

Biology Committee Meeting Agenda
October 16, 8 a.m. – 5 p.m.
Clarion Inn, 755 Horizon Drive, Grand Junction, CO

CONVENE: 8:00 a.m.

1. Review/modify agenda (Crockett, 5 min)
2. Tusher Wash (McAbee, Czapla, 1 hour) – *Update on progress on work with NRCS and McMillen to include electric barrier in design and NEPA compliance on rehabilitation of the Tusher Wash diversion. The diversion project has the ambitious goal of construction in the fall of 2013. The Committee may wish to discuss questions/concerns that have been raised regarding:*

Evaluating effectiveness of the e-barrier (pre- and post- monitoring with PIT tag antennae and how to build in the ability to analyze, house, and report on the PIT data that are collected).

How we will make provisions to fund the additional fish exclusion options referenced in step 2b and step 3 of the recommended strategy, should they become necessary.

Providing low-flow fish passage over the diversion in a downstream direction after fish are 'diverted' from the canal (Kevin McAbee presented design concepts to provide that passage at the recent NRCS scoping meeting in Price that may resolve this concern).

Effects of the e-barrier on growth and longer-term survival of larvae. Melissa Trammell has suggested that the program fund (or encourage Smith-Root to fund/co-fund) a lab study to investigate the effects of the specific fields, configurations, and duration that the larvae would be exposed to as they pass through the e-barrier.

3. Fish kills (McAbee, All, 15 min.) – *The Committee will discuss 2012 fish kills and discuss potential future remedies (e.g., asking BLM to put some effort into mitigating runoff from burned areas).*
4. PIT tag database management (Czapla, 30 min) – *Increased use of remote antennas in the basin has drawn our attention to the need for a dedicated person to maintain a database to quickly provide information from the antennas to histories of tagged fish.*

BREAK (10 min)

5. Report reviews (2 hours)
 - a. Razorback monitoring report (Bestgen)
 - b. Elkhead Reservoir smallmouth bass escapement (Breton)

LUNCH (12:00 – 1:00)

6. Nonnative Fish update (Martinez, 1 hour) – *The Committee will review recent nonnative fish management activities*
 - Basinwide Strategy – *Rather than formally acknowledging “nonnative fish as our current greatest challenge,” the Management Committee endorsed the need to shift our nonnative fish management strategy to prevention and recommended finalizing the basinwide strategy much sooner than the previously-discussed date of July 2013 so that elements can be incorporated into the 2013 RIPRAP revision. The Management Committee recommended either streamlining the strategy or producing a more action-oriented document to make this possible. The Strategy needs to: 1) build on recent efforts to shift focus from control in rivers to containment at sources and prevention of a next invasive; and 2) incorporate a more robust approach (using more tools).*
 - Steamboat meeting – *In mid-September, Tom Pitts and others convened local interests (from Steamboat, Craig, Yampa Valley Bassmasters, Yampa Valley Fly Fishers Trout Unlimited Chapter, Upper Yampa Conservancy, Colorado River Water Conservation District, Colorado Parks and Wildlife, and the Program Director’s office) to discuss ideas to: 1) protect endangered fish; 2) enhance native fish; and 3) find compatible sportfish opportunities. The meeting was very productive and another meeting will be scheduled to continue this conversation.*
 - Potential reservoir projects (Paonia [northern pike], Miramonte [smallmouth bass], Red Fleet [walleye], Elkhead [smallmouth bass and northern pike])
 - Little Snake River (LSR) – *The Little Snake River Conservation District (LSRCD) wants to remove an old diversion near Baggs, WY, which may have been a barrier to upstream movement by fish, and begin using a new diversion with fish passage for warmwater native fishes and trout. However, this would give northern pike access to restored wetland habitat upstream where they could reproduce and become a new problematic source of pike to move downstream into endangered fish critical habitat. Wyoming Game and Fish (WGF) proposed installing another barrier downstream of the new diversion/passage (near the CO/WY state-line) that pike can’t pass, but would be unable to do so before the Conservancy District removes the old diversion in early October of this year. The Recovery Program sent a letter to Wyoming Game and Fish expressing concern that pike abundance could increase if they access wetland habitat upstream and become an invasive source of additional pike downstream in critical habitat. The letter encouraged multi-agency cooperation and offered assistance to further assess local northern pike abundance and distribution in the LSR and to remove northern pike. WGF, LSRCD and Larval Fish Lab personnel participated in a joint effort sample and remove northern pike in several pools of the LSR located on both sides of the state-line near Baggs in late September and confirmed the presence of adult pike in the system. Larry Hicks with the LSRCD facilitated access to private property to conduct this sampling.*

BREAK (10 min)

7. Lake Powell (Speas, Czaplá, 30 min) – *Recent studies in the San Juan River arm of Lake*

Powell have indicated that razorback sucker are carrying out their entire life cycle in lentic habitat. Reclamation has additional funds available early in FY13 to continue this work, expand to the Upper Colorado River arm of Lake Powell, or both, but require matching dollars. Upper Colorado River Recovery Program funds are almost completely committed for FY13, and thus, unavailable for a match. Razorback can complete their life cycle in the Colorado River and its tributaries above Lake Powell; therefore, the Fish and Wildlife Service needs to discuss how Lake Powell fits into recovery for this species. Regions 6 and 2 will meet November 27-28, 2012 in Denver to discuss the role/importance of Lake Powell in razorback sucker recovery efforts and the direction of any future work on Lake Powell. (For additional information, see notes from September 4, 2012, conference call, attached.)

8. Management Committee clarification of flow recommendation approval process (Chart, 10 min) – *The Program Director’s office and Robert Wigington drafted a document to clarify the Recovery Program’s process for approving flow recommendations for the endangered fishes. This draft is in Management Committee review and will be discussed in the November 5 webinar. Tom Pitts provided comments on the draft and in the process, recalled his commitment to draft a uniform recommended review process applicable to all technical reports submitted to the Recovery Program. The Program Director’s office is reviewing Tom Pitts’ comments and draft uniform review process and will shortly send a revised draft flow recommendations approval process out to the Management Committee and the draft uniform report review policy to the BC, WAC, and MC.*
9. DOI/Reclamation Scientific Integrity Policy (Kantola, Speas, 5 min) (Attachment 3) – The Implementation Committee approved a resolution on September 19 adopting the [DOI Scientific Integrity policy](#). Principal investigators can expect to see this policy referenced in biennial Program Guidance as well as in their funding agreements from the Bureau of Reclamation.
10. Update on Reclamation Reporting and Scope of Work requirements (Kantola, Speas, 10 min.) –*A recent thorough audit of Reclamation’s funding agreements in the Recovery Programs found no substantive issues; however, it did reveal a need to improve compliance with Reclamation reporting and scope of work requirements. These include detailed 5-year budgets in scopes of work and some form of annual report for each funding agreement.*

Scopes of work: *The Upper Basin Recovery Program will begin requiring 5-year budgets with its FY14-15 scopes of work (drafts due to the Recovery Program office in April 2013). However, projects with funding agreements which expired in FY12 (thus requiring new agreements for FY13), require 5-year budgets for FY13. A number of Service project agreements and a couple of Colorado project agreements expired in FY12, and the Service and the Program Director’s office provided Reclamation with 5-year budget addendums to each of those scopes of work. Angela Kantola, Dave Speas, and Melynda Roberts are scheduled to review Reclamation requirements in early November to determine any additional steps needed to assure compliance in Program scopes of work.*

Annual reports: *With regard to annual reports, the situation is a little more complicated. Reclamation requires an annual report (“Program Progress Report” or PPR) from each entity receiving Reclamation funds for a project. In addition, from non-Federal fund recipients (e.g., States, LFL), Reclamation also requires a Federal Financial Report, SF-425.*

Both are due September 30 of each year. A 90-day grace period allows Recovery Program annual reports that are submitted to the Program Office in mid-November (due this year on Wednesday, November 12) to serve as the PPR to Reclamation. For projects that have more than one entity receiving funds, PIs will prepare the usual combined report, but with addendums of 1-page PPR's from each entity which fulfills the PPR requirements (the PD's office will develop a format with Reclamation and include this in the Program's annual request for annual reports). For Federal Financial Reports (SF-425s), non-Federal recipients of funds from Reclamation should submit these directly to Reclamation.

11. Review reports due list (Kantola, 10 min) – *Angela Kantola will e-mail the Committee an updated reports list in advance of the meeting.*
12. Review previous meeting assignments (see Attachment 1) (All, 20 min)
13. Schedule next meeting (in conjunction with December 5-6 nonnative fish workshop in Grand Junction?) and suggest agenda items (All, 5 min)
14. Consent Item: Review and approve July 12-13, 2012 Biology Committee webinar summary (revised summary sent with this agenda [Dave Speas and Aaron Webber had provided minor corrections]).

ADJOURN by 5 p.m.

Attachment 1: Assignments

(Asterisked items on meeting agenda; items preceded by a “-“can be deleted after this meeting)

Note: the order of some assignments has been changed to group similar items together.
For earlier history of items preceded by an ampersand “&”, please see [previous meeting summaries](#).

1. & The **Service and Program Director’s office** will provide the Committee a draft addendum to the White River report that will present the measured flow requirements in a historical hydrologic perspective. The Program Director’s office also will research where we left Schmidt and Orchard’s draft report on peak (channel maintenance) flows and recommend whether to have it reviewed by the geomorphology panel.
 - 5/6/10: *The Program Director’s office will complete the addendum to the White River report and provide a status update and recommendation on the draft Schmidt and Orchard report on peak (channel maintenance) flows for Biology Committee review by July 1, 2011.*
 - *Sent to BC July 1, 2011. 9/30/11: conflicting comments have been received, Tom Pitts has asked Jana for an extension on the comment deadline (extended to Nov. 2). See also agenda item #3c.*
 - *3/6/12 **Jana Mohrman** will provide a revised report to BC and WAC by December 31, 2012.*
2. &The **Program Director’s office** will prepare a list of issues to be resolved regarding Tusher Wash screening (e.g., levels of mortality acceptable for what size classes, potential O&M costs, etc.) to help move this decision forward (and provide that to the Biology Committee and the Service). *Done.*
 - 5/6/10: **A small group (Melissa, Kevin McAbee, Dave Speas, Tom Pitts, and Tom Czapla)** will work with **Kevin Bestgen** to review/build on the risk assessment, focusing on understanding existing impacts and what could be gained by various screening options. Tentatively, it would seem the best choice would be fish friendly runners with a screen on the irrigation ditch (contingent on further analysis). *BC to submit proposal to MC by 12/31/10.*
 - *12/13/10 BC discussion: The Biology Committee recommended >starting with a literature review (there may be good information from low-head structures in the eastern U.S.); working on outlining what would be needed in a mortality study (including engineering considerations); and further investigating whether the owners would consider full or partial decommissioning.*
 - *3/1/11 As **Kevin McAbee** gets engineering info from the irrigators, he will share it with the ad hoc group. **Kevin** also will inquire more about the purpose of the 9” (at riverbank) – 20” (at center) concrete cap, to determine whether it is to benefit the existing diversion, or both the existing diversion and the proposed diversion on river left.*
 - *5/13/11: Dave provided questions from Juddson Sechrist; the **Tusher ad hoc group** reviewed and discussed these on April 4 (summary sent to BC 4/20/11), agreed to have another meeting (site visit) this summer, and re-iterated the need for an initial literature search/review focusing on fish mortality at other sites with small hydro-electric facilities and smaller hydraulic head differentials.*
 - *9/30/11: The **Program Director’s office** will ask if **Brent Uilenberg** and **Bob Norman** can provide description/specifications of the hardware at Tusher to help us understand if it can be retrofitted (11/8/11: awaiting reply).*
 - *1/26/12: **Tom Czapla, Dave Speas and Kevin McAbee** will draft a Tusher Wash mortality study and literature review RFP (or similar) for review by folks who would not be submitting*

a proposal. 7/12/12: *no proposals were submitted in response to the RFP, >the ad hoc committee will work on completing the literature search portion of the mortality study.*

- 6/26/12: **Reclamation** is developing a cost estimate for a coffer dam that would allow installation of an electrical barrier.
 - *Tom Pitts suggested **Reclamation** work with **Smith-Root** to put all the Tusher Wash electrical barrier installation costs (barrier, coffer dam, construction, etc.) in a report for the Committee's review. **Tom Czapl**a will work with Smith-Root and Reclamation to produce that. 8/21/12: *Recommended strategy sent to Biology Committee and approved via e-mail.*
 - When the final engineering designs are provided (**Kevin McAbee** will send the Biology Committee any plans he receives), **key Committee members** should make another site visit.
 - The **Program Director's office** will provide more information to the Committee about a potential weir like the one at Hogback on the San Juan. *Done (weir is not a feasible solution).*
3. & Revise the Integrated Stocking Plan (ISP) and related issues. **Tom Czapl**a is convening a group to revise the ISP.
- 5/13/11: *Cost-benefit analyses should be included in the revised ISP; Tom Chart said he thinks the Program Director's office can initiate this analysis. Results of the health condition profile meeting held at Dexter in March should be incorporated into the revised stocking plan. Discussion of humpback chub and back up pikeminnow broodstock were prominent in this meeting. Horsethief pond water may be whirling disease positive, but Krissy said that Utah can apply for a variance from their Fish Health Board since the fish will be stocked where whirling disease is present and razorback are not known to carry WD.*
 - 6/2/11: *Core ad hoc group identified: Harry Crockett, CDOW; Krissy Wilson, UDWR; and Pete Cavalli, WFG; Dale Ryden and/or Dave Schnoor, Travis Francis, USFWS; Dave Campbell and Scott Durst, San Juan Program; and input from hatchery managers as needed (particularly as it pertains to space at facilities).*
 - 4/17/12; 6/26/12: *Tom Czapl*a sent out a rough draft revised ISP to the core group on April 13, 2012 and they held a conference on May 9 (>**Tom Czapl**a will send Krissy a summary if there is one); hatchery personnel determining if they can grow out 250mm bonytail in 24 months. 7/13/12: *Awaiting bonytail information from Dave Schnoor. >Krissy will work with Dale to get the variance request for Horsethief Canyon Native Fish Facility Bottom through the Department of Agriculture before stocking in September 2013. 9/27/12: Revised draft ISP sent to ad hoc group by 9/27/12.*

Humpback Chub (population estimates)

The **Program Director's office** will communicate with Gary White to determine how many and which of the questions from the HBC workshop to focus on. *Pending.* **Derek Elverud** provided the database for Westwater for Gary White to combine with Black Rocks, which will require a separate SOW.

- 5/13/11: *Black Rocks and Westwater data have been transferred to Gary White; Program Director's office will check to make sure we've got this analysis covered. 3/6/12: Done and 131 SOW revised accordingly (\$20K provided to LFL in FY12).*
- After the ad hoc group meets, Melissa Trammell will draft an Environmental Assessment of the impacts of the humpback chub captivity management plan (also addresses how to deal with captured roundtail chub); **Krissy Wilson** will work with **Melissa** on the EA. **Tom Czapl**a will send out the briefing paper he received with the humpback chub genetic data to the Biology Committee (*done*). **Melissa Trammell** will review Dexter's new plan to see if it

may impact this (also will talk to Tom Czapla). 3/6/12: This is on hold (if even necessary) until the humpback chub ad hoc committee finishes their plan. If fish are not removed from the Yampa River, an EA won't be needed.

Humpback Chub (broodstock development / genetics)

- *11/22/11: Conference call to discuss humpback genetics and potential refugia/propagation held 11/2/11; draft action plan materials sent to group from Tom Czapla.*
- *1/26/12: **Tom Czapla** will provide researchers direction on collecting fin clips from adult humpback in Westwater and Black Rocks and other populations, i.e., Cataract Canyon, Desolation/Grey Canyons, Yampa Canyon, or wherever else they may be encountered. 5/4/12: Fin clips should be taken from all fish identified as humpback chub (also roundtails, under a different project). Tom Chart said it would be great to have a photo of the fish on a grid board; Krissy agreed. **Tom Czapla** will include that in the protocol (done).*
- *3/6/12: **Tom Czapla** will remind the humpback chub genetics ad hoc group to submit comments (7/13/12 comments still pending).*
- *As identified in the sufficient progress assessment and requested by the Management Committee, the **Program** will develop an action plan for establishing refugia for humpback chub (avoiding getting bogged down in genetic analysis). Mike Roberts has recommended building in limiting factor/life history studies to better understand what's going on in the system that's affecting humpback chub populations.*
- *9/25/12: Age-0 Gila from Westwater will be brought to the Horsethief Canyon ponds this fall. Tissue samples from those humpback and fin clips collected from humpback in the field this year will be analyzed by Wade Wilson to provide information needed to determine if we can use local humpback chub for broodstock development, if needed, or if we will need to incorporate fish from the backup broodstock at Dexter NFH (from the Grand Canyon).*

Razorback Sucker

& Dale Ryden and **Dave Schnoor** will summarize Ouray hatchery needs (water source for Randlett and generator for Grand Valley) and submit it to the Program via Tom Czapla. **Dale** also will seek Service funding. The report will include a discussion the relative risks of power outages at Grand Valley. Melissa suggested that for the long-term, we need a feasibility study for alternative water sources for Randlett.

- *5/13/11: Dale said Reclamation says alternative water sources would have a \$10M price tag. The Service has been discussing the manganese problem and will convene a group to discuss (Program Director's office, hatchery folks, Reclamation, etc.). Dave Schnoor has explored the idea of a generator for the Grand Valley unit. The **Service** should have a more comprehensive idea about these things in a few months.*
- *7/6/11: Dale e-mailed write-up (discussed briefly at 7/10-11 BC meeting).*
- *8/24/11: Service purchased Grand Valley Unit generator. Service/Reclamation met to discuss manganese; proposal to hire contractor and install additional filters pending.*
- *9/30/11: Proposal for **contractor** review of alternatives for remediating manganese approved by Management Comm. 3/6/12: **Tom Czapla** will check on the status, as the contractor has not yet been onsite. 5/4/12: Contractor has recommended two options in a preliminary report; likely the selected option will be to install one more bank of filters/BIRM. 6/27/12: contractor made recommendations and Ouray ordered the filter bank and has been replumbing the facility. Contractor may provide report after the install and recheck. 7/13/12: Some additional well electrical problems at Ouray are being worked on now. The ponds also are being fenced to exclude otters (about a third of the fish were lost in one pond*

this year).

- **Tom Czapla** will talk to Dave Schnoor about whether some of the excess razorback at Ouray would be appropriate for back-up broodstock at Wahweap.

Bonytail

- **Dave Schnoor** will write up his thoughts on bonytail stocking and temperature (*3/6/12: draft provided to Tom Czapla, Dave Schnoor revising and will send to BC*). The **Mumma and Wahweap hatcheries** will compile their records of stocking temperatures and provide that to **Tom Czapla** for consideration as part of the integrated stocking plan. *Done; Tom Czapla included Dave's recommendations in the draft ISP. Krissy will get river temperature at stocking prior to 2008 by 7/16/2012.*
4. The **Program Director's office** will follow up on establishing a process to track percentages of hybrid suckers using standardized protocol for identification of hybridization at fish ladders and in monitoring reaches. *Pending. 1/11/12: Discussed on 1/5/12 NNFSC call; process pending from **Pat Martinez** (lower priority).*
 5. **Krissy Wilson** will forward the Committee UDWR's plan for larval light trapping in Flaming Gorge Reservoir (looking for burbot) when she gets it. *9/30/11: this survey for larval burbot couldn't be completed as the likely window was missed this year; willing to consider in next year's work plan. This will be discussed at the nonnative fish workshop. 1/11/12: Gardunio said burbot are attracted to light during larval stage, but such trapping in winter could be difficult. 3/6/12: **Krissy** will provide the annual report (and other relevant reports) to the Committee; **Pete Cavalli** will forward a copy of Wyoming's report(s), also. **Krissy** said she asked and they do not capture smallmouth bass or burbot just below the dam. **Melissa Trammell and Pat Martinez and Krissy Wilson and Jerry Wilhite** will work on a Flaming Gorge burbot risk assessment (conference call scheduled for August 15, 2012). UDWR is funding two studies (food web and early life history). The next conference call is scheduled for Wed, October 24, 1-4 PM.*
 6. **Tom Chart and Jana Mohrman and Kirk LaGory** will convene fish biologists involved in developing flow recommendations and geomorphologists (e.g., John Pitlick and Cory Williams) to identify logical next-steps (e.g., is MD-SWMS modeling the best way to proceed) to evaluate flow recommendations, particularly on (but not limited to) the Gunnison where sediment transport is so important. *Pending.*
 7. **Dave Speas** will check on what gets prepared/distributed in the way of a FGTWG meeting summary (per mention in the draft flow request letter). ***Dave** said the summaries are sent to the FGTWG and will check to see if he can send these to the Committee when they are finalized. 8/2/12: Dave e-mailed summaries from the 6/14/12 and 7/6/12 FGTWG meetings; the FGTWG is looking into posting these online along with FG Working Group summaries.*
 8. - **Dave Speas** (and any other **Committee members**) will send **Joe Skorupski** additional comments on the #144 report by May 11. **Dale Ryden** will see if there's a citation from a San Juan summary document that he can send Joe (*done*). **Joe** will revise the report and send to the Committee by for final approval by May 25, then the **Committee** will approve via e-mail by June 8 (with no response indicating approval). *6/27/12: Joe provided final revisions*

5/27, no additional comments from BC; >**UDWR** just needs to submit the final report.
7/24/12: Done and [final report](#) posted to web.

9. **Pat Martinez** and **Dave Speas** will poll agencies to determine the number of folks they would want to send to a Program-specific electrofishing course led by Jim Reynolds and what time of year would be best. 9/25/12: Done. The course is reserved for Recovery Program participants conducting electrofishing for endangered fish monitoring or nonnative fish removal under Program scopes-of-working within critical habitat, adjacent river reaches, floodplains, tributaries and reservoirs. Class size is limited to 28. Agencies will only be responsible for travel costs; the Recovery Program and Reclamation are covering the instructor's fees and expenses and the meeting room. The course will be held Monday – Thursday, March 11-14, 2014 in Grand Junction. The first and last days will be in the classroom (at the Clarion hotel), and the second and third days will be on Highline Lake. For the field portion of the course, seven electrofishing will carry four students each. Tuesday will focus on basic procedures to document electrical performance of all boats and rafts, and collect data essential for Thursday's classroom exercise to develop a standard power chart. On Wednesday, boats and rafts will participate in a sampling exercise to establish a standardized baseline for future work of the Recovery Program.
10. To follow-up on additional potential nonnative fish management, >**Dale Ryden** will call Ouray NWR manager, **Dan Schaad**, to initiate a conversation with the new Thunder Ranch landowner about rotenone. 9/23/12: Done. Landowner not amenable to rotenone at this time; however, the site has very little water at this point and so northern pike may be winter-killed. >**Dave Speas** will convene a conference call to schedule reconnaissance for future nonnative fish work on the Dolores River. (Dave also plans to look for a site for a PIT-tag antenna on the Dolores.) For additional northern pike removal passes on the Colorado River this year, Dale said the Service may need some assistance from Colorado; >**Dale Ryden and Harry Crockett** will talk about this and make sure the work is covered under collecting permits. 9/27/12: additional passes were not feasible. >**Harry** will ask CPW Regional and Aquatic staff if Colorado's view regarding a smallmouth bass bounty on the White River might be different if Colorado weren't responsible for the bounty dollars/management.
11. ->**Dale Ryden** will work with Utah, Reclamation, Brandon, and the Park Service to begin drafting a scope of work for sampling the Lake Powell inflows (a reconnaissance trip may be needed for the Colorado River inflow). 9/26/12: After discussion on the September 4 conference call, it was decided a scope of work will not be developed yet.
12. - **Angela Kantola** will send Brandon Albrecht's and Kevin Christopherson's comments on the razorback monitoring report to the Biology Committee. 7/24/12: Done.

Attachment 2

Lake Powell Razorback Sucker Survey

Final notes from the 4 September 2012 conference call

Participating on the conference call:

Mark Buettner – Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Dave Campbell – San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program (Program Director)
Harry Crockett – Colorado Parks & Wildlife (UCREFRP Chair)
Tom Czapla – Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program
Scott Durst – San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program
Travis Francis – US Fish & Wildlife Service
Mark McKinstry – Bureau of Reclamation
Bill Miller – Miller Ecological Consultants (SJRBRIP Chair)
Dale Ryden – US Fish & Wildlife Service
Ben Schleicher – US Fish & Wildlife Service
Dave Speas – Bureau of Reclamation
Melissa Trammell – National Park Service
Sharon Whitmore – San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program
Krissy Wilson – Utah Division of Wildlife Resources

Comments to draft meeting minutes submitted by: (all comments received were incorporated)

Dave Campbell – San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program (Program Director)
Scott Durst – San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program
Sharon Whitmore – San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program

General discussion points:

- 1) The Bureau of Reclamation reiterated that they are willing to fund up to \$250,000 worth of work in Lake Powell for FY-2013 under the following conditions
 - a. There is a legitimate interest (as identified by the USFWS and the Biology Committees of the Recovery Programs) to perform such work
 - b. There are Recovery Program approved, , scientifically-justifiable scopes-of-work (SOW) in place to guide distinct parts of the work
 - c. At this point, the money is available for one fiscal year only (FY-2013)
 - d. The money will be used in a 50/50 split between the two Recovery Programs
 - e. The Bureau expects/needs a match (ideally a 50/50 match, but this may be negotiable) in funds from the Recovery Programs in order to release money to fund work in FY-2013
 - f. The Bureau won't fund work in Lake Powell exclusively (i.e., without matching funding from the Recovery Programs)
 - g. The money the Bureau is offering up will be available for a few months in FY-2013, but if a decision regarding the need to perform work in Lake Powell is put off until later in FY-2013, the money will likely be obligated for other uses

- 2) Several individuals were concerned because it seemed like the possibility of getting funding from the Bureau of Reclamation was driving the decision to perform research in Lake Powell in FY-2013 (i.e., we have money so let's find something to do with it)
 - a. The San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program's Biology Committee had already decided to take a hiatus from performing field work in the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell in FY-2013 and:
 - i. Instead would pursue scale aging and scale laser ablation analysis to help determine
 1. Origin of untagged razorback sucker being collected (are these fish that were stocked without PIT tags in the San Juan River that have just found their way down to the lake?)
 2. Are these perhaps fish that were wild-spawned in Lake Powell, that have recruited there?
- 3) National Park Service offered the following as potential in-kind services to any work that might occur in Lake Powell
 - a. Big Park Service boat for resupply efforts
 - b. Housing at the Hite Marina
- 4) There are some data gaps about the endangered fish in Lake Powell and the role of Lake Powell in the recovery of the San Juan and UC river system populations; for example:
 - a. Are the razorback sucker that are found in the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell potentially intermixing with any razorback sucker that may be found in the Colorado River arm of the lake?
 - i. Data from Lake Mead shows that razorback sucker make long-distance movements within that lake between inflow areas. They have also demonstrated movement upstream out of the Colorado River inflow area of that lake into the lower Grand Canyon
 - ii. Data from the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell shows
 1. Movement of razorback sucker upstream out of Lake Powell and into the San Juan River during a brief period when the waterfall was inundated (making them one functional population for Recovery?)
 2. Movement of one sonic-tagged razorback sucker downstream out of Critical Habitat, moving towards the confluence of the two arms of Lake Powell.
 - b. We have essentially no knowledge about endangered fish in the Colorado River arm of Lake Powell
 - i. This includes razorback sucker and potentially Colorado pikeminnow and bonytail
 - ii. The feeling among several individuals on the call was that there ARE razorback sucker in the Colorado River arm of the lake
 1. Just don't know how many or what the population looks like until you actually go out and look
 2. Dale Ryden pointed out that by trying to obtain basic information (presence/absence, abundance, distribution, can you find fish in

spawning condition, etc.), you can actually learn many peripheral pieces of valuable information

- a. Ascertain movement patterns
 - b. Determine numbers of tagged versus untagged fish
 - c. Ability to collect scales for aging
 - d. Chance to do larval sampling
 - e. Chance to do contaminants sampling
- iii. Dave Speas and Dale Ryden both felt that if any work were done in the Colorado River arm of Lake Powell, the first attempt to do such work should be some kind of generalized survey-type approach
 1. Something akin to what was done in the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell
 - iv. Melissa Trammell suggested that drawing on the knowledge gained from the San Juan arm studies, it may be possible to narrow the window of time that crews are in the field, thus reducing costs of any potential scope-of-work (SOW)
- 5) Dale Ryden stressed that in order to make any field work happen in FY-2013 (if it is decided that such work should happen), the agencies/individuals that may be involved in that work need to know sooner rather than later
- a. Hiring of seasonal staff for government agencies usually begins in December
 - b. Need 6-8 months to
 - i. Hire seasonal staff
 - ii. Acquire appropriate collecting/access permits
 - iii. Write SOWs and get them approved through the committee process
 - iv. Set up logistics
 - v. Obtain, repair, replace equipment
 - vi. Coordinate with other agencies and the Recovery Programs
- 6) There was some discussion that the San Juan Recovery Program may have some funds available in their 2013 budget to contribute to a limited amount of work in Lake Powell; UCR has no funds for cost-share
- a. Dave Campbell expressed that both Programs should take the view that work in Lake Powell should be done as a cooperative effort between both recovery Programs (i.e., a "Joint Project")
 - b. Dave Campbell also suggested that a comprehensive study be developed (by both Programs) with clearly articulated objectives and hypotheses that drive the study effort
 - c. the San Juan Recovery Program would be willing to contribute to work in the SJR and UCR in Lake Powell for FY-2013 as a joint program if it is important for recovery
 - i. Bill Miller brought up the point that if this scenario were to occur, that the SJ Coordination Committee would need to concur.

Decision points &/or action items:

- 1) No SOW will be developed for Lake Powell yet

- 2) USFWS – Grand Junction will provide the following to Biology Committee members of the two Recovery Programs
 - a. Notes from conference call
 - b. List of bullet points regarding important findings from first two years work in the San Juan river arm of Lake Powell
 - c. List of bullet points regarding what they see as outstanding data needs/gaps in either arm of Lake Powell
- 3) Sometime this fall, there will be a meeting between staff from both Recovery Program offices and/or representatives from Regions 6 and 2 of the USFWS to determine:
 - a. What do the findings in the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell to date mean for recovery of razorback sucker?
 - b. Is more work in either arm of Lake Powell necessary?
 - c. If more work is needed, what level of work is desired/needed, when does it occur (FY-2013?), who would perform said work, etc.?
 - d. The decisions from this meeting will be presented to the members of the Biology Committees for both Recovery Programs during subsequent BC meetings
 - e. This meeting will be set up by staff from the two Recovery Program offices
 - i. Scott Durst initiated this effort on 11 September 2012 via Doodle poll
 - ii. The meeting has been scheduled for 27-28 November 2012 in Denver, CO

Attachment 3

Approved by the Implementation Committee on September 19, 2012

**Resolution of the Implementation Committee of the Upper Colorado River
Endangered Fish Recovery Program on
Adherence to Department of Interior Scientific Integrity Policy**

WHEREAS, the U.S. Department of Interior (DOI) has established a policy entitled “[Integrity of Scientific and Scholarly Activities](#)” (Jan. 28, 2011) to ensure and maintain scientific and scholarly ethical standards in Departmental decision-making, and

WHEREAS, the aforementioned policy applies to all DOI employees and all contractors, cooperators, partners, permittees, and volunteers who assist with developing or applying the results of scientific and scholarly activities, and

WHEREAS, the majority of Recovery Program projects are carried out using power revenues administered by DOI’s Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), and

WHEREAS, Reclamation formally adopted the aforementioned policy on March 6, 2012 in the [Reclamation Manual](#), and

WHEREAS, the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program (Recovery Program), desires to adhere to the highest standards of scientific integrity in all of its scientific endeavors;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Implementation Committee of the Recovery Program that the Recovery Program operates in accordance with the U.S. Department of Interior policy entitled “[Integrity of Scientific and Scholarly Activities](#)” (Jan. 28, 2011), including future updates of this policy.