

Dated: May 15, 2020

Management Committee Webinar Summary, April 27-28

CONVENED: April 27, 12:30 PM MT

1. Introductions & requests to modify agenda – Steve Wolff welcomed everyone to the call and thanked everyone for being present under these unusual circumstances. Agenda was modified as reads below.

The Committee approved the February meeting summary. >Julie will finalize and post (*done*).

2. Impacts of COVID-19 pandemic on Program activities – Biology Committee Chairman Dave Speas provided an update of Program activities that have changed because of various recommendations issued by states and local governments. The Biology Committee met on March 20th by phone and has met several times since then to monitor developments in guidance. Dave praised the participants in the BC call for the information they have provided during those meetings. As of today, Colorado is transitioning into a “Safer at Home” policy which is very similar to the previous order, but does allow for some additional outings and movement. In addition, the Southeastern Utah Public Health Department Order was last revised on April 23rd. Advice remains to limit travel through May 1st. Many closures remain in effect, but some restaurants and campgrounds have opened. At the Federal level, OMB provided a memo on March 14th restricting travel to essential functions. Universities have closed campuses, most National Parks are closed and most of the National Monuments have closed to river trips, and Navajo Nation has closed their borders as well. PIs will continue to plan as possible during the next transition period. CSU suspended all field research for multiple reasons, including concern about moving from densely populated areas to rural areas. Most employees have been busy working on manuscripts, reports, data, repairing equipment. No guidance is currently available for travel from CSU. CPW was able to conduct some field work in March. However, backwater netting in the Yampa and removal of nonnative fish from Kenney Reservoir and ponds along the Colorado River were cancelled. Additional guidance is expected in coming weeks. FWS-FWCOs have delayed on-boarding all out-of-state seasonal staff, but were able to bring on staff from the local areas. Hatchery work has been able to continue, including the spawning of razorback sucker. Local field work will continue as possible, with the priority on Colorado pikeminnow population estimates on the Colorado River. Chris Smith in Vernal was given permission to conduct light-trapping and operate Johnson and Old Charley floodplain wetlands to take advantage of LTSP. Some antennas were deployed in the vicinity of Razorback Bar. UDWR postponed a lot of their work, cancelling work through June in the Moab office. June 8th may be the first day of field work. UDWR-Moab has continued limited electrofishing of walleye at the Tusher Diversion. Operation of Stewart Lake is moving forward as well. Local seasonals were hired, but seasonals were not brought in from out of state. Public perception of scientific employees being able to work when so many others may not caused concern. Additional details are forthcoming, but crews may delay multi-day

river trips for a while. Information and Education efforts have been curtailed for the spring and will likely not occur throughout this summer if events do open. Melanie is focusing on digital offerings and will support the Program as needed. The decision to attend partner meetings (Colorado Water Congress, CRWUA and UWU) will be made later in the fall. Reclamation has been able to move forward with Red Fleet construction, which is scheduled to begin in May from the Provo area office. The National Parks are accepting permit applications that include plans to adhere to social distancing measures while sampling. Dave thanked everyone for their concerted effort to really evaluate how to work best through these times, with priorities for safety and optics. Jojo thanked Dave for the comprehensive summary and transparency about what is possible. Jojo noted that reservoir operations have been operating normally. Don confirmed that all reservoir operators are meeting and delivering water on schedule without substantial complications. Jojo asked for a list of projects for what was able to go forward and what was not. Dave said that list will be available later in the summer, as it is still a moving target. The lower half of the Colorado River pikeminnow estimates have been cancelled and no work occurred on the Yampa this year.

3. GREAT Report Overview – Tom reviewed the history of the GREAT report, noting that both the WAC and the BC approved the report last fall. Tom sent it to the MC in December and MC members requested this review. WAPA was interested in doing an analysis of the recommendations and their effect on hydropower. Tom hopes we can get the hydropower analyses online before we begin drafting our 2021 Green River flow request letter.

Kirk reviewed that the goal of the revised document was to provide an overall evaluation and status assessment of the original flow recommendations (Muth *et al.* 2000). The authors evaluated conditions before and after the original flow recommendations were implemented and determined that changes were warranted in the recommendations. The study area is broken into three reaches: Reach 1 (Flaming Gorge to the Yampa), Reach 2 (Yampa to White) and Reach 3 (White to Colorado). Specific recommendations are present for all reaches. The authors acknowledge a variety of changes in the Green River since Muth *et al.*, including increase in razorback sucker due to stocking, LTSP, higher occurrence of CPM in upstream reaches and lower abundance of CPM overall, increasing bonytail survival, apparent extirpation of humpback chub in Yampa and Whirlpool canyons, an increase in the abundance of nonnative predatory fishes, sustained drought, and restrictions in the use of the Flaming Gorge spillway. Flow recommendations focused on floodplain connections in Reach 2, backwater nursery habitat in Reaches 2 and 3, and nonnative fish effects in Reaches 1 and 2. Key elements of the recommendations include:

- Experimental implementation of revised recommendations
- Place greater emphasis on timing peak Flaming Gorge Reservoir releases to match the occurrence of larval razorback suckers rather than Yampa River peak flows to improve razorback sucker recruitment

- Increase the rate of decline from peak flow to base flow to provide for Colorado pikeminnow backwater habitat earlier in the year and before larval drift
- Provide short-duration, cool-water flow spikes prior to pikeminnow larval drift to disadvantage smallmouth bass reproduction
- Increase the magnitude of base flows in dry, moderately dry, and average years, and decrease them in moderately wet and wet years to improve pikeminnow recruitment

Specific Recommendations include:

- Reach 1 – peak flows – no change in magnitude/duration recommendations. Timing now recommended to coincide with larval emergence of razorback sucker rather than matching the Yampa peak. In some years, channel maintenance may take priority.
- Reach 1 – base flows – now broken into experimental and non-experimental components. Experimental base flows adjust the rate of decline to prioritize dropping flows as quickly as possible (up to 2,000 cfs/day) and should continue through September. No change was recommended in base flow variation. Once experimental base flows are complete, flows should revert to non-experimental baseflows listed in Muth et al.
- Reach 1 – temperature – recommending 3-5 week period at the beginning of base flows, which corresponds with how recommendations are currently implemented.
- Reach 1 – experimental nonnative fish flows to disadvantage smallmouth bass are recommended when possible.
- Reach 2 – peak flow – changed average year recommendation to increase 8,300 cfs to 14,000 cfs for years when 18,600 cfs is not targeted. This change is because a number of wetlands can connect at levels below 18,600 cfs. Changes recommended for average, moderately wet, and wet years prioritizing longest duration possible. Timing recommendations align with Reach 1.
- Reach 2 – base flow – changes align with Reach 1 baseflows with recommended flows of 1700-3000 cfs based on hydrologic conditions. The recommendations for rates of decline and period align with Reach 1. Base flow variation is similar to Muth et al. but daily changes could be up to 300 cfs, instead of 3% per day.
- Reach 2 – experimental nonnative fish flows recommended to be implemented for short durations at the start of the base flow period prior to CPM larval drift.
- Reach 2 – water temperature – no change recommended.
- Reach 3 – peak flow – no change recommended in magnitude or timing, duration recommendations align with Reach 1.

- Reach 3 – base flows – changes recommended during experimental base flow period, targeting 1700 cfs – 3800 cfs depending on hydrologic conditions which are lower than the original recommendations in wetter years. Rate of decline and period align with Reach 2 recommendations.
- Reach 3 – no recommendations for experimental nonnative fish flows or water temperature.

Derek asked how the Program would decide to implement channel forming flows. Kirk said monitoring information would provide indicators that channel narrowing was occurring through the NPS Channel Monitoring Study Plan. Timing was discussed and the participants estimated that channel forming flows might occur about every 10 years, but actual implementation would be based on the monitoring results. Melissa noted that the Monitoring Plan is currently out for review and comments are due on May 4th.

Kirk reviewed the implementation process, outlined in a flow chart. The implementation process is specific to different hydrologies, using the same categories that were established in Muth et al. Three experiments are proposed to evaluate the recommendations. Monitoring results could be used to prioritize recommendations for peak flows in average years. In wet years, the priority will be floodplain connections and channel maintenance. During dry years, the goal is to prioritize backwater habitat and smallmouth bass control. The Flaming Gorge Technical Work Group would continue to work with the committees to implement the recommendations. A number of uncertainties are acknowledged in the report, both in ability to implement the recommendations and in the effects of the recommendations.

Shane said a lot of the concern from WAPA's perspective center around the uncertainties. WAPA is trying to understand the effects of changing the recommendations, especially as the categories change over time in the context of Drought Contingency Planning and Drought Response Releases. WAPA expressed concerns about the paragraphs relating to base flow experiments translating into lower reservoir levels. Kirk clarified that the point of that paragraph is that operators could see some of the consequences of the base flows and adjust accordingly, not to restrict the decision making process around how to move forward in any given year. Shane called attention to the language on page A-6 regarding lower reservoir levels and asked how balancing would work between the experiments. Derek asked which uncertainties gave the authors most pause. Kevin Bestgen said they are all important, but the climate change scenarios are still in flux with multiple models. He also called attention to the change in availability of the Flaming Gorge spillway to augment peak flows and flood wetlands. Kevin also said the nonnative fish effects are based on robust datasets, but also that the nonnative species dynamics change frequently. He noted the difference between nonnative fish populations during the development of Muth et al. and what it looks like 20 years later. Tom Chart said the synthesis documents provide robust analyses on these changes, especially in relation to LTSP. Tom is most excited about testing the anticipated effects of the smallmouth bass flow spikes and improved base flow management to enhance pikeminnow survival. Leslie asked for more detail around the uncertainty of using the spillway. Kevin Bestgen said Reclamation has said that use

of the spillway for other than dam safety purposes is off the table, and compared that to the decisions made during the Muth et al recommendations when use of the spillway was assumed. Leslie clarified that the uncertainty around the spillway was not uncertainty that the spillway could be used, but that the goals could be accomplished without the use of the spillway. Kevin and Kirk agreed. Leslie asked how the model results from the Drought Contingency Plan were integrated into these recommendations. Tom Chart recognized that drought operations could be a reality but are a management decision that would occur outside of the Recovery Program and therefore we felt beyond the purview of GREAT team other than to recognize them as an uncertainty. He felt a drought operation could have serious effects on future reservoir management, similar in some ways to climate change, and the authors recognized they could affect our ability to conduct these experiments in the future. Reservoir elevations are a significant driver in the decision making process because of both of those effects. If drought operations were in effect in any given year, the Recovery Program would factor those into our annual flow requests.

Tom Chart asked if drought contingency was likely to occur within the timeline of the interim flow recommendations. Steve Wolff said the likelihood of drought operations occurring before 2026 was very, very low, but not impossible.

Dave Speas asked about the hydropower analysis and how that would affect approval. Derek said WAPA started their analysis in January, with support from Reclamation. The process was interrupted by COVID-19, but met again last week. The CRSS modeling from Reclamation will likely not be available for some time. WAPA is currently seeking a path forward without that modeling. Tom Chart said WAPA's analyses would be brought to the MC as soon as WAPA is ready. Shane was unsure if the hydropower analysis would be included in the GREAT, as an appendix, or a standalone report. He noted how important it was to complete the analysis to be able to examine whether or not rate increases would be likely because of these experiments. Dave Speas asked the MC if the hydropower analysis affects the GREAT report itself or whether it would be included in the implementation stage from Reclamation's perspective. Leslie said whenever experiments are proposed in the GCMRC, the effects on hydropower are evaluated as part of the discussion. Steve Wolff said from Wyoming's perspective, any operations that would affect tiers in Lake Powell would be of significant interest from multiple parties. Tom Chart committed to reporting back to the MC on a proposed strategy to complete the GREAT report in relation to the pending hydropower analysis. Tom and Steve thanked Kevin and Kirk for their excellent presentation.

4. Report from DC Briefing Trip – Steve Wolff said 26 calls were conducted instead of the DC in-person briefings. Unfortunately, the Reclamation environmental programs funding report had not been released yet. Steve said the call with Aurelia Skipwith and Brenda Burman went very well. Overall, 16 people participated in the calls. Steve thanked Melanie for her excellent work in making both the physical Briefing Book and a last minute digital copy as well. Jojo said one of the meetings that did not occur was with the Senate Appropriations Committee and asked if that meeting would be

rescheduled. Steve said he is still working on getting on Tyler Owens' schedule, but he has not been able to reschedule it as of yet, likely because of COVID-19.

5. Program Director's Update – Tom said the office is currently working on Post-2023 and Section 4 documents. Tom also highlighted the work Shane Capron and Melissa Trammell have been leading on reintroducing humpback chub in the upper basin. He noted that Tildon and Kevin are the representatives from our office on those calls. Tom said the BC is very focused on collections of young pikeminnow to create genetically-robust broodstock from both the Green and Colorado rivers. Tildon has been the lead from our office, working with PIs, the San Juan Program, as well as Southwestern Native ARRC. Tom said multiple landowners in the Green River referred to as the Green River Stakeholders provided language to the State Legislature in a proposed resolution that did not pass. The Stakeholders have offered some privately owned habitat that could be used for grow-out facilities potentially in conjunction with the hatchery system. Tildon has been the Program's point of contact on those conversations and has drafted up a list of specifications that outline the key components of managed floodplains. One of the key components is the inclusion of water control structures. Tom would like to make the offer that if there are any areas that would fit within our expectations, the Program would consider providing funds to build those structures and asked if the MC could support further conversations. Jojo asked how the habitat use would be framed within the context of spring flow releases. Tom Chart said it would not be in lieu of the dam releases recommended under larval trigger. Tildon said the landowners are seeking some sort of benefit occurring from the spring releases, which might occur through funding for inundated lands that provide benefits to recovery, but that conversations were still in the early stages. Steve Wolff said if there is a benefit to the Program, it could be worth further discussion, but encouraged caution in those discussions. Tom Chart said the Program is trying to acknowledge the best parts of the Stakeholders' proposal, and therefore is focused on the specific aspect of their proposal that could provide seasonal nursery habitat. Jojo encouraged bringing Tom Pitts into those discussions.

Tom Chart said that both he and Melissa Mata met with Brent Esplin on the previous Friday to provide an in-depth view of the programs as he is pretty new in his role at Reclamation. Tom thanked Ryan Christianson for being on that call and providing information to Brent. Tom said he or his staff are always available to describe the program to any new participants or key leaders in any of the partner agencies.

6. ESA Section 4 document updates
 - a. Colorado pikeminnow SSA & 5-year review – Tildon said the SSA has been completed for Colorado pikeminnow and will be released with the completed 5-year review. The USFWS's Recommendation Team recommended maintaining the current ESA status of endangered; Tildon is drafting the 5-year review for the species, which should be complete before the end of the fiscal year. Jojo asked if the BC had seen the SSA. Tildon confirmed that the BC saw it last fall. Tom said the 5-year review will also recommend revision of the recovery plan for that species, a

process that will begin this summer. Jojo asked if the decline of the species and potential stocking factored into the decision. Tildon said a status quo scenario was included along with various conservation activities. The status quo scenario trajectories are fairly grim, with declines in the population continuing. Tildon noted that the decision making process first assessed whether or not, based on the current condition, the species was endangered; when the decision was reached to retain endangered status, there was no need to consider the threatened status, which relies on the future scenarios analysis.

- b. Humpback chub proposed rule – Kevin McAbee said the comment period closed in late March and thanked all of the partners who submitted comments. All comments can be accessed here. The Navajo Nation, the States of Utah, Arizona, and Colorado, water users (11 organizations), and CREDA submitted comments. Five NGOs submitted comments, including an email campaign from the Grand Canyon Chapter of the Sierra Club, as did 10 members of the general public. No federal agency offered comments. Lots of comments related to population stability, future drought and runoff conditions, and climate stability. Kevin is working on assessing and responding to those comments. FWS is going to begin a period of government-to-government consultation with Navajo Nation at their request. Pending the outcome of the government-to-government consultations, FWS will assess the deadline of January 2021 for publication of the final rule. Steve asked if any comments referred to long-term funding of the Program. Kevin said that was a common topic from both the partners who submitted comments as well as from NGOs who read the scenarios in the SSA. Funding will be need to be addressed and assessed in the final rule. Kevin clarified that our region’s goal is to get the final rule to HQ by the end of the fiscal year, which then supports publication of the final rule in the Federal Register before January 2021. Marj said the comment level was not substantial in relation to other rulemakings, which to her indicates a small amount of controversy,
 - c. Razorback sucker proposed rule – Julie Stahl said the proposed rule is working its way to HQ after incorporating Solicitor review. The timeline for publication is currently unknown, but we are hoping to get it published as soon as possible. We hope to use Tribal Consultation for HBC as an opportunity to also talk about the razorback sucker proposed rule. Patrick McCarthy asked about the government-to-government consultation and at what level we might work with Navajo Nation. Kevin McAbee clarified the comments came from Navajo Nation Dept. of Wildlife and the FWS tribal liaison has been working with that department, but it appears other departments have been invited. Patrick asked if representatives from the San Juan Program were also involved. Julie explained that the San Juan Program was involved with the razorback sucker SSA but since humpback chub is not present in that basin, the same process was not in place. Chris Breidenbach asked about the timeline for the proposed rule. Timelines have not been consistent with expectations, so it has been hard to predict.
7. RIPRAP Question and Answer – Tom Chart said typically this April meeting is a face to face meeting to pore over the RIP/RAP materials reviewed by the technical committees. We have been

taking a more streamlined approach this year. The RIP/RAP includes a text document, detailed tables, recommendations, and a hydrology summary provided by Don Anderson. The hydrology summary used to be included in the tables, but hopefully the separate format is easier to interact with. The review, which covers February 1st 2019 to January 31st 2020, is first completed by the PDO coordinators examining performance on recovery actions that have occurred over the last year, recognizing shortcoming or accomplishments. Typically, it would then go to the technical committees to review the tables specifically. Their input was incorporated and then presented to the Management Committee. This year, we requested a streamlined approach that allows everyone to assess and approve the report by email.

Tom asked that each stakeholder provide one set of comments through their MC member by May 15th. Comments will be incorporated and a final RIP/RAP will be distributed along with a response to comments before it is used for sufficient progress. Tom said next year's review would likely be returning to the original structure as the post-2023 process will be returning to the original process. The documents will be brought forth for formal approval once the comments have been incorporated.

8. Capital Updates – Ryan said both of the projects are moving forward well despite COVID delays.
 - a. Red Fleet screen construction update - NEPA is complete, the Provo Area Force Account is planning to begin construction on May 12, which will go through July. A meeting was held on the previous Friday to discuss the O&M contract, which is on track. \$665K is the total cost, Utah will fund \$150K of the project.
 - b. Ridgway screen update - NEPA is complete for this project. Final design review is scheduled for the week of May 12th. \$3.6M is final projected cost, with a \$1M contribution from CWCB. Jojo confirmed that Colorado is still reviewing the contributed funds agreement for this project. Ryan said the construction contract will likely be awarded this fiscal year, with construction starting in the fall of 2021 and finished by December. The Program had hoped to build this project in 2020, but USBR believes that the construction crews need more planning time to successfully construct the project. Ryan expects that the fabrication of the screen may need to occur ahead of time during the winter months and then installed. Ryan does not anticipate any impact to water in that reservoir because the project can be constructed in the “dry” after water levels decrease in the early fall. The O&M contract is close to completion on that project, likely wrapped up within the next month. The parties to the O&M contact include Tri-County, Reclamation, FWS, and CPW. Tom Pitts thanked Ryan for the wonderful work completed to date on construction projects for the Program.

ADJOURNED: 4:10 p.m.

CONVENED: April 28, 9:05 a.m.

9. Green River Stakeholders – Todd Adams said he has had conversations with Rep. Chew about the legislation (resolution) proposed by the Green River Stakeholders. Todd and the State of Utah have committed to continued conversations between the Stakeholder group and the Program. Tom Chart said Tildon has been our contact with Rep. Chew in the area as well as with the Green River Stakeholder group. Conversations are ongoing about ways to interact with those interested parties, including potentially adding habitat on private land that could support recovery. Tildon drafted a letter outlining the necessary features of any potential habitat, which he will share with the MC. Leslie offered support from CREDA when talking to legislative representatives if it is of interest.

10. Post 2023

a. Update from Funding Group

Michelle reminded the group that the authorization for the program expires in 2023, as do the agreements between the partners. DOI must submit a Report to Congress prior to the end of FY21. The PDO is working on drafting components of that report. The Program went through a comprehensive process last year to define the scope of the Program after 2023 based on activities and their anticipated effect on recovery of the four species. Cost estimates were developed by the PDO staff in conjunction with Ryan Christianson at Reclamation. A Funding Group was developed to discuss funding after 2023. The Funding Group received a white paper from Reclamation which outlined the hydropower revenue available into the future. The hydropower revenue that has been funding the programs has come from debt repayment owed to the Treasury for projects constructed in the basin. Most of those debts have been repaid, and so the funding likely available from FY23 through FY32 is \$12.5M annually across all three programs. The white paper recommends that the Glen Canyon Program receive priorities for those funds, causing a disproportionate cut in the upper basin program. The Funding Group is tackling these issues over a series of meetings, two of which have been held so far. The meetings have covered the white paper with support from WAPA and Reclamation and reviewed the lists of activities from the programs. The group will meet again on Friday, May 1st and will meet pretty regularly (1-2 meetings a month) until fall.

b. Update from Federal Family - Tom Chart said that discussions have occurred within DOI, including Reclamation, NPS, FWS, and USGS. He said that hydropower revenues are a key component of this discussion. During one of the Federal Family meetings, they saw a little bit more information about WAPAs projections and what is sustainable. A lot remains to be discussed, including the distribution of funds between programs and cost sharing requirements. The hydropower funds are non-reimbursable and Tom was wondering if there are additional sources within the Basin Fund, e.g., reimbursable revenues, that we should be considering. Michelle said conversation can continue around what is possible and noted that Reclamation has expressed a willingness to seek appropriations, but that they desire a 50-50 cost share from

others. Kathy Callister reminded the group the white paper is just a starting point for discussion. Reclamation is willing to seek appropriations, but Kathy is concerned about the uncertainty of those funds on an annual basis. She believes that the cost share will help remove some of that uncertainty over time. Tom asked if adding some program costs should be put into the rate of hydropower, i.e. the reimbursable pathway. Leslie said at the beginning of this Program, there was an agreement that the funding would not impact hydropower's rate, which was very important for CREDAs support of the programs. Leslie does not believe that affecting the rate is currently in the intent of the authorizing legislation of any of the programs. Tom is raising options really to make sure we are having robust discussions about as many creative solutions as we can – potentially looking at alternative strategies for different time periods. Tom Pitts encouraged discussion of all funding mechanism possibilities to make sure that we can answer all questions raised by Congress as the final proposal is presented. Kathy said we can define what cost-share is and what is considered in that and recommended a focus on that discussion. She clarified that both the percentage and mechanisms are up for discussions. The Platte Program states provided cost-share with significant water and land contributions. Jojo said uncertainty is also present within the state funding process in annual budgets. Jojo asked if conversations had been held around capital costs. Ryan expects that the capital projects will be funded through Reclamation, but expects competition to increase for those funds, as with all of Reclamation's appropriated dollars. Michelle summarized that as a program, we really need to get creative in identify funding sources and mechanisms and anticipated robust discussions.

- c. Update from IC meeting – Tom Chart reviewed that the Program had a good conversation with both Noreen Walsh (FWS), Brent Esplin (Reclamation), Brian Sadler and Steve Johnson (WAPA). The Program reviewed the origin of the cost estimates developed to date, a summary of the funding group from Michelle, an examination of the projections of both programs from Tom Pitts and a characterization of the shortfall that is currently projected. The group covered the capital projects identified and the associated prioritization of that list. Tom Chart said the focus should remain on the annual funding and that certainly more scrutiny could be applied to the capital list before we move into the final recommendations. The IC specifically discussed the white paper and its ramifications. Some of the discussions have been about whether any new funding structure would be needed at the end of FY22 or FY23. WAPA said they would not strand the programs and that discussions could continue to make sure funding was available through the current authorization. Brent Esplin described concerns around requesting appropriations for Glen Canyon because of high interest in the area and was less concerned about requesting appropriations for the upper basin programs. Reclamation reiterated that the white paper was a starting point for discussion, not a final proposal. Jojo made the point that not all recovery programs are the same and that the individual components of each should drive funding agreements. Jojo said we can take positive aspects of other programs and see how they will fit in to our programs. Patrick asked if anyone could explain why there was concern related to expanding the GCDAMP program. Kathy thought the concern was outside of the AMP, not within the members themselves, but that Brent would be the appropriate contact for that

question. The IC continued to discuss funding in general and WAPA noted that funds for FY20 have been distributed to Reclamation for the programs. WAPA expressed concern that they may be required to repay funds to the Treasury as well in FY20, per current guidance from OMB. The transfer guidance was in place for FY19, which caused funding for the Program to come from appropriations. In FY19, WAPA was not required to submit funds to the Treasury, but Tom Pitts said there was a real chance for two payments needed in FY20. Shane noted that a few years of double payments from the basin funds could drain the fund quickly and he was not certain if WAPA's commitment to the Treasury in FY19 was resolved. Kathy noted that funds are available in the President's budget for FY21 through appropriations if needed.

- d. Report to Congress Update - Don Anderson is leading the charge from the PDO, with other members of the office assisting with drafting specific sections of the document. Don has been coordinating with the San Juan office to make sure we continue progress on development of the report. Don is following guidance to try to keep the report as simple as possible, with more details provided in the appendix. We have completed efforts documenting accomplishments of the programs to date, the species status and activities needed post-2023 as recommended through the post-2023 process. Don is focusing the effort to document what is currently occurring and would continue versus what may be needed in addition to those efforts post-2023. He is seeking to be as clear as possible in as few pages as possible. Don will plan on bringing drafts back to the MC as soon as possible to make sure we have an appropriate level of detail in those reports. Jojo asked if the new outline is available. >Tom Pitts said he would distribute that soon. Jojo asked if previous reports have been heavily edited as they ascend through Interior. Tom Pitts said because we are re-establishing the programs and asking for the Secretary's endorsement of these efforts which may prompt a more careful review than in previous years. Tom Chart said during previous efforts, Reclamation has led the charge on these efforts and little revision was seen during those processes.

11. Future meetings: webinars will be scheduled as needed over the summer. MC will hold the dates of September 30-Oct 1 for an in person meeting in Denver if possible.

ADJOURNED: 10:48 a.m.

Attachment 1: Meeting Attendees

In Attendance:

Steve Wolff, chair	State of Wyoming
Todd Adams	State of Utah
Michelle Garrison	State of Colorado
Jojo La	State of Colorado
Tom Pitts	Water Users
Patrick McCarthy	The Nature Conservancy
Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Assoc.
Shane Capron	Western Area Power Administration
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
Ryan Christianson	Bureau of Reclamation
Kathy Callister	Bureau of Reclamation
Marj Nelson	Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Chart (non-voting)	Program Director, Upper Colorado Program

Upper Colorado Program Office Staff:

Kevin McAbee	Nonnative Fish Coordinator
Julie Stahl	Deputy Director
Don Anderson	Instream Flow Coordinator
Tildon Jones	Habitat Coordinator
Cheyenne Owens	Natural Resource Intern
Melanie Fischer	I&E Coordinator

Interested Parties:

Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation
Derek Fryer	Western Area Power Administration
Kirk LaGory (day 1)	Argonne National Laboratories
Paul Badame	State of Utah
Kyle Whitaker	Northern Colorado Water Conservation District
Kevin Bestgen (day 1)	Colorado State University
Chris Keleher	State of Utah
Clarence Fullard	Bureau of Reclamation
Chris Breidenbach	State of Colorado Attorney General's Office
Chad Smith (day 2)	Platte River Recovery Program
Ray Tenney (day 2)	Colorado River Water Conservation District
Edalin Koziol (day 2)	The Nature Conservancy
Tom Econopouly (day 2)	Fish and Wildlife Service
Rob Billerbeck (day 2)	National Park Service

Attachment 2: Meeting Assignments

1. **Tom Pitts** will distribute the new outline for the Report to Congress as possible.
2. **The PDO** will schedule webinars as needed throughout the summer. PDO will also determine a final location for the meeting in Sept-Oct.