service for their cooperation and flexibility in achieving flows to benefit the fish on the Gunnison and Colorado rivers during this extreme drought year). Brent said he thinks we should consider the flow recommendations and the Black Canyon water right in one EIS process. Tom Pitts added that he believes Chuck McAda understands the revised draft report must provide justification for the target flows. Tom Pitts asked >the Service to let the Committee know a firm date when the revised report will be available.

- g. Status of estimation/identification of future Gunnison River depletions - Tom Blickensderfer hasn't met with Randy Seaholm, Eric Kuhn, and Tom Pitts yet, and he would like to know if we need to get a better sense of flow recommendations first. Brent said in the absence of other direction from Colorado, Reclamation will use the in-basin estimates based on future demography. Tom Pitts clarified that this wouldn't preclude additional diversions (which could undergo separate consultation under the Section 7 agreement). Randy Seaholm suggested the

following process: complete the flow recommendations, followed by the Park Service's quantification of the reserved water right and/or contract, EIS process, then do a PBO. Tom Pitts said Reclamation needs to know estimated depletions by the time the reserve water right is quantified and recommended that >Tom Blickensderfer will convene a group to lay out a process and alternatives.

- h. Larval razorback and bonytail survival in the Stirrup floodplain - Bob Muth reported that larval endangered razorback sucker and bonytail survived and grew in the presence of nonnative predators in an experimental array at the Stirrup floodplain at Ouray. This demonstrated that we can get larval razorback and bonytail survival in floodplain habitats that are "reset" periodically, giving the native and nonnative fish an "equal start" (as opposed to floodplain depressions that retain nonnative fishes from one year to the next).
- i. Monitoring stocked fish - Bob Muth gave a report on the recent workshop to reassess stocking plans and determine how the Program can best monitor stocked fish. Bob distributed a one-page summary of the workshop. A full summary will be out in draft to the Biology Committee by September 27th (with a table listing all stocked fish). Tom Czapla will get an addendum to the stocking plans out to the States for their review at that time, as well. The stocking plans will be made more consistent among the States. Fish excess to the stocking plans will be stocked into floodplain habitats, and these fish will be coded-wire tagged, at minimum. In the short-term, monitoring will be done primarily in the course of population estimate sampling and nonnative fish control efforts. Tom Pitts added that the San Juan program agreed to increase Colorado pikeminnow stocking in an effort to achieve recovery in the same time frame as the upper basin; however, they will have to overcome limitations in hatchery capacity (possibly through use of upper basin facilities or redirection of fish that would have been stocked in the mainstem lower Colorado River basin). Tom Pitts asked >the Service to inform the Program how they will achieve the requisite number of fish for stocking in the San Juan River. Brent Uilenberg said the San Juan program wants to construct additional growout ponds, but if there's excess capacity in the Upper Basin, we should consider using that instead of constructing additional ponds in the lower basin. Bob Muth said he'd like to reserve judgement on available pond space until the stocking plans are revised.
- j. Floodplain synthesis report and floodplain land acquisition cost estimate - Bob Muth said Pat will have the revised synthesis out by early-mid October.
- k. Flaming Gorge EIS process - Beverly Heffernan posted a note to the listserv saying that The EIS Interdisciplinary Team is preparing the preliminary draft EIS and will be reviewing it beginning this week. The preliminary draft EIS is expected to be ready to forward to the Cooperating Agencies for review in early October. If no major substantive issues are raised in that review, Reclamation will finalize and publish the draft EIS in November 2002, with public hearings in December and January 2002. The target date for publication of the final EIS is April 2003, and for the Record of Decision, May 2003. John Wullschlaeger

responded, asking how the EIS will deal with the run-of-the-river "alternative" and if it and the reasons it could not be considered will be discussed in the EIS. Brent Uilenberg said Reclamation ran the modeling for the run-of-the-river alternative and it will be discussed in the EIS, but not as the preferred alternative.

1. Colorado River Coordinated Facilities Operations Program (CFOP's) - Randy Seaholm recalled that the purpose of this work (begun in 1999) is to identify an additional 20,000 af to augment the peak in the 15-Mile Reach on a voluntary basis. Total budget for CFOP's was \$395,000. Near the end of phase two of this work, objections were raised to the modeling. Colorado has been working on that and think they've completed what's needed to resolve the objections. Hopefully the work can be completed in 16-17 weeks, and a final product should be available in January 2003. At that point, it will be up to the Program to work out agreements/contracts to secure the water.
 - m. Elkhead Reservoir enlargement - Ray Tenney said they have re-assessed Elkhead enlargement and the District is pursuing a 12,000 af enlargement instead of the 8,700 af previously contemplated. The District likely would entertain splitting the cost of the enlargement up to 50/50 with the Program, and would like to know how much water the Program would like to get from Elkhead. Ray noted that the new storage will cost about \$3,200/acre-foot (including the barrier net to prevent nonnative fish escapement). Gerry Roehm pointed out that the additional enlargement of Elkhead would replace leased water from Steamboat (which is difficult to deliver to the fish). Brent Uilenberg said the Program can't afford construction to provide an additional 6,000 acre-feet (\$19M), or even the 3,700 acre-feet previously contemplated (\$11.8M); as only \$6.2M is currently budgeted for Elkhead enlargement; \$1.4M for a barrier net; and \$9.6M for overall capital projects contingency ("to acquire new water to enhance flows"). George Smith agreed there are good reasons to move away from leasing water from Steamboat.
5. Reports status - Angela Kantola distributed an updated list.
 6. Information and education for nonnative fish removal - Debbie reviewed the draft communications/public involvement plan to assist the Program in expanded nonnative fish control beginning in FY 2003. (The plan was posted to the listserver on September 13.) Debbie invited the Committee's feedback and said the Information and Education Committee will discuss the plan on September 26. The fish being removed are viewed differently in Colorado and Utah and thus, we may take different approaches in each State. >Sherm Hoskins said he will talk with folks in Utah and provide feedback on this plan to Debbie. Tom Pitts noted that local sportfishing groups are a target audience (sporting good stores are one way to contact them), as are local elected officials. Teams will need to meet to discuss how to implement the plan in each State. Until then, it's unclear if this will require additional State expenditures.
 7. Grand Valley Water Management - Brent noted that these facilities enabled Reclamation to reduce diversions and conserve up to 700 cfs this irrigation season, which primarily benefitted east and west slope water users. Brent recommended that we get this message

out to the public. >Brent will work with Debbie Felker and Jone Wright to publicize this quickly, perhaps in the context of the overall cooperation that occurred during this extreme drought year.

ADJOURN 4:30 p.m.

Tuesday, September 17

CONVENE 8:10 a.m.

8. Ruedi Reservoir - Brian Person discussed the negotiations on a contract through 2012 for 10,825 af from Ruedi Reservoir. One issue under discussion is the cost of the water. Brian has recommended that Reclamation absorb the costs in a way that wouldn't negatively impact other Ruedi Round II participants. Reclamation proposes to do this with the proviso that they be credited for the cost of the water under the Recovery Program. One up-front payment through 2012 would cost \$5.4M plus \$40K O&M; if amortized, the cost would be \$731.5K/year in capital costs plus \$40K/year O&M. Reclamation recognizes the impact of this proposal to the Program budget and is willing to discuss with Program participants how the cost can be credited without hampering progress on other Program projects. Tom Pitts asked how the 10,825 af requirement in the Ruedi Round II biological opinion would be met if there were no Recovery Program. Brent said he believes that would drive up the cost of the remaining water (if there's no cost for non-reimbursable fish and wildlife benefits). Tom Pitts said the possibility of non-reimbursable fish and wildlife benefits should be explored. Brent said he believes the \$731.5 + \$40K could fit within the Program's annual & O&M budget (especially as research costs decrease). Committee members noted that these costs were not anticipated and Brent noted that credit for the cost of storage in Highline Lake wasn't anticipated either. The obvious question is who gets credit for what – should some Program participants get credit and others not? Dave Mazour added that credit for Aspinall power hasn't been considered. John Shields asked the basis for the contract only going through 2012. The next negotiating session is planned for September 26, but probably should be postponed. >Reclamation will look into the ability to assign non-reimbursable fish and wildlife benefits (as in the Fryingpan-Arkansas legislation) under Ruedi Round II. >George Smith will put together a chronology on Ruedi, starting with the biological opinion on Ruedi Round I. The Committee will need to schedule a conference call on this prior to the October 15 Implementation Committee. >John Shields will write a letter to Reclamation outlining the specific questions the Committee needs answered.

9. Review of the revised FY 2003 work plan

Bob Muth outlined the proposal to develop a strategic plan for additional habitat monitoring and research. The rough cost estimate for Argonne to undertake this effort is \$100K. A workshop would be held before the end of the calendar year and a plan developed by March so that we might begin implementing some work in 2003. Tom Pitts questioned the notes that indicate projects deferred until 2004, recommending instead, that the comments say the projects have been postponed until after the strategic plan is developed then reviewed on their merits. Bob Muth agreed. Tom Pitts requested showing

some funds under “other habitat monitoring placeholder.” The Committee agreed to \$250,000.

>Bob Muth will talk with Dan Alonso about the cost for floodplain easement and weeds management for FY 2003.

Brent Uilenberg and Tom Pitts expressed serious concern about the whole approach and cost of C18/19. Tom Pitts commented: 1) staff for isotope analysis is not justified; 2) cost of fish screen evaluation (>\$500K) seems excessive; 3) two months of coordination time for the wildlife biologist III seems excessive (and Brent questioned the need for a wildlife biologist III to do flow measurements); 4) labor costs for backwater monitoring of \$33,220 are not broken down; and 5) it’s still not clear what the overall cost of pond screening would be. Brent said most of these expenditures are not appropriate for capital funds. Brent thinks Mark Wieringa’s comments on this scope (posted to the listserver on 9/13/02) are right on. Bob said he doesn’t necessarily agree with all Mark said, but does believe we need to go back and rescope this effort. Tom Nesler said Anita and Pat Martinez met with the Biology Committee and the current scope was supposed to be the outcome of those interactions, so he is somewhat frustrated that the scope of work got this far if such serious concerns remain with the approach. Tom Nesler said that the scope focuses most on largemouth bass, but that many of Mark’s comments are directed more toward other nonnative species (e.g., green sunfish). Bob Muth said we may need to re-evaluate the feasibility of controlling centrarchids. Brent emphasized that screening these ponds will require daily screen maintenance. Tom Nesler suggested the Committee consider a \$60,000 place-holder for this project while Program participants reconsider the need for this project and the feasibility for controlling centrarchids. >Tom Nesler and Bob Muth will discuss this and write up some direction for Biology Committee discussion.

Brent asked if the Committee believes the Program can afford \$250,000 every 3-4 years to replace the Highline net (and \$1M to replace a net at Elkhead every 3-4 years).

The Committee discussed assessment of pike exclusion and agreed we need a \$50K placeholder for this work in FY 03, with a decision on whether or not to fund this work to be made by the end of December (based on FY 02 results).

With regard to 98b, Shane Collins asked about all the boats and equipment the Program purchases and if anyone is tracking inventory to determine if we actually need all this equipment. Tom Pitts said he’d like to see more justification for boat and motor purchases (explain why another boat or a replacement boat is needed). >The Program Director’s office will ask each of the offices conducting research and monitoring under the Program to submit an inventory of major capital items (boats, motors, trailers, electrofishing rigs, etc.), when they were purchased, etc.

On a related note, Tom Pitts expressed concern about minimal information provided in cost breakdowns in the revised scopes of work. Tom distributed an analysis of labor rates found in the new and revised scopes and a proposal for telling PI’s how we want them to submit the cost breakdowns. Tom asked that the budgets for revised projects this year be made to follow the directions previously provided for 2002-2003 scopes of work (see

attachment to this summary). "Equipment" will be defined to mean single items over \$1,000 (which will be itemized and justified). In addition, for FY 2004-2005 scopes of work, Tom proposes that the labor *rate* be included (per day, per week, whatever), and that per diem costs be shown separately. The Committee agreed to this. >The Program Director's office will review all the new and revised scopes of work (not just the ones where this is noted in the comments column of the table), have the PI's make the necessary revisions to itemize and justify costs, and then coordinators will post these revised scopes to the listserver by October 4 >By October 30, the Program Director's office also will review each of the ongoing scopes of work (those not revised) to make sure they have the required cost information. See Attachment 2 for budget detail requirements.

Tom Pitts questioned the identical labor and supply costs for UDWR and USFWS under the new Green River catfish removal page, yet the labor *rates* vary. Labor costs for catfish removal in Deso/Gray is shown at \$60K in FY 03 and \$120K in FY 04. Is this *one* trip in FY 03 and *two* trips in FY 04? Why is the per trip cost so high?

>The Program Director's office will provide guidance to PI's for writing annual reports for population estimates (e.g., reports for second and third years will include data from the first year, etc.).

10. FY 2004-2005 work planning schedule - Angela Kantola distributed the schedule (also posted to the listserver on 9/10/02).
11. Capital funds status report - Brent Uilenberg distributed an outyear budget planning spreadsheet dated 8/12/02. Brent said with the revisions we just made to the work plan, FY 2003 capital projects now total \$6,740,200. The spreadsheet brings state/power contributions into balance every 2 years (as required in the legislation), but Federal contributions balance out over a longer term. >Brent Uilenberg will revise this table by early next week so everyone has the new numbers for State and power contributions. Brent cautioned that we're quickly approaching full allocation of our capital funds ceiling (especially in light of Ruedi credit, increased cost of Elkhead enlargement, and replacement of the Highline net). Brent Uilenberg said the Upper Basin Program should get credit if it provides excess capacity in its propagation facilities resulting in a reduced cost for San Juan Program propagation facilities. Tom Blickensderfer said that with Colorado's budget shortfall, he's concerned that the security of their contributions beyond FY 03 may be questionable. A briefing by all Program participants for Colorado's agriculture committee may be considered.
12. Status report on working with Congress to extend the authorization period for federal and non-federal funding under P.L. 106-392 - Tom Pitts reported that H.R. 5099 was passed by the House Resources Committee on September 12 by unanimous consent, without amendments, and has been sent to the House floor. The next likely step is that 5099 will be incorporated into an omnibus bill that will be passed by the House and sent to the

Senate. Tom is working with Sen. Allard's office and the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee to determine what must be done in the Senate to get this legislation passed this session, given that it appears that the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee will not be holding any more hearings this year. Corey Gardner of Sen. Allard's office suggested a letter to Sen. Bingaman from our delegation. Tom Pitts distributed a draft letter, which he distributed. After he gets comments from Corey on the draft, >the States will determine which of their senators will be willing to sign the letter. >Sherm Hoskins will find out if it appears that there is no controversy on this and it is expected to stay in the omnibus bill. If needed, CREDA or TNC might also put calls into Bingaman's office.

13. Section 7 update

- a. Status updates on items of concern in the Service's sufficient progress letter - Bob Muth noted we've discussed most of these items over the last two days and progress is improving on most of them. The Yampa PBO is a concern, as dates for the biological assessment, the PBO, etc. keep slipping. The BA needs to address potential impact on terrestrial species, and that information is supposed to come from Ayers' subcontractor (Pioneer). >Bob Muth will ask the River District to get this information from the subcontractor, and will provide them with a written description of the required work by the end of this week. >George and Bob and Brent will prepare a compilation of all the contracts and agreements we currently have to provide water for the fish and when they apply.
- b. Consultation list - Angela Kantola discussed the updated (3rd quarter of FY 2002) consultation list (posted to the listserver on 9/6/02), noting that from the Program's inception in January 1988 through June 30, 2002, the Service has consulted on 683 projects depleting more than 1.7 million acre-feet of water (nearly 1.5 million acre-feet in historic depletions and 224,455 acre-feet in new depletions) from the upper Colorado River basin. Tom Pitts said that the 15-Mile Reach PBO needs a 100-af "set-aside." Bob Muth said >the Service will continue to look at ways this might be done.

14. Status of environmental group representation on the Implementation Committee - Tom Iseman said they're still working on ways that Dan Luecke can return to represent the environmental community in the Recovery Program. Dan is ready to do that, and the environmental groups are working on how his representation would be defined (TNC is not comfortable being the only environmental group at the table). The Land and Water Fund of the Rockies seems to be a good fit and they are working on structuring an agreement. The idea is that Dan would "be his own guide" and inform the Land and Water Fund and TNC of his opinions. Along with an agreement regarding representation, the funding still has to be worked out. Committee members would like to be assured that LWF would not cause Dan to come to the table with a new agenda. >Dave will talk to Leslie James about this and said he thinks a conference call among the concerned members, TNC, etc. to discuss representation concerns would be helpful. John Shields encouraged the environmental groups to have someone representing them at the October Implementation Committee meeting.

15. Agenda for October 15, 2002, Implementation Committee meeting in Denver - Agenda items for this meeting will include: Program Director's update; status of extending the period of authorization for the long-term funding legislation; review/approval of the summary of their previous conference call; approval of revised FY 2003 work plan; environmental group representation; Ruedi credit; and achievement of recovery goals in the lower basin for razorback sucker, humpback chub and bonytail. (Since there is no vehicle for achieving recovery in the lower basin, it appears we cannot downlist or delist these species in the upper basin even if we achieve the upper basin recovery goals. The water users would like to know how the Service plans to achieve recovery in the lower basin.)
16. Schedule next meeting - Conference call from 9:00 a.m. - 10:30 on October 9 in advance of the Implementation Committee meeting to discuss Ruedi credit and approval of revised scopes of work. >The Program Director's office will set up the call and post the information to the listserver. Next meeting on November 20 in Denver from 9 a.m. - 4 p.m. near DIA (>the Program Director's office will arrange the location and post that information to the listserver). The Committee appreciates Frank Pfeifer's invitation to Vernal, but believes spring would be a better time to schedule a meeting there.

ADJOURN: 1:25 p.m.

ASSIGNMENTS

Angela Kantola will post the revised June 27 meeting summary to the listserv. *(Done.)*

John Shields will send a memo to Program participants regarding the review process the Committee agreed to at the June meeting for information and education materials.

Brent Uilenberg will post photographs of the GVIC fish screen to the listserv.

The Service will inform the Committee of a firm date for availability of the revised Gunnison River flow recommendations report.

Tom Blickensderfer will convene a group to lay out a process and alternatives for identifying future Gunnison River depletions.

The Service will inform the Program how they plan to achieve the requisite number of fish for stocking in the San Juan River.

Sherm Hoskins said he will talk with folks in Utah and provide feedback on the nonnative fish communications/public involvement plan to Debbie Felker.

Brent Uilenberg will work with **Debbie Felker and Jone Wright** to publicize this quickly, perhaps in the context of the overall cooperation that occurred during this extreme drought year.

Reclamation will look into the ability to assign non-reimbursable fish and wildlife benefits (see Fryingpan-Arkansas legislation) under Ruedi Round II.

George Smith will put together a chronology, starting with the biological opinion on Ruedi Round I.

John Shields will write a letter to Reclamation outlining the specific questions the Committee needs answered about Ruedi.

Bob Muth will talk with Dan Alonso about the cost for floodplain easement and weeds management for FY 2003.

Tom Nesler and Bob Muth will discuss project C-18/19 and write up some direction for the Biology Committee discussion.

The Program Director's office will ask each of the offices conducting research and monitoring under the Program to submit an inventory of major capital items (boats, motors, trailers, electrofishing rigs, etc.), when they were purchased, etc.

The Program Director's office will review all the new and revised scopes of work (not just the ones where this is noted in the comments column of the table), have the PI's make the necessary revisions to itemize and justify costs, and then **coordinators** will post these revised scopes to the listserv by October 4

By October 30, **the Program Director's office** also will review each of the ongoing scopes of work (those not revised) to make sure they have the required cost information.

The Program Director's office will provide guidance to PI's for writing annual reports for population estimates (e.g., reports for second and third years will include data from the first year, etc.).

Brent Uilenberg will revise the capital projects spreadsheet by early next week so everyone has the new numbers for State and power contributions.

The States will determine which of their senators will be willing to sign the letter regarding extending authorization. **Sherm Hoskins** will find out if it appears that there is no controversy on this and it is expected to stay in the omnibus bill.

Bob Muth will ask the **River District** to get the information for the Yampa PBO BA from the subcontractor, and will provide them with a written description of the required work by the end of this week.

George and Bob and Brent will prepare a compilation of all the contracts and agreements we currently have to provide water for the fish and when they apply.

The Service will continue to look at ways they could have a "set-aside" for projects under 100 af under the 15-Mile Reach PBO.

Dave Mazour will talk to Leslie James about environmental group participation/representation (a conference call among the concerned members, TNC, etc. to discuss representation concerns may be helpful).

The Program Director's office will set up the Management Committee conference call from 9:00 a.m. - 10:30 on October 9 call and post the information to the listserv.

The Program Director's office will arrange the location for the next Management Committee meeting on November 20 in Denver from 9 a.m. - 4 p.m. near DIA and post that information to the listserv.

ATTACHMENT 1
Colorado River Management Committee, Cheyenne, Wyoming
September 16-17, 2002

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Blickensderfer	State of Colorado
Robert King and Sherm Hoskins	Utah Department Of Natural Resources
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Shane Collins	Western Area Power Administration
Bob McCue and Mary Henry	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Mazour	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
John Reber	National Park Service
Tom Iseman	The Nature Conservancy

Nonvoting Member:

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

Recovery Program Staff:

Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Gerry Roehm	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Debbie Felker	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others:

Tom Nesler	Colorado Division of Wildlife
Randy Seaholm	Colorado Water Conservation Board
George Smith	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ray Tenney	Colorado River Water Conservancy District
Brian Person	Bureau of Reclamation

ATTACHMENT 2
Scope of Work Budget Detail Requirements

The budget should be broken down by task, category (at least labor, travel, supplies, and equipment) and funding target. Under "labor," the type should be identified (e.g., project manager, technician, secretary, etc.) as well as the expected amount of effort (expressed in terms of hours or weeks). If supplies exceed 5% of the project budget, please explain those costs. All equipment expenses should be itemized and justified. "Equipment" is any single item >\$1,000.

Example:

FY 2002 Costs:

	<u>Agency A</u>	<u>Agency B</u>	<u>Contractor</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Task 1</u>				
Labor				
Proj. mgr (3 wks @ agency A, 2 wks @ agency B)	\$5,500	\$3,600	\$0	\$9,100
Technicians (10 wks per agency)	\$8,100	\$9,000	\$0	\$17,100
Travel				
Per diem (20 days)	\$600	\$700	\$0	\$1,300
Vehicle (20 days)	\$1,200	\$1,500	\$0	\$2,700
*Equipment				
Boat	\$0	\$12,000	\$0	\$12,000
Trailer	\$0	\$6,000	\$0	\$6,000
Motor	\$0	\$2,000	\$0	\$2,000
Electrofishing Unit	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000
Supplies	\$700	\$800	\$0	\$1,500
Task subtotal	\$16,100	\$39,600	\$0	\$55,700

*Justification: Additional outfitted electrofishing boat and trailer needed for concurrent sampling in two river reaches as required by population estimate protocol. Current equipment inventory of agency B includes only one outfitted electrofishing boat and trailer.

<u>Task 2</u>				
Labor				
Biologist (2 wks)	\$0	\$3,000	\$4,000	\$7,000
Technician (3.5 wks)	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$4,000
Task subtotal	\$0	\$7,000	\$4,000	\$11,000
 FY 2002 TOTAL	 \$16,100	 \$46,600	 \$4,000	 \$66,700

FY 2003 Costs:

	Agency A	Agency B	Contractor	Total
Task 2				
Labor				
Proj. leader (2 wks @ Agency B, 3 wks contractor)	\$0	\$3,600	\$7,500	\$11,100
Biologist (5 wks at each)	\$0	\$7,500	\$10,000	\$17,500
Task subtotal	\$0	\$11,100	\$17,500	\$28,600
Task 3				
Labor				
Biologist (4 wks @ each)	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$8,000	\$20,000
Proj. leader (2 wks @ each)	\$3,700	\$3,600	\$5,000	\$12,300
Travel				
Vehicle (5 days)	\$300	\$350	\$300	\$950
Airfare (1 trip)	\$500	\$700	\$650	\$1,850
Per diem (7 days)	\$210	\$245	\$210	\$665
Equipment	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supplies				
Tags		\$1,150		\$1,150
Glassware		\$250		\$250
Sample bottles		\$100		\$100
Task subtotal	\$11,710	\$13,395	\$15,160	\$40,265
FY 2003 TOTAL	\$11,710	\$24,495	\$32,660	\$68,865