

## MEETING SUMMARY

**Meeting:** Colorado River Management Committee, Craig, Colorado

**Date:** August 21-22, 2000

**Attendees:** See Attachment 1

>Assignments are highlighted in the text.

CONVENE - 10:00 a.m., Monday, August 21

1. Review/modify agenda and time allocations and appoint a time-keeper (Shields) (5 min.)
2. Approve June 7, 2000 meeting summary - The summary was approved as written.
3. Program Updates
  - Ouray hatchery water quality - Brent reported on their investigations into what should be done at the Ouray Hatchery. The existing well field likely will be expanded to double current water production, and they also will be testing the pumps. Pond water will no longer be treated, but 10% of the water in the ponds will be replaced daily. With these and other modifications (which may cost up to \$250K), Brent said they believe Ouray can produce the needed 150,000 fish per year. Tom Pruitt noted that they are producing fish this year (~30,000). Pruitt said he believes we have ~\$5M invested in the Ouray Hatchery, but Henry noted that with Service expenditures of drought and flood relief money, the investment is probably higher. >The Committee would still like to see a summary of the costs of Ouray to date. The Management Committee approved the \$250K expenditure. Brent will get back to the Management Committee if they encounter any major problems or cost escalation. Everything should be up and running correctly by late winter/early spring.
  - Long-term funding legislation - Tom Pitts reported that the bill passed the House on July 25. The hearing in the Senate on April 25 went well, but the committee staff didn't write a report on the bill which brought progress to a halt in the Senate. Tom said he spoke with Andy Colosimo, Seth Voyles, and Alan Freemeyer last week to get this out of the committee and get the House bill onto the Senate floor for a vote in early September.
  - Fish passage - Price/Stubb - Brent Uilenberg said the Service has completed their biological opinion on the Jacobsen Hydro. unit. Under the opinion, Mr. Jacobsen would be required to cover the incremental cost of installing a ladder over removal of the dam. Reclamation is continuing to look at the three options of: 1) removal; 2) ladder; and 3) rock-drop structure. Removal is least expensive, but may carry some risk of liability for Reclamation in the event of later landslide. The third alternative could cost \$1.5 - 2M more than removing the dam, but since this is the preferred alternative for whitewater recreation and for other reasons, the city of Grand Junction is looking for alternative funding for

the incremental difference between dam removal and a drop structure. Grand Valley Project - Reclamation will have a report on the conceptual alternatives analysis for fish passage at this dam in September. This will be a very expensive ladder. Conceptual design will contain rough cost estimates. The draft EA is in the works, also, and should be sent out in October. Hartland - The alternatives analysis report is underway with two alternatives: 1) a ladder at ~\$.5M; or 2) a boatable rock-drop structure at ~\$2M. Reclamation is discussing the second option with the city of Delta which owns property the Program may be interested in for floodplain restoration.

- Grand Valley water management - Brent said GVWUA contract has been awarded and construction on the check structure will begin this fall. The Highline pumping plant agreement is still being negotiated.
- Diversion canal fish screening - GVIC design is 90% complete and discussions are continuing with GVIC regarding operation and maintenance. Tusher Wash - apparently Thayne Hydropower is not appropriately permitted, so Reclamation probably will move ahead on design to screen pumping and irrigation water only (~515 cfs is the apparent legal entitlement). The estimated cost would be ~\$2M. The canal company and Thayne would be responsible to pay for screen enlargement if the canal company enters into agreement with Thayne in the future. Redlands also will be screened (Reclamation will discuss this under the work plan.)
- Colorado River Coordinated Facility Operations Studies - Tom Nesler distributed Randy Seaholm's summary. Tom Pitts expressed concern regarding delays on this project (~6 mo.). Phase II of this study is supposed to be completed next fall. The group has not met recently. Contrary to the report, funding is available with or without the long-term funding legislation. The Management Committee will put an update on this project on the agenda for their next meeting, also.
- Ruedi Reservoir Water Service Contracts - Long Term and Municipal Contracts - Julie Swanda reported that the municipal contract out of Green Mountain Reservoir is still awaiting approval from Washington, D.C. to negotiate the contract. >Christine will talk to Rick Gold about what can be done to expedite the Washington approval. >This will be on the Implementation Committee meeting agenda. Brent noted that we're fast depleting our other options for supplementing 15-Mile Reach flows while we have a surplus water in Green Mountain. Without the contract, the Green Mountain surplus can't be administered for the fish at this point (would go to transmountain diversions, instead). The Program really needs this water for the fish in early September, and strongly encouraged Reclamation to execute a temporary contract (between CWCB, BOR, and the City of Grand Junction). >Henry will send a request letter to Reclamation's acting area manager and also brief Randy Seaholm on this (done). The Management Committee would like to be kept informed on the progress. Julie said Reclamation is working on NEPA scoping for the Ruedi

contract and they also are looking at the hydrology. Tom Pitts said the water users are concerned that the Orchard Mesa Check meetings aren't being announced and held early enough each year. >George Smith will draft a letter from the Program Director's office and send it to Tom Pitts for comment.

- Land acquisition status - Dave Soker reported first on easements, noting several that are very close to acquisition. Tom Nesler asked how many acres we're currently managing; and Brent noted that the table totals 405 for the Green River (~\$1500/acre at this point). (>Dave will add totals to the table as well as a summary table at the top.) Growout ponds - Six ponds were acquired or leased for growout this year in the Grand Valley, and four in Utah. The average cost is \$2K per year per pond for these leases. The pond leases are cost effective, involve the community, and build support for the Program. >Dave also will add to this list the other ponds that we're using for growout that are not under leasing contracts. >The Program Director's office will then post the tables to the Program website.

4. Review and approve recommended FY 2001 Work Plan (to be discussed and approved by the Implementation Committee on September 6, 2000)

Brent Uilenburg distributed revised scopes of work for the following capital projects: Tusher Wash screening, Price-Stubb fish passage, Grand Valley Project passage and screening, GVIC screening, and Grand Valley Project water management. (>Brent will post these to the listserver.) These scopes have been revised based on schedule changes since we can't control when we can begin work on Price-Stubb and since the need to screen Tusher Wash is immediate. Minor changes also have been made to the narratives. \$4.887M is available in FY 01. Reclamation's proposed budget and schedule would use \$4.075M (the remainder would be turned back). Brent said they don't believe it's reasonable to use more funding in FY 01.

Chris Karas raised a concern about data not being submitted to the central database in a timely fashion and suggested that >the Committee discuss this in more detail in the future. >The Program Director's office will check with Chuck McAda to see how serious this problem is and what can be done.

Tom Pitts asked how the proposed monitoring program meets the recovery goal requirements and Henry Maddux said >his office would send out a write-up of how the monitoring tracks the recovery goals as soon as the recovery goals are approved.

The Management Committee made minor revisions to the work plan and approved it as revised.

5. Incorporating long-term funding into the Recovery Program -

John Shields noted that we need to make it clear what funds are power revenues (the white paper incorrectly refers to those as Reclamation funds). However, it's still

undecided if those funds will come directly from power revenues now or through a CWCB loan to be repaid with power revenues at a later date. >WAPA and CREDA need to make that decision.

Brent recommended using the simplest mechanism possible to incorporate the state funds into the Program (preferably where the states put their funds into NFWF on an annual basis). Those funds would be tracked separately for each state (with separate agreements between the Foundation and each state). Henry endorsed this recommendation, noting that those agreements can specify that any funds contributed and not spent in any given year will be returned to the state. In addition to putting the funds into NFWF, there also will be some circumstances where the state will pay or get credit for something without the funds needing to go through the Foundation. >Robert King will get a copy of the sample NFWF agreement (Utah Big Game Mitigation Fund agreement) and send it to the Committee members for Wyoming and Colorado (and also the Program Director's office). We need to maintain parity between the state and power revenues each year to the extent possible. Ideally, we also would maintain parity among the states each year, but that may not be possible (e.g., we might need additional funds from Wyoming in FY 01 to compensate for a shortfall from the Colorado endangered species trust fund if Colorado's full FY 01 capital contribution can't be made up from GOCO funds).

>Prior to the September 6 Implementation Committee meeting, Bruce McCloskey and Tom Pitts will need to meet with Greg Walcher and Kent Holsinger to discuss how to meet Colorado's capital fund obligation for FY 2001. Colorado will need to identify the projects that their funds will be spent on.

The Committee recommended that the states use NFWF to transfer their funds into the Program and that they begin working with the Foundation now to develop those agreements. >Brent Uilenberg will modify the outyear funding discussion table based on the decisions made to the FY 01 budget today. >The ad hoc group will revise the white paper and post it to the listserv. At the Implementation Committee, >each state will report if they have the FY 01 capital funds called for and if they are willing to transfer the money via NFWF.

6. The Committee viewed the Grand Valley videotape.

ADJOURN: 5:10 p.m.

CONVENE: 8:30 a.m., Tuesday, August 22

7. Recovery Goals - Henry introduced the recovery goals discussion and noted that he would like to publish them in the Federal Register by the end of September so that we can enter the more formal review process.

Tom Pitts recommended striking "recommendations" from Task A-1 on page 37 (and other tasks as applicable), so that it reads "Develop, implement, evaluate, and revise (as necessary) flows to benefit endangered fishes..." since this otherwise could be read to

require implementing the flow recommendations as downlisting/delisting criteria. The Committee agreed to replacing “recommendations” with “regimes” and adding language similar to the sentence on page 24 which says “these flow regimes will be evaluated as part of adaptive management.”

>Chrisrine Karas will submit specific language for page 25 regarding Glen Canyon operations, along with any citations.

The Committee discussed the need for site-specific management actions vs. fish population goals as downlisting criteria and the relationship of the site-specific management actions to the tasks identified in the RIPRAP. Tom Nesler maintained that the ESA itself doesn't require site-specific management actions as downlisting criteria. Concern exists in the Committee that some of the management actions could be used to prevent downlisting/delisting if we were achieve the population downlisting/delisting criteria without implementing each of the management actions to the fullest extent to which they might be interpreted. Tom Czapla suggested that the last sentence on page 36 could be re-written to say “the management tasks identified to minimize or remove threats will also have to be completed *before delisting*.” >This issue will be summarized for the Implementation Committee and discussed at their September 6 meeting. The parenthetical “see section 2.1” will be placed after the “five listing factors” on page 35 (first paragraph of section 5.0).

Tom Pitts raised concern about the pikeminnow numbers for downlisting criteria for the San Juan River.

The Program Director's office will send out the razorback and bonytail packages (in the same format as the humpback and pikeminnow packages) no later than September 8. >Management Committee members will submit any additional written comments on all four packages by September 22. The Program Director's office will call those who comment to discuss any comments which they don't believe they can address. (The Implementation Committee will discuss if these dates are acceptable, since it will prevent publishing the goals in the Federal Register by September 30 [the date now will be mid-October].) The Management Committee does not intend to meet again before the goals are published in the Federal Register.

8. Yampa Management Plan Alternatives - Henry outlined the plan, noting that the two primary issues are augmentation flows (~7,000 af, primarily during the irrigation season) and nonnative fish control. Gerry Roehm reviewed the augmentation options and estimated costs (see attachment 2). Alternatives 9 and 10 and 5 best meet the augmentation requirements. Brent noted that the capital funds cost ceiling allows ~\$14.5M for the Yampa management plan, therefore, alternative 9 may not be realistic. Henry said he believes some combination of alternatives 4, 5, and 6 may be the best option. Christine questioned how the current review with the “narrow public” will mesh with the NEPA process. >Gerry will post to the listserver the schedule for the public scoping and NEPA process. The next meeting of the Yampa work group will be August 30-31 in Craig.

9. Section 7 Consultation

- Programmatic biological opinions: The 15-Mile Reach PBO has been in place since December, and about 20 recovery agreements have been signed since then. NRCS is still evaluating their ability to retain discretionary authority. The Program Director's office is tracking items in the PBO that may not be on schedule (e.g. Ruedi contract, etc.) and will continue to bring those to the Committee's attention.

- Aspinall flow recommendations - The draft report is out and will be discussed by the Biology Committee in October. The Service is meeting with WAPA and CREDA tomorrow to discuss the recommendations and how they fit into overall recovery. Henry said he believes the report won't be finalized until about December.

- Section 7 consultation list - Angela Kantola distributed the updated list (through 6/30/2000).

10. Draft Implementation Committee agenda for September 6, 2000 meeting (9:30 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.). Agenda items will include:

- Approval of March 8, 2000 meeting summary
- Recovery Program and fish status update (include update on Green Mountain contract)
- Recovery Goals presentation
- Review/approval of recommended FY 2001 Work Plan
- Incorporating long-term funding from the States into the Recovery Program
- Update on long term funding legislation
- Update on biological opinions
- Scheduling of March 2001 Implementation Committee meeting. (Perhaps March 8?)
- CREDA would like to discuss having voting privileges in the Recovery Program
- Update on hiring process for new Program Director

11. Process for hiring new Program Director - Susan Baker said the Service intends to advertise the position both inside and outside the government. Bob McCue will be the selecting official for the position, and Susan said she will recommend to Ralph that the interview panel consist of Bob McCue, Henry Maddux, and John Shields. >Susan will post a note to the listserver as soon as the position is advertised. Susan anticipates that a selection could be made and the person on board by late November.

12. Next meeting - If the legislation doesn't pass, the Committee will meet on October 23<sup>rd</sup> in Denver near DIA. If the legislation does pass, the Committee will not meet until November 20<sup>th</sup> in Denver near DIA. In either case, the meeting will begin at 9:30 a.m. and adjourn at 4:00 p.m.

ADJOURN – 11:45 a.m.

**Attachment 1**  
**Colorado River Management Committee, Cheyenne, Wyoming**  
**August 21-22, 2000**

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Christine Karas	Bureau of Reclamation
Bruce McCloskey	State of Colorado
Robert King	Utah Department Of Water Resources
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Shane Collins	Western Area Power Administration
Susan Baker	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Nonvoting Members:

<u>Henry Maddux</u>	Recovery Program Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Mazour	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association

Recovery Program Staff:

Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bob Muth	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Soker	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pat Nelson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Debbie Felker	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Czapl	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Gerry Roehm	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others:

Tim Modde	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Pruitt	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Nesler	State of Colorado
Jim Hartman	Western Area Power Administration
George Smith	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bob McCue	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Paul Dey	State of Wyoming
Ray Tenney	Colorado River Water Conservancy District
Julie Swanda	Bureau of Reclamation
Todd Hartman	Rocky Mountain News
John Reber	National Park Service
Rich Valdez	SWCA, Inc.

Attachment 2: Management Committee Update  
Yampa River Management Plan

The August 16, 2000, draft of the Yampa Plan outlines a variety of alternatives to augment base flows in the Yampa River for the endangered fishes. Eleven different scenarios were formulated and evaluated with CRDSS. Table 1 below describes each of the alternatives; Table 2 evaluates their ability to satisfy the estimated augmentation requirements; Table 3 compares their costs.

Table 1. Description of augmentation water supply alternatives

Water Source(s)	Augmentation Volume (acre-feet)										
	No Action	Multiple-source Alternatives						Single-source Alternatives			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7*	8*	9	10	11*
Steamboat Lake (primary)		2000 <sup>1</sup>	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2000 <sup>1</sup>	2000 <sup>1</sup>	7000 <sup>1</sup>			
Elkhead Reservoir		3700 <sup>2</sup>		5000 <sup>2</sup>	3700 <sup>2</sup>	3700 <sup>2</sup>			7000 <sup>4</sup>	7000 <sup>2</sup>	
Stagecoach Reservoir			3700 <sup>2</sup>		1300 <sup>3</sup>		1300 <sup>3</sup>				7000 <sup>5</sup>
New Tributary Reservoir						1300					
Supply Interruption Contract(s)							3700				
Steamboat Lake (secondary)		1300 <sup>1</sup>	1300 <sup>1</sup>								
Total AF Available to Augment	0	7000	7000	7000	7000	7000	7000	7000	7000	7000	7000

<sup>1</sup> Lease from Colorado State Parks

<sup>2</sup> Reservoir enlargement

<sup>3</sup> Lease from Tri-State

<sup>4</sup> 3700-AF reservoir enlargement; 3300-AF exchange w/Steamboat Lake

<sup>5</sup> 3700-AF lease from Tri-State; 3300-AF exchange w/Steamboat Lake

\* Non-structural alternatives

Table 2. Ability of water supply alternatives to satisfy augmentation needs of fish

Evaluation criteria	No Action	Multiple-source Alternatives						Single-source Alternatives			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7*	8*	9	10	11*
#Years w/demand for fish	48	48	48	48	48	Alternative 5	Unknown	48	48	48	48
#Years w/shortages > 500 AF	45	<b>0</b>	2	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>			1	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
#Years w/shortages < 500 AF	3	3	2	1	<b>0</b>			12	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	1
Maximum shortage (AF)	7000	1	546	27	<b>0</b>			6127	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	389
Rank (smallest max. shortage)	9	4	7	5	<b>1</b>			8	1	1	6

\* Non-structural alternatives

Values in **bold** represent the best performance

Table 3. Estimated costs of Yampa River augmentation water supply alternatives

Alternatives	New storage @\$1800/AF		Lease costs @ \$35/AF/year capitalized over 45 years at a 6% discount rate			Total x\$1000
	AF	x\$1000	AF	\$/AF	x\$1000	
1	-	-	-	-	-	-
7,8,11	-	-	7,000	573	4,014	4,014
2,3,5,10	3,700	6,660	3,300	573	1,892	8,552
4,6	5,000	9,000	2,000	573	1,147	10,147
9	7,000	12,600	-	-	-	12,600