

Colorado River Recovery Implementation Committee
August 22, 1990 Meeting
- Minutes -

Attendees: (Attachment 1)

Agenda: (Attachment 2)

Actions and Assignments: (Attachment 3)

Major Topics Discussed/Decided

Dan Luecke of the Environmental Defense Fund represented the environmental groups. Carse Pustmueller is on a leave of absence from Audubon for 1 year. The intent of the environmental groups was to have Bob Weaver represent them on the Implementation Committee, funded by the Colorado Wildlife Federation and the Environmental Defense Fund, but the Federation has had to withdraw their funding. The environmental groups now are seeking funding from other sources for Bob's participation, as well as the participation of a biologist on the Biology Committee. Dan will serve as Bob's alternate.

1. Review/Modify Agenda: Robert Wigington's presentation on the Cross Mountain Ranch water right acquisition and proposed resolution, part of the Water Rights Acquisition Subcommittee report, was inserted after agenda item 5, San Juan River activities.
2. Approval of Last Implementation Committee Meeting Summary: The summary was accepted with the following change
 - A. Under Razorback Sucker Listing Status (Agenda item 3.D), the word "necessarily" was struck under item 2;
 - B. The last sentence under Sediment Subcommittee Report (Agenda item 5) was revised to read "The Committee agreed that although there was emphasis placed on development of a sediment research program, each sediment proposal will be evaluated on its own merit."
 - C. Added under Assignments in Attachment 3 was "The Service was requested to have an agreement in place with the Utah Division of Wildlife on stocking proposals by the next Implementation Committee Meeting."
3. Recovery Program Update
 - A. Program Director and Management Group Report: John Hamill was on a detail in Senator Tim Wirth's office from April through July. He noted that the Recovery Program is not seen as a major issue in Congress, but Congress is familiar with it and views it positively as the way to resolve conflicts. Concern exists that the \$1 million appropriation

made for water acquisition in 1988 has not been spent. John recently gave Recovery Program briefings (prompted by Animas-La Plata) to the staff of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the State of Colorado's Senate Committee on Water. Since the last meeting, the Management Group has focused on developing the FY-91 work plan with the Technical Group, as well as solutions to organizational and communication issues (see reorganization plan).

- B. Significant Events Since Last Meeting: (1) The Water Acquisition Subcommittee has made progress in implementing their plan; (2) second Recovery Program newsletter was completed and distributed; (3) developed the draft FY-91 work plan by Technical and Management Groups; (4) the propagation plan is being implemented and making progress; (5) positive discussion between the Service and Utah regarding stocking of nonnative fish; (6) need for comprehensive planning is being addressed in 5-Year Road Maps; (7) proposals to develop a recovery program for the San Juan Basin are surfacing--we may be asked if we want to include the San Juan in the Implementation Program; and (8) Flaming Gorge technical studies have been wrapped up and we are now at a crossroads regarding proceeding with the biological opinion and conducting further studies.
- C. Upcoming Issues: The budget will likely be an issue this year and the Service and other Federal Agencies may be in limbo for several months going into FY-91.
- D. Technical Group Report: Jim Bennett outlined recent Technical Group activities in developing the draft FY-91 Work Plan. Proposals received totalled around \$4.5M for an available budget of about \$2.5M, so the ranking process was an arduous one. The Management Group agreed to include two additional studies (stocking sterile catfish in Kenney Reservoir and intensive Colorado squawfish culture) in the Work Plan. These will be funded by Colorado and water users (outside the Recovery Program budget), and no credit towards future contributions to the Recovery Program will be given for funding these studies. The Management Group also agreed to make funding available for the Aspinall work plan and Colorado squawfish genetics study by funding three studies related to water acquisition with Section 7 funds.

When asked about the adequacy of the Technical Group's process for ranking project proposals, Jim said he thought a better ranking system was needed. It is difficult to rank proposals on the basis of their technical merits in light of the priority of ongoing studies and projects recommended by the Implementation Committee. The Management Group will identify and implement needed changes to the ranking process as a major agenda item. The Implementation Committee encouraged them to develop the most objective and biologically based process possible.

Jim will be stepping down as Technical Group chairman. In light of committee reorganization, the next meeting has not been scheduled.

4. Reorganization Recommendations:

John Hamill outlined reorganization activities and handed out a list of perceived concerns about the Recovery Program which prompted the reorganization effort (Attachment 4). Tom Pitts summarized the Management Group's recommendations for reorganization of the Recovery Program's committee structure (Attachment 5). This includes assignment of management and planning functions to the Management Group and replacement of the Technical Group with three technical committees (Biology, Information and Education, and Water Acquisition) which will be responsible for developing, implementing, and monitoring work plans. Each Recovery Program participant should appoint an official representative to each committee, and other technical experts may attend at will. Credit will be allowed for each agency representative's participation on the Biology, Information and Education, and Water Acquisition committees, but not on the Management Group, Implementation Committee, or other technical subcommittees.

Although the reorganization plan does not directly address some concerns expressed by field researchers, it is hoped they can be met by:

- a) providing widely circulated and timely meeting summaries to keep everyone informed of Program and Committee activities;
- b) greater commitment by each agency to solicit and represent the views of their researchers; and
- c) developing an outreach program to improve communication between the members of the Biology Committee and researchers. This outreach may involve: a) working directly with supervisors, Biology Committee members, and field researchers to improve intra-agency communication; b) Biology Committee meetings once or twice a year in Vernal and Grand Junction to meet with field researchers; and c) continued participation by research biologists on technical subcommittees and participation in Road Map development.

The concern that some committee members do not have enough time to complete all the required preparation, coordination, and document review to fully participate is a real one. John Hamill pointed out that it is particularly important that Biology Committee members have enough time to participate, as this committee has the largest job to do, and no specific staff assigned to it. The Committee agreed that agencies need to commit the time necessary for their representatives to fully participate in the Program.

Tom Nesler was asked about the Biological Researchers' Advisory Group's perspective on the reorganization plan. Tom said the Group believes that most of their concerns remain. The primary concern is that there is still no provision for collective input from the field biologists; only individual input through agencies. No official forum for the field biologists to get together is provided, and biology is not seen as the driving force for the Recovery Program. Tom provided a suggested flow chart (Attachment 6) and referred to a summary of Research Advisory Group input on reorganization and the Road Maps (Attachment 7). Chips Barry stressed that field biologists do have a voice through their respective

agencies, and that it is inappropriate for them to circumvent that avenue of input. He also noted that the Recovery Program cannot be only biologically driven, as it is an interagency effort to recover the fish while allowing water development to continue, and necessarily involves politics and education, as well.

John Hamill suggested the Implementation Committee consider three recommendations (assuming they approve the reorganization): a) have the Biology Committee develop an outreach program (in conjunction with Tom Nesler and the Researchers' Advisory Group) and report results at the next Implementation Committee meeting; b) sanction the Researchers' Advisory Group to work with the Biology Committee to develop the outreach program and meet periodically to discuss issues and coordinate research activities; and c) ask the Biology Committee to document the amount of time and resources it requires to function adequately.

Bob Williams suggested that perhaps the Researchers' Advisory Group could be a subcommittee to the biology group. The Implementation Committee did not address this. Dee Hansen noted that the reorganization plan required that the technical committees get approval from the Implementation Committee (not just the Management Group) in order to create new subcommittees. The Implementation Committee decided that the Management Group could approve such subcommittees, and the language regarding Implementation Committee approval will be dropped from the reorganization plan.

The Implementation Committee then approved the reorganization plan as well as John Hamill's aforementioned three recommendations.

5. San Juan River Activities

A. Management Plan: In FY-89 the Implementation Committee approved \$50K to complete an evaluation of the San Juan River to lead to the development of a river management plan by March 1989. In FY-90, \$53K was allocated to complete field work, assess present and future hydrology, operational flexibility, and to develop a management plan (by February 1990). At the February 1990 meeting, the Implementation Committee discussed the project and postponed the February 1990 due date to July 1990. The Reclamation recently provided a summary of the fisheries surveys conducted in the San Juan. This report contained a few management recommendations, but was not a management plan. Reclamation noted that: 1) the Section 7 consultation on Animas-La Plata revealed that there was a need for as good a biological summary as possible; 2) all the money has been spent in preparation of the fisheries and hydrology reports; 3) the recovery team meetings have made it clear that recovery is possible in the San Juan River; 4) the management plan was originally intended to determine whether recovery was possible in the San Juan; 5) no management plan is planned at this point; and 6) ongoing negotiations on the Animas-La Plata Project are

expected to encompass management recommendation needs. It was agreed that the Recovery Program should not put any more funding into the San Juan River until these issues are resolved and that the Reclamation could defer preparation of a management plan for the river.

- B. Animas-La Plata Project: Galen Buterbaugh explained that following the Service's draft jeopardy biological opinion, reasonable and prudent alternatives are now being discussed. If any are arrived at they will go back to both the Service and the independent group of biologists for review. One possible alternative is setting up something similar to the Recovery Implementation Program in the San Juan Basin. This could be separate or a part of the Implementation Program. Chips Barry noted that he thinks the Implementation Program is the way to achieve recovery. Tom Pitts commented that it does not make biological or political sense to have two separate programs, and that he thinks the Implementation Program should include all of the Upper Colorado River Basin (including the San Juan). Lloyd Greiner seconded Tom's comments. Roland Robison said the Reclamation's primary concern now is responding to the Service's draft biological opinion and that this has not come to closure yet, but progress is being made.

6. Cross Mountain Ranch Water Rights Acquisition

John Hamill and Robert Wigington outlined the proposed Cross Mountain Ranch water rights acquisition on the Yampa River and submitted a draft resolution for the Implementation Committee's approval (Attachment 8). The resolution would basically recommend the expenditure of up to \$400,000 to purchase Cross Mountain water rights at fair market value and pay appropriate transaction costs.

Dee Hansen commented that he was reluctant to set a precedent by buying water calculated on a diversion basis as opposed to a depletion basis, noting that the actual depletion might only be half of the diversion due to return flows. Robert explained that the value of the water is exceptional any way it is quantified, and that it is not likely that another opportunity will be found where the Bureau of Land Management wants a piece of land and the Program wants the associated water.

Roland Robison asked about the risk that the Colorado water court might not approve the acquisition as an instream flow. Robert replied that the risk is probably very low, but there may be some question as to the amount that will be approved. Chips Barry noted that no downstream users can claim injury, and that problems in water court will more likely occur when we try to convert a conditional right to instream flows, rather than an absolute right like Cross Mountain. Although there is some risk in this, there is greater risk in not spending the money Congress has already appropriated to us.

The following modifications were made to the alternative language for condition #3 of the resolution: a) "by converting them as expeditiously as possible to instream flows" was added to the end of the first sentence; b) "until such time as they have been converted to instream flows" was added to the end of item a; and c) "deemed necessary" was removed from the end of item b. The Implementation Committee also requested that the Yampa phase II flow recommendations report be referenced in the resolution, then approved the resolution as modified.

John Hamill noted that the proposed appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management to acquire Cross Mountain Ranch is before the Senate Committee now, and suggested that the resolution and perhaps a letter be sent to Congress (Senator Byrd) recommending that they appropriate funds for the balance (Bureau of Land Management portion) of the acquisition. The Service will finalize the resolution and Chips Barry will take the lead to get the resolution and a letter to Congress by early September. Colorado will provide the letter to Utah and Wyoming and suggest they orchestrate a similar one from their delegation to Senator Byrd, as well.

7. FY-91 Recovery Program Budget and Work Plan: John Hamill gave a brief overview of the proposed FY-91 Work Plan (Attachment 9).
 - A. Section 7 Funds Status: (Attachment 10) \$319,000 of Section 7 funds in the Service account was originally designated by a biological opinion for construction of fish passage at Redlands Dam. Tom Pitts asked how that money could be de-obligated and used for higher priority recovery activities. The Service agreed to go back to the project proponents and request permission to reprioritize the use of the \$319,000, using the Section 7 funds policy statement as explanation of how the funds would then be spent. Concomitantly, the Service will need to make a determination that the new intended use of the funds is a sufficient reasonable and prudent alternative to the project. Tom Pitts and Colorado agreed to assist the Service as needed to de-obligate the funds.
 - B. Status of Funding for FY-91 by Agency/Participant: The Service noted that the Federal budget may be under a continuing resolution after October 1, 1990, which could impair the ability to let contracts. The Service's \$624,000 contribution to the Recovery Program is in the President's budget. If Gramm-Ruddman goes into effect, it might not affect the Reclamation's contribution to the program (which comes from power revenues), but would impact other parts of the Reclamation program. Dee Hansen said Utah's contribution was set. Wyoming noted that all of their contribution (with the exception of \$7,700 previously agreed upon to complete payment for the Little Snake/Yampa River sediment study) would be made. Colorado recently got word of a 2 percent budget cutback, but this is common, and is usually returned to the budget, so it should not affect their contribution to the Recovery Program.

- C. Budget Concerns (Limitations/Flexibility): Jim Bennett noted that more and more of the annual budget is tied up in ongoing projects, thus limiting the flexibility to direct funds to other high priority activities. (Thus, the reason for using Section 7 funds for some projects this year). The solution is difficult, but certainly we need to be very careful when we commit to large, ongoing projects.
- D. FY-93 Increase for FWS: The Service's contribution this year should be about \$651,000 with inflation, but only \$624,000 has been authorized. The Management Group recommended that the Service seek a \$150,000 increase for the FY-93 budget cycle (to cover the amount owed as well as inflationary increases for the next few years). Galen Buterbaugh said this effort would be given a high priority from Region 6 for FY-93.
- E. Recommendations for the FY-92 Work Plan: John Hamill noted that the procedure for ranking and reviewing project proposals needs to be improved.

Tom Pitts raised four concerns about the Work Plan:

1. Status of recovery goals. The Recovery Program funded a project in FY-90 for the Service's Grand Junction Colorado River Fishery Project to begin developing recovery goals, but the report has not been received yet, and the FY-91 proposal for continuation of this work was not funded. The need for definitive recovery goals has been emphasized during recent development of the Road Maps, Propagation Plan, and other activities, however. Although the Service and the Recovery Team may have responsibility for developing recovery goals, the Recovery Program can help by directing funds towards the effort. John Hamill agreed that we need to get on with defining recovery goals or at least the process to define them. Frank Pfeifer noted that Grand Junction has put together a plan identifying the process. The Service agreed to complete review of the plan and provide it to the Management Group. Tom Pitts suggested that continuation of this work be funded by making it a contingency project for FY-91 or that the Management Group be directed to fund it from Section 7. Chips Barry pointed out that ongoing Program activities should be helping to define and reach recovery goals, as well. Chips also noted that he sees definition of recovery goals as a policy issue as well as a biological one.
2. Operation and maintenance activities. Tom Pitts said he did not think the Recovery Program budget was really intended to provide for operation and maintenance of facilities (such as the razorback sucker propagation facility at Ouray National Wildlife Refuge and the 15-mile reach gage), and we need to try to find other sources

for their funding in future years. The Service agreed to include a request for operation and maintenance funds as a part of the FY-93 budget request.

3. **Sediment impacts.** The Committee previously agreed that sediment impacts would be offset by Recovery Program activities. The Ad Hoc Sediment Committee developed a list of possible projects, but did not prioritize them, and no sediment proposals were funded in the FY-91 Work Plan. Tom Pitts said he thinks the Sediment Committee should reconvene and identify what needs to be done to offset sediment impacts. This information could then be included in both the revision of the Road Maps and the FY-92 budget. John Hamill recommended that sediment studies be done in conjunction with flow recommendation studies rather than independently. The Implementation Committee agreed that the Sediment Committee should reconvene and identify and prioritize needed work.
4. **15-mile reach.** Tom Pitts said he was concerned about the amount of funding in 15-mile reach studies. John Hamill agreed and noted that the environmental groups also are concerned. John suggested that the key players in the 15-mile reach work together to define future direction, but that FY-91 studies stand. The Committee agreed.

The Implementation Committee approved the FY-91 Work Plan pending discussion of Flaming Gorge studies.

- F. Service Overhead Charges on Reclamation Transfer Funds: (Attachment 11) Colorado and Utah have signed a letter to Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan requesting a waiver of these overhead charges. Utah has the letter now and will sign and send it. Galen Buterbaugh noted that there is probably a better chance that the charge would be reduced, rather than waived completely.
- G. Approve Finalization of Road Maps: (Attachment 12) The Service recommended finalizing the current Road Maps as this year's version, and then to meet in January 1991 to revise and update them again for FY-92 guidance. John Hamill asked Tom Nesler about the researchers' perspective on the Road Maps. Tom replied that they think it is an important process, but that the current Road Maps lack the focus, organization, and clear-cut prioritization needed to serve as guidance. Tom also noted that the biologists are not comfortable prioritizing activities such as information and education against biological tasks. Eddie Kochman shared some of Tom's concerns, noting that he thinks much discussion still needs to occur, and that he did not think the Road Maps were ready for approval yet. Gene Jencsok said he thought the scope of the Road Maps should be narrowed back to 5 years. The Implementation Committee approved the Road Maps with the condition that they be revised and updated yearly, with the next iteration to be completed before the February Implementation Committee meeting.

8. Nonnative Fish Activities

- A. Review of Utah Fishery Management Plans: John Hamill gave an update on progress on an agreement with Utah for Service review of Utah's fishery management plans (Attachment 13). Barry Saunders said no agreement had been signed yet, but that Utah would reply soon. (Utah biologists have been occupied with the treatment of Strawberry Reservoir.) Utah intends to develop management plans for all its lakes and reservoirs, starting with those most likely to impact endangered fish habitat. The agreement for Service review of these plans will be patterned after the Colorado agreement. John Hamill distributed a summary of the Service's consultations on Colorado lake management plans (Attachment 14). The Service will distribute an updated version of this list at every Implementation Committee meeting.
- B. Rainbow Smelt Introduction: (Attachment 15) Lynn Starnes summarized the Service's review of Utah's proposal to introduce rainbow smelt in Lake Powell. Lynn noted that the American Fisheries Society also reviewed the proposal and reached the same conclusion that rainbow smelt are not a good solution to Lake Powell's striped bass problems. The Service has agreed to try to help Utah find an alternative solution.

9. Section 7 Consultation Update

- A. Summary of Biological Opinions Issued and Pending: Jim Lutey summarized the status of recent and pending Section 7 consultations in the upper Colorado drainage involving water depletions (Attachment 16). The Service hopes to have a draft opinion on the Sandstone project by this fall, and it will probably require that water be provided from the Sandstone Project to enhance flows for the endangered fishes until other suitable water rights have been acquired by the Recovery Program.
- B. Flaming Gorge Biological Opinion: The Service summarized the status of the Flaming Gorge opinion, noting that Reclamation had asked the Service to delay the biological opinion until 5 more years of studies are done to provide better flow recommendations for the winter/spring period. The Service responded by saying they wanted to go ahead and consult on the summer/fall period, with interim recommendations for winter/spring (see Attachment 17). The Service and the Reclamation will meet for further discussion the week of September 10, 1990. The Reclamation commented that they are willing to accept the summer/fall flow recommendations, but do not believe there is enough information to implement winter/spring recommendations. The Implementation Committee decided that John Hamill should hold the Flaming Gorge portion of the FY-91 Work Plan until after the September 10 meeting between the Reclamation and the Service, and present any modifications to the Management Group on September 26, 1990.

- C. Other Issues: The Service recently met with the Bureau of Land Management to develop consistent approaches to treating water depletions. This meeting is summarized in Attachment 18.

10. Technical Subcommittee Reports

A. Information and Education:

Connie Young gave an update on the status of information and education activities: the poster was finalized and sent to everyone on the mailing list; the "media kit" is underway (Connie also will send the information packet portion of the kit to Recovery Program participants to send to people who inquire about the Program); guidelines will be prepared for getting newsworthy information to Connie so she can do news releases (can be done for all three States); and a news release was prepared as a followup to the articles on the hatchery fish found in the Colorado River (Attachment 19).

Chips Barry asked about the response to the suggestion to change the name of the Colorado squawfish. The Service said the American Fisheries Society (AFS) had responded negatively. There are indications that the name is offensive to Native Americans, we may wish to re-petition AFS, and perhaps request backing from Congressman Ben Nighthorse Campbell. Lynn Starnes noted that the committee that makes these decisions is a joint committee between AFS and the American Society of Ichthyologists and Herpetologists, and we should work together with both groups, perhaps by writing an article for publication in their technical magazines to elevate the issue to enough of their membership.

Connie explained that the Information and Education Committee had decided to shift the primary audience for the newsletter to the general public, as opposed to people directly involved in the Recovery Program. The upcoming issue will emphasize progress being made by the Program, activities at the Ouray facility, the hatchery feasibility study, potential acquisition of water at Cross Mountain Ranch, etc. Any other ideas for articles are welcome, as well.

B. Propagation:

Lynn Starnes reviewed highlights of the Propagation/Genetics Management Plan activities update (Attachment 20). Reclamation explained that the portion of FY-90 funding for Gila taxonomy contracts that could not be spent by the end of the fiscal year will be rolled over into FY-92. Chips Barry asked why the Service is looking at potential hatchery sites in Arizona and New Mexico, in light of the fact that Colorado has committed to build a facility. Holt Williamson noted that: 1) that was what was agreed to in the original propagation/genetics management plan; and 2) very little time will be spent looking for sites in the

Lower Basin. Tom Pitts asked if the Service received a request for fish eggs at Bellvue, and the Service said two requests were received. The first was met, but the second was a request for wild eggs and was made after the fish had spawned. Consequently, the request could not be met. Tom Pitts asked Holt to add the dollar amounts in parentheses after each study on the list at the end of Attachment 20, and to note that the hatchery study is in its second year.

Frank Pfeifer gave an update on the three hatchery-stocked squawfish recently found in the Colorado River, and stressed that we need to learn more about what happened to the fish that were stocked in the early 80's. Galen Buterbaugh noted that if the Service could find money to do so, they would like to conduct followup studies on these fish, such as the ones proposed but not funded for FY-91. Chips Barry commented that he would be interested in more followup of the fish stocked in Kenney Reservoir, and hoped that the Service could include that as well.

Colorado asked what the Service planned to do with the progeny of humpback chub to be captured from Black Rocks, as well as other fish caught from the wild and taken into refugia. Some confusion seemed apparent, and it was agreed that the Service and Colorado needed to get together and clearly outline their plans. The Biology Committee will look into the problem and respond by the February Implementation Committee meeting.

C. Water Acquisition Activities: Tom Pitts summarized recent water acquisition activities. Although there was a 4-month delay, a consultant has now been selected to conduct the Yampa River Basin Feasibility study. It is now underway, and is projected to be completed in 2 years. The report on the Little Snake River Appraisal to look at value and yield of conditional rights there has been completed, and the Reclamation's study of water sources in the 15-mile reach is out for review, with comments due October 1. Upcoming activities include hiring a consultant to evaluate water rights proposals, funding (\$47K) of the 15-mile reach water availability study (scope is being developed now, total cost could be as high as \$100K over 2 years), and the possibility of leasing water on the Yampa River from the Colorado Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation or the Upper Yampa Water Conservancy District (proposals being solicited).

11. Washington Briefing: The planned trip to Washington, D.C., to brief congressional representatives on Program progress was delayed because of the controversy generated by Animas-La Plata. The trip will be made this winter (after elections) in conjunction with the request for an increase in the Service budget for FY-93 and for operation and maintenance funds. John Hamill and Tom Pitts will organize the trip.

12. Next Meeting: The next meeting will be held February 21, 1990, in the Service conference room in Denver.

Attachment I

Attendees
Recovery Implementation Committee Meeting
August 22, 1990

- * Roland Robison, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- * Galen Buterbaugh, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- * H. J. (Chips) Barry, Colorado Department of Natural Resources
- * Lloyd Greiner, Western Area Power Administration
- * Dan Luecke, Environmental Defense Fund
- * Tom Pitts, Upper Basin Water Users
- * John Hamill, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- * Dee Hansen, Utah Department of Natural Resources
- ** John Shields, State of Wyoming
- Barry Saunders, Utah Division of Water Resources
- Bob Williams, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
- Jim Lutey, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Pat Nelson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Lynn B. Starnes, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Holt Williamson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Frank Pfeifer, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Angela Kantola, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Neal Ward, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- Laurie Mathews, Colorado Department of Natural Resources
- Jim Bennett, Colorado Division of Wildlife
- Tom Nesler, Colorado Division of Wildlife
- Connie Young, Colorado Division of Wildlife
- Eddie Kochman, Colorado Division of Wildlife
- Clee Sealing, Colorado Division of Wildlife
- Gene Jencsok, Colorado Water Conservation Board
- Ray Tenney, Colorado River Water Conservation District
- Russ Bovaird, Tri-State Generation & Transmission Assoc., Inc.
- Clayton Palmer, Western Area Power Administration
- Robert Wigington, The Nature Conservancy
- Jerry Olds, Utah Division of Water Resources

- * Implementation Committee Member
- ** Substituting for Jeff Fassett, Wyoming State Engineer

Agenda
Colorado River Recovery Implementation Committee Meeting
August 22, 1990

Convene - 8:30 a.m.

1. Review/Modify Agenda
2. Approval of last Implementation Committee Meeting Summary
3. Recovery Program Update
 - o Program Director and Management Group report
 - o Technical Group Report
4. Reorganization recommendations
 - o Related issues
5. San Juan River Activities
 - o Management Plan
 - o Animas-La Plata Project

LUNCH

6. FY-91 Recovery Program Budget and Work Plan
 - o Overview of work activities
 - o Status of funding for FY-91 by agency/participant
 - o Section 7 fund status
 - o Budget concerns (limitations/flexibility)
 - o FY-93 Increase for FWS
 - o Recommendations for the FY-92 work plan
 - o Approve finalization of the Road Maps
7. Nonnative Fish Activities (FWS/UT)-
 - o Rainbow smelt introduction
 - o Review of Utah fishery management plans
8. Section 7 Consultation Update (Lutey)
 - o Summary of biological opinions issued and pending
 - o Flaming Gorge biological opinion
 - o Other issues
9. Technical Subcommittee reports
 - o Information and education (Young)
 - o Propagation
 - o Water acquisition (Pitts)
9. Washington Briefing (Hamill)
10. Next Meeting

Item Requiring Implementation Committee Action
Colorado River Recovery Implementation Committee Meeting
August 22, 1990

Agenda Item	Action Item
2.	Approval of February 21, 1990, Implementation Committee Meeting Summary.
4.	Approval of the recommendations by the Management Group to reorganize the Management and Technical Groups.
6.	Approval of the FY-91 Work Plan.
9.	Approve finalization of the first edition of the "Road Maps." Approve acquisition of Cross Mountain Ranch water rights (subject to recommendations of the Water Acquisition Subcommittee).

Attachment 3

Actions and Assignments
Recovery Implementation Committee Meeting
August 22, 1990

COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Modified and approved agenda.

Modified and approved minutes of August 30, 1989 meeting.

Approved and made recommendations on the reorganization plan.

Agreed that agencies need to commit the time necessary for their representatives to fully participate in the Program, particularly on the Biology Committee.

Sanctioned the Researchers' Advisory Group to work with the Biology Committee to develop the outreach program.

Agreed that the Recovery Program should not put any more funding into the San Juan River until related issues are resolved and that the Reclamation could defer preparation of a management plan for the river.

Approved and made recommendations on the Cross Mountain Ranch resolution.

Approved work plan with recommendations, and condition that Flaming Gorge studies' portion will be revised after the meeting between the Service the Reclamation and the September 26, 1990, Management Group meeting.

Approved the Road Maps with the condition that they be revised and updated yearly.

ASSIGNMENTS:

The Management Group will identify and implement needed changes to the annual project proposal ranking process.

The Biology Committee will: 1) develop an outreach program to improve communication with the biological researchers (in conjunction with Tom Nesler and the Researchers' Advisory Group) and report results at the next Implementation Committee meeting; and 2) document the amount of time and resources needed for the Biology Committee to function adequately.

The Service will finalize the Cross Mountain Ranch resolution and Chips Barry will take the lead to get the resolution and a letter to Congress by early September. Colorado will provide the letter to Utah and Wyoming and suggest they orchestrate a similar one from their delegation to Senator Byrd, as well.

The Service will approach several project proponents about using the \$319,000 of Section 7 funds currently identified for fish passage at Redlands for other purposes. Tom Pitts and Colorado agreed to assist the Service as needed to de-obligate the funds.

The Service will give high priority to seeking a \$150,000 increase in their contribution to the Recovery Program for the FY-93 budget cycle.

The Service will include a request for operation and maintenance funds as a part of the FY-93 budget request.

The Service will provide their plan for definition of recovery goals to the Management Group.

The Sediment Committee should reconvene and identify and prioritize needed work.

Key players in the 15-mile reach work should get together to define direction of future work. (FY-91 studies stand as approved.)

Colorado and Utah have signed a letter to Secretary of the Interior Manuel Lujan requesting a waiver of these overhead charges. Utah has the letter now and will sign and send it.

The next iteration of the Road Maps are to be completed before the February Implementation Committee meeting.

The Service will distribute an updated version of their list of consultations with States on lake management plans at every Implementation Committee meeting.

Utah will reply soon to the Service's letter regarding review of nonnative fish stocking plans in the Upper Colorado River Basin.

John Hamill will finalize the Flaming Gorge studies portion of the FY-91 Work Plan after the meeting between the Service and Reclamation and the September 26, 1990, Management Group meeting.

Connie Young will: 1) send the information packet portion of the kit to Recovery Program participants for their use in providing information to people who inquire about the Recovery Program; 2) send out guidelines for getting newsworthy information to her so she can do news releases; and 3) send a plastic endangered fishes sign to the Service for their main office.

The Service will work with both the American Fisheries Society and the American Society of Ichthyologists & Herpetologists to change the common name of the Colorado squawfish, and will write an article for publication in their technical magazines to elevate the issue to their membership.

The Service will add dollar amounts in parentheses and a total cost on the study list at the end of Attachment 20, and note that the hatchery study is in its second year.

The Service and Colorado will get together and clearly outline their plans for wild-caught fish and their offspring in refugia. The Biology Committee also will look into this and respond by the February Implementation Committee meeting.

John Hamill and Tom Pitts will organize the briefing trip to Washington, D.C.