

Management Committee Meeting Summary
July 31 - August 1, 2003
Cheyenne, Wyoming

Attendees: See Attachment 1

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

CONVENE - 9:30 a.m.

1. Review/modify agenda and time allocations and appoint a timekeeper - The agenda was modified as it appears below.
2. Approve May 15-16, 2003, meeting summary - Angela Kantola proposed revisions based on comments submitted by Mike Baker of Reclamation on the NIWQP discussion. The summary was approved as revised. With regard to assignment #5, Bob McCue said the draft budget language said "fund Ouray Hatchery at the requested amount," with similar language for the Recovery Program funding. Tom Blickensderfer said he's still working to arrange a meeting with Rep. Beauprez.
3. Recovery Program updates -
 - a. Flaming Gorge EIS process - Brent Uilenberg said they still expect a draft EIS this October, with a final EIS and Record of Decision in June 2004. There will be a pre-release of the draft to the cooperating agencies (probably in late August).
 - b. Ruedi long-term contract - George Smith said a 12-year contract has been signed and thanked Reclamation and Randy Seaholm for their work on this.
 - c. Flow conditions - George said the Program has about 30,000 af of water for late-season augmentation in the Colorado River this year. Brent said additional late summer water may be available from Green Mountain Reservoir. Spring flows were good and coordinated reservoir operations weren't needed this year (nor was the water available, as cooperators were filling their reservoirs). Flows are fairly low now, but we will hopefully maintain 600-700 cfs. The Yampa is holding up fairly well and hopefully will not drop to 93 cfs where supplemental water is needed. The Gunnison has varied, but we are trying to maintain 300 cfs for operating the Redlands fish ladder. Randy Peterson reported that Flaming Gorge releases were recently increased from 800 cfs to 1400 cfs for a few days to move sediment from a rainfall event.
 - d. Yampa Plan/EA, PBO, Elkhead enlargement - Gerry Roehm reported that the notice of availability was published in the Federal Register and comments will be taken through the end of August. Public meetings will be held in Baggs, Wyoming August 11, in Steamboat Springs on August 12, and in Craig on August 13. After a 15-20 minute introduction, the remainder of the 2-hour meetings will be devoted to public comment. Gerry expects to be able to prepare a final EA by the end of September. A draft biological opinion will be completed near the end

of October and a final opinion by the end of November. A cooperative agreement should be signed by the end of November (among Wyoming, Colorado, and the Service). Gerry said the River District will begin the COE permit process at the end of September (Ray Tenney later said it would begin in early September). Ray Tenney said they're moving forward with the various agreements required to begin enlarging Elkhead. Brent noted the importance of getting financing arrangements in place with CWCB to cover any periods where there is a budget shortfall (based on appropriation and state contribution schedules). Before CRWCD can sign a construction contract for enlargement, the cash has to be available, so >CRWCD will meet with Colorado, Reclamation, etc. to work out those arrangements (before the September 21-22 CWCB meeting).

- e. Tusher Wash screen - Sherm Hoskins said the parties don't want to take any action before the court decision (the court has heard the case but hasn't reported their decision yet).

- f. Land acquisition - Bob Muth said Rich Valdez completed the model to determine the amount of floodplain habitat needed to support a minimum viable population of razorback suckers in the Green River. The model estimates a need for 1,000 - 27,000 acres (the wide range is due to dependency on survival, growth, and densities). We have data on survival of young razorback and bonytail in the presence of nonnative predators, and studies looking at survival are continuing. A data weakness in the model is information on survival of egg-hatching to larvae and larvae coming off the spawning bar. The good news is that by meeting the Green River flow recommendations and with our completed or anticipated land acquisition and habitat restoration, we currently fall somewhere in the middle of that range with available habitat. The second important conclusion is that the closer the floodplain habitat is to the spawning area, the greater the benefit. This further emphasizes the importance of acquiring an easement at Thunder Ranch, just below the Green River spawning bar. Bob added that a draft of the floodplain management plans should be out by the end of August and will be used to evaluate research, monitoring, and management needs. Also, Ouray NWR is organizing a floodplain management workshop in Denver tentatively on October 29 to integrate planning for floodplain and riparian enhancement between Ouray NWR and the Recovery Program. >Bob will invite Rich Valdez to attend. >Bob will provide feedback on this meeting at the next Management Committee meeting. In response to a question about Walter Walker, Pat said the gravel company will remove a portion of the dike in September. Bob distributed an update on land acquisition. Brent Uilenberg said there are concerns about flooding neighboring properties to the Audubon property. Pat Nelson said he plans to set up a meeting with those landowners and that our acquisition won't cause any more or less flooding. Brent said it's a very flood-prone area and people are very concerned, so we need to work closely with the landowners. Pat discussed the Hot Spot area complex and explained proposals for land ownership. Refuges does not want to acquire these lands in fee, but rather in easements. The Thunder Ranch owner rejected the Program's most recent offer and made a counter offer. Bob Muth recommended finding a way to acquire this property,

noting he believes it's critical to recovery of razorback sucker in the Green River basin. The Committee agreed and approved continuing the negotiations.
>Reclamation and the Program Director's office will subsequently provide a proposal to the Committee on funding details.

4. Coordinated Facilities Operations Plan (CFOP's) - Randy Seaholm recalled the purpose of this study was to look at alternatives to provide an additional 20,000 af of water for the spring peak in the Colorado River. Randy outlined the alternatives considered and the July 25th recommendations of the CFOP's executive committee (page 9) which are to maximize coordinated reservoir operations (CROPS) and augment the spring peak by using up to 20,000 af of stored water in addition to CROPS. The latter would depend on an insurance pool from the existing "environmental pool" to ensure that releases of stored water to enhance the peak wouldn't jeopardize reservoir yield. Brent said he envisions implementation happening through the group that already meets each spring to determine how to operate the reservoirs. With regard to the first recommendation, John Shields asked if the Program needs to play a role in encouraging increased participation in the CROPS process (e.g., from Northern and Colorado Springs) and Dan Luecke said yes, at some point. Randy Seaholm, Brent and George said that participation is most important in the spring meeting. With regard to additional storage (Webster Hill), the water users agreed to consider a feasibility study with their own funds which would address environmental criteria identified by the Service. After the feasibility study, the Program would consider whether to participate in the project. Dave emphasized that we shouldn't lose sight of the fact that all this replaces the instream flow water rights that were to have been part of Colorado's contribution to the Recovery Program. Dan Luecke called the recommendations an exquisite compromise and said the environmental groups support, but still have issues with: 1) the environmental pool as insurance (thus they've asked for an annual report); and 2) the Webster Hill site which would involve construction within the top ~5 miles of critical habitat (and they've insisted the Service provide a set of environmental questions and criteria to be addressed in a feasibility study). Since Webster Hill may provide part of the water user's 10,825 af (which has a deadline), Tom Pitts asked if this feasibility study is imminent and Randy said he expects it may be. The Committee approved the Executive Committee's recommendations. The final report and appendices should be out within 3-4 weeks. >Tom Pitts will provide information at the next Management Committee regarding encouraging increased participation in CROPS process.
5. Lower Basin issues - Tom Czaplá outlined lower basin activities, including a Multi-Species Conservation Plan (MSCP) team meeting being held tomorrow and a draft plan from the Recovery Implementation Program Scientific Work Group (RIPSWG) to provide scientific guidance/management recommendations to the MSCP. Tom gave a Powerpoint presentation about humpback chub population estimates in the lower basin and concerns with methodologies (e.g., use of Floy tags prior to 1990 and potential over-estimates of the population, a change in data collection design in 1996, no sampling in mainstem, use of a model that's never been successfully applied to any fishery, sampling during spawning season rather than during the fall when the fish aren't moving, two-pass versus three-pass sampling, etc.). Bob McCue said the Service (Regions 2 and 6) is meeting to discuss this in late August. Bob Muth pointed out that the model may be

correct, but the only way to validate it is to get a point estimate of the population in the Little Colorado River and the mainstem. Gary Burton emphasized that the group needs common guidance from Region 2 & Region 6 as well as clear direction regarding the first population estimate the Service will accept to “start the clock” to consider downlisting. Randy Seaholm agreed that the model needs to be validated with a point estimate. Tom Pitts asked the Service to remind Region 2 about recovery goals for razorback and bonytail, also. The Colorado Fish and Wildlife Council is considering hosting a workshop to discuss setting up a Recovery Program in the lower basin. Randy Seaholm said the Grand Canyon seems to get left out of the lower basin discussions, so from that perspective, it may make sense to have a separate program for the Grand Canyon. The Committee asked the Service to resolve any internal issues and get the lower basin to collect data to provide population estimates as required in the recovery goals (population estimate achieved through mark-recapture). Bob McCue said that is his goal.

6. FY 04-05 work plan review - Angela Kantola and Bob Muth introduced the work plan. Bob noted that he’s asked for annual reports in November to better enable the Program to determine if any changes need to be made before FY 04 work begins.

Instream Flow

67 - George Smith said the Steamboat lease will be signed this year (2003) and funds are available if the water is needed this year.

C-11 Brent reported that the last element of Grand Valley Water Management is for the pumping plant at Highline. The agreement is being reviewed by Interior’s new solicitor and hopefully the pumping plant will be completed by early summer of 2004.

Geomorph - Bob Muth said he’s reviewing the Argonne report and will soon provide the Biology Committee with recommendations for geomorphology studies to begin in FY 04.

Habitat Restoration

C-5 Brent said Price-Stubb fish passage (rock ramp) is moving forward. The former FERC licensee will donate a construction easement and a perpetual operation easement. The design process is coming together well. Now they are working to resolve some ownership issues once the passage is constructed. Brent hopes that passage will be under construction in winter of 2004-2005. Once Reclamation makes an application for access, CDOT and UP railroad issues will need to be resolved.

C-23 Brent said access issues have been worked out with CDOT and he believes the Federal Highway Administration will sign an agreement today. Working out these issues has resulted in additional costs of ~\$250K (for acceleration/deceleration lanes, etc.).

C-29 Brent said they’ve been working through GVIC’s concerns with the screen operation. Some of the modifications are being installed this summer, but probably not in time to allow significant operation this year.

Fish salvage - Bob Muth said his office is still discussing fish salvage at GVIC, GVP, Tusher and Yampa River with the Service. The budgets will stay as is for those items right now.

Construction management costs - Brent reviewed his July 25 e-mail on the cost of managing construction (raised by Tom Pitts at the Biology Committee). For 04 and 05, capital construction totals ~\$17.9M excluding Elkhead. Non-contract costs in that time are \$1.7M or ~9.6%. In both private industry and government, 15% is considered good. Brent noted that these estimates don't include costs of resolving serious landowner issues or other unexpected problems. Tom Pitts said he is satisfied with Brent's explanation.

Easements - Bob McCue said he knows there are issues to be resolved, but the Program committed \$50K/year for this, so he has some concerns about the Biology Committee's cut. >The Service will try to get this resolved before the Implementation Committee meeting. Bob McCue agreed that the scope of work needs to meet the standards.

>With regard to capital funds which won't be obligated in FY 03, in advance of the Implementation Committee meeting, Brent will provide Angela with preliminary budget figures to remove from the FY 03 budget and add to the FY 04 budget.

Nonnative Fish Management

C-20 - Brent recommended deferring net replacement until FY 05, if possible. >The Program Director's office will contact Chris Foreman of Colorado Division of Parks to clarify status of the Highline net to determine if net replacement could be put off until 2005. Under the Highline agreement, they are only operating the top 2 feet of the reservoir, which could conceivably result in an increased spill frequency. Operating Highline to provide angling opportunities for nonnative fish raises the question of what we will do at Elkhead. And if we're also willing to pay the even higher costs of a barrier net at Elkhead, that raises the question of the willingness of all Program participants to cooperate in other nonnative fish management activities. Dan Luecke said he doesn't believe the Program has ever been fully willing to seriously take on nonnative fish control from both a scientific and management perspective. Bob McCue said the Service's Salt Lake City ES office is very concerned about the significant increase in smallmouth bass in Lodore whilst we are capturing them and returning them to the river under the control/treatment regime (then they go downstream to Utah where they're removed). Since there isn't angling pressure in Lodore, does the treatment/control approach need to be used there? Bob Muth said they will consider this in the upcoming nonnative fish management workshop. Bob Muth said the recovery goals require identifying the level of control required, then implementing that level of control. The current work is aimed at identifying the required level of control, which is a research question. Brent said he can accept replacing the Highline net, but will not in the future support similar screening to provide warmwater nonnative fishing opportunities at Elkhead unless Colorado fully supports other nonnative fish control efforts. Ray Tenney noted that we are currently evaluating nonnative fish escapement from Elkhead Reservoir.

Monitoring & Research

Tom Czaplá outlined ongoing population estimate work and said a workshop is tentatively planned for the fall of 2004 to look at pikeminnow and humpback population estimates and discuss what the Service will accept for the first reliable estimates.

Sherm Hoskins asked about Utah's funding questions and the Program Director's office explained why they believe the Biology Committee summary and budget table are correct as shown.

Information & Education

12C - The Management Committee approved the revised scope of work.

Work plan summary: Dan Luecke said he hopes that nonnative fish management work will increase in FY 05. The Committee approved the work plan as revised above. >The Program Director's office will incorporate these changes and prepare materials for the Implementation Committee's review and approval of the work plan.

7. Gunnison River EIS process - Tom Pitts distributed by e-mail a summary of the May 28 meeting of the Gunnison water users and Reclamation. Brent Uilenberg said they propose to conduct a narrowly-focused EIS process on implementation of the Service's flow recommendations (or a reasonable alternative to them). They've laid out a 4-year schedule, which seems long, but is simply realistic. Toward the end of that process they would prepare a BA and request a BO from the Service. In parallel, a programmatic biological opinion on all existing depletions in the Gunnison and Dolores basins would be prepared. The Dolores is included because its biological opinion points to an upstream reservoir (assumed to be Aspinall) to provide mitigation. The basin water users do not want to do a PBO with future depletions like the 15-Mile Reach PBO. They prefer to address future depletions under the Section 7 agreement (whatever the sufficient progress limit is at that time). They do not want a PBO on a block of future depletions that could be used for the East slope (which would be speculative). One exception is the Dallas Creek project which has 20-30K af of marketable water remaining. Both the water users and Reclamation would like that included in the PBO. Brent said he views consideration of water for the Black Canyon (Park Service) as a separate and distinct process. Randy Peterson said that if this is settled, it would seem to fit well within the description of the environmental baseline. Randy Seaholm said the concept of the potential agreement on Black Canyon is a 300 cfs baseflow with a 1933 date for the Park Service and for CWCB to file for an instream flow right for peak flows. Part of the language of the enforcement agreement is that CWCB would protect peak flows up to 10,000 cfs at this time (up to 14,500 later). Randy said he would expect CWCB to ask for something similar in the Aspinall operation EIS process. Dan Luecke said the environmental groups wouldn't support that inclusion. Bob McCue said the Service will officially transmit the flow recommendations to Rick Gold within the next week and will ask for a meeting to discuss the schedule. The Service is willing to do a BO on Aspinall and a separate PBO.

ADJOURN 5:00 p.m.

Friday, August 1

CONVENE 8:00 a.m.

8. Proposed Sulphur Gulch reservoir - Don Carlson of the Northern Water Conservancy District gave a status report on the proposed reservoir. The 15-Mile Reach PBO requires permanent protection of 10,825 af for late summer and fall augmentation and 20,000 af for spring peak enhancement. Sulphur Gulch is being explored as a way to provide the summer and fall augmentation and perhaps some spring peak enhancement, as well. The site is 3 miles southwest of DeBeque, 3/4 mile upstream of Sulphur Gulch confluence with the Colorado River. A brief water availability analysis (1974-1994) showed average annual flow is 2.8MAF and indicated that a 16,000 af (maximum) reservoir with a 150 cfs diversion rate could provide the full 10,825 af each year. Environmental concerns include a small wetland, a great blue heron heronry, and endangered species (bald eagle, razorback sucker, and Colorado pikeminnow). Permits required would include COE, a possible BLM right-of-way, etc. Dam-only construction costs would be ~\$14.8M (not including pumping station and spillway) and the total cost would be about \$23.2M. A preliminary water quality assessment indicates that if water is diverted to storage during the winter, total dissolved solids (TDS) in water released back to the river in late summer would be greater than in the river itself. On the other hand, if water were diverted during the rising/falling limbs of the spring peak when TDS is lower, water quality potentially could be improved by summer releases. USGS is conducting a more detailed water quality and water availability study and modeling several release and pumping scenarios for a full range of hydrologic conditions. The USGS final report is expected sometime in mid-2004, but Northern will have preliminary information from USGS in 3-4 months. The only purpose of this reservoir would be to provide water for the fish. Northern is also looking at other options, such as multi-purpose projects (Wolcott, Jasper, Webster Hill, etc.). The reservoir would have adequate water for spring peak enhancement, but they're still looking at that in light of water quality issues.

9. National Fish and Wildlife Foundation - Claire Thorp, director of the NFWF's Southwest Regional Office in San Francisco discussed the Foundation's goals and its agreements with various Federal agencies. The Southwest Regional Office now has responsibility for projects in Colorado and Utah, so the Program's accounts will be transferred from the Colorado office to San Francisco. (Don Glaser will remain in Denver working on an evaluation of all of the Foundation's grants.) The Southwest office has a challenge grant program, as well as staff who manage contracts for the ecosystem restoration projects of CalFed (~\$125M). Rebecca Kramer is the special funds manager for the Southwest office and will be managing the Recovery Program's funds. Claire said NFWF has converted to a state-of-the-art reporting system, but the conversion has been quite time-consuming. Concurrently, they've been going through an extensive audit. The new reporting system will be operational within the next couple of months. Claire and Rebecca have been reviewing agreements with Program participants and are committed to timely invoice processing and reporting. Claire reported that the outstanding invoice to GVWU was paid yesterday and the McLaughlin invoices will be paid next

Wednesday. Rebecca will be our main point of contact and will be sending everyone letters of introduction in the coming week. Claire and Rebecca are reviewing draft financial reports and will provide final reports to Program participants within 2 weeks. Brent suggested it would be simplest if we all operated on quarterly reports and Claire agreed. Payments to NFWF should now be made to the San Francisco office. >Angela Kantola will provide that address to the Service offices writing biological opinions. John Shields asked that the introductory letter formally change the project officer identified in the cooperative agreements. Angela Kantola suggested follow-up conference calls to work out procedures and Claire agreed that would be a good idea. John suggested we have the call after the initial reports are received. Tom Blickensderfer said Colorado would like to get a draft financial report before it's finalized; the Committee agreed that perhaps all of these first reports should be in draft. Angela also offered to do whatever's needed to compare files on the FWS agreement for Section 7 funds to resolve any discrepancies in those records. >NFWF and the states will look into whether the cooperative agreements need to be amended since the capital projects period has been extended to 2008. Perhaps a 1-page amendment could incorporate change of project officer and extension of the capital projects period.

10. Section 7 Updates

- a. Draft sufficient progress letter - (Posted to listserver on July 24.) Bob Muth said the Service met in May to draft its sufficient progress assessment and also to assess progress under the 15-Mile Reach PBO. The draft concludes that progress has been sufficient to continue to serve as a reasonable and prudent alternative for projects depleting up to 4,500 af. Bob said future species status summaries (in Program Director's updates and in the Service's sufficient progress letter) will include lower basin information. Bob said the Service will consider comments and plans to finalize the letter prior to the Implementation Committee meeting. John Reber said it seems progress has been more in process this year, leaving the Park Service with the impression that there hasn't been as much strength of progress in areas such as nonnative fish management. John Wullschleger said the Park Service has particular concerns about nonnative fish management in the Yampa River. Bob McCue pointed out on-the-ground progress that is described in the RIPRAP assessment. Bob added that the Service has highlighted nonnative fish management as an area of specific concern. Bob Muth emphasized that the nonnative fish management workshop in December will address results and any concerns about current work and the need for any changes in direction will be discussed at that time. Bob asked if perhaps some of these concerns are more of a work plan issue than a sufficient progress assessment issue. John Reber suggested perhaps the Service could mention nonnative fish control again in the conclusion. Bob McCue said the Service would consider that. Any comments on the draft letter should be submitted to the Service (preferably to the listserver so others can see them) by August 8. Tom Pitts asked about the statement in the PBO review regarding whether floodplain habitat acquired in the Grand Valley area is adequate. Bob McCue said the PBO suggests 3,500 acres would be required, but we haven't been able to acquire that and don't know what will be needed. Bob Muth said the Program also will be providing fish passage at

diversions which may provide access to additional habitat and Tom suggested that be noted in the summary. Tom Iseman said the environmental groups support identifying nonnative fish control as a concern and they agree it needs to go from a concern to an accomplishment. With regard to the population estimates, Tom Iseman said they are looking forward to seeing improved estimates so that the Program can really assess the status of the fish.

- b. Updated Section 7 consultation list - Angela Kantola distributed copies of the updated list. Randy Peterson asked about the footnote on Flaming Gorge Dam as it relates to the EIS process. Randy asked if this number came from a historic biological opinion. Do the flow recommendations supercede all the requirements of previous biological opinions? Randy said Reclamation has two questions: 1) is there any historic biological opinion that requires any part of storage to be added to the spring peak; and 2) how will this type of storage volume be incorporated into the flow recommendations and the EIS? >The Service will look into this with its Salt Lake City field office. >The Program Director's office will ask Clayton where he came up with the 145,787 af number.
11. NIWQP - Mary Henry said the National Irrigation Water Quality Program is under siege financially. Brent Uilenberg said Reclamation's FY 03 budget was assessed 9% underfinancing and the NIWQP program was cut nearly in half as a result. No remediation on the Gunnison or Colorado rivers could be done this year (all funds went to Stewart Lake). Something similar could happen in FY 04. According to draft budget language, \$3.6M could be available, but that might not survive Departmental underfinancing assessments if the draft Congressional language regarding uniform underfinancing assessment does not survive the budget process. Brent said he'd like to see some support for NIWQP. Mary added that if letter-writing, etc., is not successful and the NIWQP budget doesn't survive, then we may need a backup plan to maintain the expertise in the two very functional core groups that have been working on these issues (she's not suggesting the Program fund NIWQP, however). Bob Muth said that the RIPRAP endorses selenium remediation efforts and the recovery goals recognize the conflicting research and support additional research and remediation (especially for razorback sucker and Colorado pikeminnow). Mary noted that these groups provide expertise to clear land acquisitions for selenium concerns. Non-Federal parties to the Program could independently or in a coordinated effort encourage Interior (perhaps both the water & energy side and the fish, wildlife and parks side) to support maintaining the expertise and core teams for the middle Green River and for the Gunnison River and Grand Valley. Such a letter or letters could specifically refer to the RIPRAP and recovery goals and also could mention the relevance of this expertise to Reclamation's 2025 initiative. >Mary and Brent/Mike Baker will advise the non-Federal Program representatives on this (keeping the Service and Program Director's office informed).
12. Duchesne River minimum flows - Sherm Hoskins said Utah has been meeting with the Service, CUWCD, and Reclamation to consider alternatives for meeting minimum flows on the Duchesne. Utah's water rights division is looking at what might be workable. The next meeting will discuss which alternatives seem the most feasible. Some alternatives may require additional gaging stations and there might be a need for some

water acquisition (which may not involve a cost to the Program). Brent said the capital funds budget is pretty well all committed.

13. Reports status - Angela Kantola distributed copies of the updated "reports due" list.
14. September 4, 2003, Implementation Committee meeting agenda - Agenda items will include: Program Director's Update; approval of FY 04-05 work plan; status of the Yampa River Management Plan and Elkhead enlargement; transfer of the Program accounts to NFWF San Francisco office; sufficient progress determination; Gunnison River flow recommendations and EIS process; Flaming Gorge EIS process update; capital projects budget update; a briefing on changed floodplain management strategy; a briefing on the status of and strategy/needs for nonnative fish management; lower basin issues/coordination; and population estimates.
15. Next meeting – The Committee will meet on Oct. 9 from 9:30 - 4:00 near DIA. Agenda items will include: Elkhead financing agreement, floodplain management plans, lower basin issues, update on Colorado's meeting with Rep. Beauprez, Gunnison River EIS, etc. >The Program Director's office will arrange a meeting room near DIA.

ADJOURN – 11:20 a.m.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. CRWCD will meet with Colorado, Reclamation, etc. to work out those Elkhead enlargement financing arrangements before the September 21-22 CWCB meeting.
2. Bob Muth will invite Rich Valdez to the floodplain management workshop in Denver (tentatively October 29) to integrate planning for floodplain and riparian enhancement between Ouray NWR and the Recovery Program. Bob will provide feedback at the next meeting.
3. Pending the outcome of negotiations on Thunder Ranch, Reclamation and the Program Director's office will provide a proposal to the Committee on funding details.
4. Tom Pitts will provide information at the next Management Committee regarding encouraging increased participation in CROPS process.
5. The Management Committee asked the Service to resolve any internal issues and get the lower basin to collect data to provide population estimates as required in the recovery goals (population estimate achieved through mark-recapture).
6. The Service will try to resolve issues about easement management funding before the Implementation Committee meeting
7. The Program Director's office will contact Chris Foreman of Colorado Division of Parks to clarify status of the Highline net to determine if net replacement could be put off until 2005.
8. With regard to capital funds which won't be obligated in FY 03, in advance of the Implementation Committee meeting, Brent will provide Angela with preliminary budget figures to remove from the FY 03 budget and add to the FY 04 budget.
9. The Program Director's office will incorporate Management Committee changes and prepare materials for the Implementation Committee's review and approval of the FY 04-05 work plan.
10. Angela Kantola will provide the address of NFWF's southwest office to the Service offices writing biological opinions.
11. NFWF and the states will look into whether the cooperative agreements need to be amended since the capital projects period has been extended to 2008.
12. The Service will look into Reclamation's questions about Flaming Gorge EIS with its Salt Lake City field office and the Program Director's office will ask Clayton Palmer where he got the 145,787 af number in the footnote of the Section 7 consultation list.
13. Mary and Brent/Mike Baker will advise non-Federal Program representatives how they might encourage Interior to support maintaining the expertise and core teams for the middle Green River and for the Gunnison River and Grand Valley (and will keep the Service and Program Director's office informed).

14. The Program Director's office will arrange a meeting room near DIA for October 9.

ATTACHMENT 1
Colorado River Management Committee, Cheyenne, Wyoming
July 31 - August 1, 2003

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Randy Peterson	Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Blickensderfer	State of Colorado
Sherm Hoskins	Utah Department Of Natural Resources
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Gary Burton	Western Area Power Administration
Bob McCue	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
Debbie Felker	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Gerry Roehm	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pat Nelson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Czaplá	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others:

George Smith	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Brian Kelly	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
John Wullschleger	National Park Service
Claire Thorp	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
Dan Luecke	Western Resource Advocates
Randy Seaholm	Colorado Water Conservation Board
Mary Simbala	Western Area Power Administration
Don Carlson	Northern Water Conservancy District
Mary Henry	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Nesler	Colorado Division of Wildlife