

I. Project Title: Yampa River Management Plan

II. Principal Investigator:

Gerry Roehm, Instream Flow Coordinator
Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program
P.O. Box 25486, Denver Federal Center
Denver, Colorado 80225-0486
E-mail: gerry_roehm@fws.gov
Phone: (303) 969-7322 x272
Fax: (303) 969-7327

III. Project Summary:

The purpose of the Yampa River Management Plan is to maintain and recover the endangered fishes of the Upper Colorado River Basin and protect other native fish and wildlife resources in the Yampa River and its tributaries while depletions to serve existing and foreseeable future human needs continue.

The original strategy was to meet this dual purpose in the Yampa River Basin was by evaluating a variety of stream flow augmentation alternatives within the framework of a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process. A contractor was hired to prepare NEPA documents and to handle public involvement. However, this approach was abandoned due to a perceived lack of a clearly defined federal action. Moreover, there has been some opposition within the Recovery Program to construct or enlarge a reservoir specifically, or in part, to augment flows for fish. An enlargement of Elkhead Reservoir had been proposed for that purpose in 1995, based on flow recommendations derived from a statistical analysis of historic stream flows, rather than on the biological or physical habitat needs of the fishes. A subsequent study (Modde et al. 1998) determined that flows lower than the 1995 recommendations were sufficient to meet the needs of the fishes, and stream flow augmentation requirements were adjusted accordingly.

Also, there was a perception, both within and outside the Yampa River Basin, that the Basin was being treated differently from other subbasins of the Upper Colorado River. To achieve some measure of equity among the subbasins, the Recovery Program proposed an approach for the Yampa and Gunnison rivers similar to that taken in the Colorado River upstream from its confluence with the Gunnison. Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), in December 1999, the Service completed a programmatic biological opinion (PBO) for the so-called "15-mile reach." Recovery Program participants agreed that the PBO approach should be followed for the Yampa and Gunnison rivers, as well as other significant tributaries to the Colorado and Green rivers.

A workgroup consisting of representatives from state and federal agencies, environmental organizations, water users and other local stakeholders convened to draft a management plan for the Yampa River Basin. The plan would identify current and future human water needs, as well as outline those recovery actions considered necessary to offset potential adverse effects of depletions on the endangered fishes. It will serve as the basis for an intra-Service Section 7 consultation, the product of which will be PBO for the Yampa River Basin. The federal action that requires Section 7 consultation, as well as compliance with the NEPA, is the intent of the FWS to enter into a Cooperative Agreement with the states of Colorado and Wyoming to implement the plan.

A Water Subcommittee of the larger workgroup was established to address some of the technical issues concerning depletions and the augmentation needs of the fishes. This group's role was expanded during the process of developing the management plan to address other issues on an ad hoc basis. The subcommittee identified, evaluated and presented 11 alternatives to the workgroup for its consideration. These included 10 "action" alternatives and a "no action" alternative. Action alternatives use either a single water source or combination of sources to provide 7,000 AF of augmentation during the base-flow period (July–February). These sources include Steamboat Lake, Stagecoach Reservoir, Elkhead Reservoir, supply interruption contracts with water users, and new tributary reservoir(s).

A plan was drafted and submitted to the workgroup in August 2000 for review and comment prior to a 2-day conference in Craig, Colorado. At that conference, another alternative was identified that borrowed certain elements from several of the action alternatives and was recommended as the preferred alternative. In 2002, two new non-structural options were added that either supplied the entire augmentation volume from supply interruption contracts with irrigators or relied exclusively on instream flow water rights. However, for the purposes of fulfilling ESA and NEPA requirements, each of these 14 alternatives were given equal consideration.

Eight alternatives were specifically evaluated for their reliability, relative costs, impacts to Colorado State Parks, water-related recreation, agriculture and peak flows, and legal and institutional constraints. Of these alternatives, Elkhead-only options (5 & 6) ranked highest in terms of their overall performance against the evaluation criteria, whereas the Steamboat-only option (4) fared the worst. Although the remaining six options were not specifically evaluated against all the criteria, alternatives that were evaluated served as surrogates for individual elements of the other alternatives, by assigning the same point values to the evaluation criteria as their most closely related counterparts. For example, options that rely on the same volume of storage in a particular reservoir, released in the same priority, are expected to have similar impacts on State Parks and water-related recreation at that reservoir. impacted the ascending limb of the spring hydrograph (March–April), while Stagecoach-only options distributed storage more evenly over a broad peak-flow period (March–July), thereby reducing the magnitude of impacts in any single month. Multiple-source options also distributed storage over a broader period. All but the Steamboat-only option exhibited some potential for winter storage, particularly Stagecoach, which has the most reliable winter inflows.

Subsequent to the August 2000 conference, there was further discussion as to the size of the increment of future depletions to be covered by the management plan and PBO. Modeling with the Colorado Decision Support System (CDSS) determined that average annual depletions would reach ~155 KAF/year in Colorado by 2045, representing an increase of ~30 KAF/year over a current depletions of ~125 KAF/year. However, water users in Colorado sought to secure 50 KAF/year for future development. After further discussion, the workgroup agreed to take an incremental approach, going forward with a 30-KAF increment initially, but recognizing that a second increment of 20 KAF/year could be developed in the future, as needed. However, there is too little information currently available to assess the impacts of the second increment, so additional impact analyses would be required at that time. Wyoming developed its estimate of future depletions, ~66 KAF/year, which represents an increase of ~31 KAF/year over current depletions of ~35 KAF/year. The Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) worked with the Wyoming State Engineer's staff to evaluate basin-wide impacts of depletions. More work needs to be done in FY 2002.

A third draft of the management plan was issued in April 2001, and a final draft was completed in October 2001. Public meetings were scheduled in November 2001, and comments on the final draft were due December 14, 2001.

V. Relationship to RIPRAP:

Green River Action Plan: Yampa and Little Snake Rivers
I.A.4.a.(3) Yampa River management plan

VI. Accomplishment of FY 2002 Tasks and Deliverables, Discussion of Initial Findings and Shortcomings:

Tasks 1–7. These tasks were completed prior to FY 2002.

Task 8. Nonnative fish control activities are reported separately under that Program element. Refer to project numbers 98a, 98b, 110 and C-31.

Task 9. Prepare final Yampa Management Plan: The Instream Flow Coordinator drafted and distributed a management plan for the Yampa River in April 2001 with direction from and review by other members of the PBO workgroup. A final draft, revised pursuant to comments received, was posted to the Yampa PBO and Colorado River listservers, as well as the Recovery Program website in October 2001. Printed copies also were sent to members of the PBO workgroup, Management Committee, Implementation Committee, and steering committee of the Yampa River Basin Partnership. Publication of the final draft was delayed due to the need to reconcile contradictory procedural and legal points of view with respect to regulatory compliance. As a result, the impact analysis in the August 2000 draft that had been removed from the April 2001 draft was restored and augmented in the October 2001 draft. The October 2001 draft was revised based on both written and oral comments received; the revised draft was then submitted

to members of the PBO workgroup for their review. Additional revisions will be made prior to its expected publication early in 2003, with a final expected by the end of FY2003. The Plan is about a year behind schedule due, in part, to the need to model additional augmentation water supply alternatives identified during scoping and changing attitudes within the Recovery Program as to which alternative best meets the objectives of the Plan. These delays, in turn, cascade throughout the remaining tasks.

Task 9. Determine NEPA and ESA requirements: The Regional Solicitor for the Department of the Interior (DOI) provided guidance as to the nature of the federal action that would require compliance with both the NEPA and ESA— that action being the intent of the FWS to enter into a Cooperative Agreement to implement the plan. The FWS, as the federal action agency, must satisfy NEPA and ESA requirements before it commits to implementing the plan by signing the Agreement.

The Program Director's office held three public scoping meetings on November 27–29, 2001, in Steamboat Springs, Colorado, Baggs, Wyoming and Craig, Colorado. At each meeting the Instream Flow Coordinator gave a formal presentation introducing the Yampa Plan and outlining NEPA and ESA processes and the roll of public involvement. A representative of local water users (CRWCD in Colorado, SEO in Wyoming) also spoke from their perspectives in support of the Plan. After these formal presentations, those in attendance were given an opportunity to ask questions and offer comments on the Plan and provide scoping input for an environmental assessment (EA). An additional comment period of 30 days was provided for interested parties to submit written comments following the meetings. Both written and oral comments were recorded and given due consideration in revising the draft management plan and identifying significant issues to address in the EA.

Task 12. Collect and analyze environmental data, evaluate and document impacts of implementing the Yampa Plan: Certain individual actions that may be proposed under the plan, such as any reservoir enlargement(s) or other construction activities, would undergo separate NEPA review(s) to satisfy federal permit requirements (e.g., Clean Water Act, Section 404; federal rights-of-way and/or land use permits). In such cases, the permit(s) would provide the federal nexus for the purposes of both the NEPA and ESA; the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or affected land management agency (e.g., BLM, USFS) would likely be the federal action agency.

Half of the 14 augmentation water supply alternatives would require 3,700–7,000 AF from Elkhead Reservoir, of which 3,300–7,000 AF would be derived from an enlargement of the reservoir. The CRWCD is investigating the feasibility of enlarging Elkhead Reservoir by 12,000 AF, of which 5,000 AF would be dedicated to instream flows. The CRWCD selected Ayres Associates to be the prime contractor for Elkhead environmental studies. The Recovery Program agreed to fund these studies on a pro rata basis, or roughly 5/12 (42%) of the total cost of the studies. In 2002, Pioneer Environmental Services, subcontracted by Ayres, collected field data for an application of the Habitat Evaluation Procedures (HEP) to assess the impacts of the proposed 12,000-AF enlargement of Elkhead Reservoir.

The HEP is based on a suite of evaluation species to represent different guilds (e.g., habitat types, trophic levels, feeding/breeding behavior, etc.). For this application, nine evaluation species were selected: Brewer's sparrow, yellow warbler, red-winged blackbird, sandhill crane, western grebe, ferruginous hawk, osprey, beaver, American mink. For each of these species, habitat suitability indices (HSI) were developed or derived from existing models and calibrated for regional differences. These HSI are based on measurable habitat variables (e.g., percent shrub cover, water depth, vegetation type, etc.) ranging from 0 (no habitat value) to 1.0 (optimum habitat value). Formulae developed or derived for each species relate the various HSI to one another, the result of which is multiplied by the number of acres to arrive at a number of habitat units (HU). By comparing the number of HU without the project to the number of HU with the project, gains and losses of HU can be estimated for each species, and an overall HU score can be ascertained. A draft HEP report will be submitted early in 2003.

Task 13. Prepare Biological Assessment; initiate consultation: In addition, Program Director's office will initiate intra-Service consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA, the product of which will be a programmatic biological opinion. The request to initiate will be made when the draft EA is issued early in 2003.

Task 14–15. Using these scoping inputs, the Program Director's office will prepare an EA for the Yampa Plan. The draft EA will be issued with the next draft of the Yampa Plan early in 2003, followed by a comment period, including additional public meetings. A final EA is expected to be issued with the final Yampa Plan by the end of FY2003.

Tasks 16. Develop Cooperative Agreements to implement the Management Plans: The CWCB developed a draft Cooperative Agreement between the FWS, Colorado and Wyoming to implement the Yampa Plan. The agreement does not outline the plan, but cites it and spells out the respective roles of the signatories in implementing the plan. Workgroup members, FWS and the DOI Regional Solicitor submitted comments, and a second draft was submitted. A final agreement will be completed and signed in FY 2003.

Task 17. Public Involvement: Activities included issuing press releases, advertizing public meetings in local newspapers, preparing for and conducting public meetings and making presentations at regular meetings of the Yampa River Basin Partnership.

Task 18. Hydrology support: The CWCB continued to provide hydrology support, using the CRDSS hydrologic model for the Yampa River. Working with the Wyoming State Engineer's office, the CWCB also developed a model for the Little Snake River.

Task 19. Technical Project Support and Coordination: The Instream Flow Coordinator arranged meetings, presented reports to the BC, MC and IC, as appropriate, provided guidance to the CWCB in designing CRDSS Yampa River model runs, and used CRDSS outputs to estimate stream flow augmentation needs and analyze impacts of storage on peak flows. He also prepared FY 2001 annual reports and FY 2003 scopes of work, and coordinated with research personnel

and the Yampa River workgroup to draft and edit a management plan for the Yampa River.

VII. Recommendations:

A management plan for the Yampa River is a year behind schedule; it is imperative that it be completed in FY 2003. An effective and implementable agreement with water users is needed to protect instream flows and other essential habitat for native fishes now and into the future. Such a plan is vital to the recovery of listed fish species, while providing some assurance to water users that their needs will be met in the future. This project provides the framework by which to develop a management plan to meet these dual objectives.

VIII. Project Status:

Ongoing but behind schedule. Expected completion date for the Yampa Management Plan and EA is August 2003, when a Cooperative Agreement would be signed. Recovery actions implemented through this management plan would continue indefinitely, unless and until the Recovery Program discontinues or modifies them.

IX. FY 2002 Budget Status:

	<u>Ayres</u>	<u>CRWCD</u>	<u>Total</u>
A. Funds Provided:	\$276,665	\$27667	\$304,332
B. Funds Expended:	<u>\$276,665*</u>	<u>\$27667*</u>	<u>\$304,332*</u>
C. Difference:	\$ 0	\$ 0	\$ 0
D. Percent of the FY 2002 work completed:	100%		

Projected costs to complete: \$0

* Reallocation of costs between the RIP and CRWCD could result in a reduction in FY 2003 costs and/or refund of FY 2002 expenses in FY 2003.

E. Recovery Program funds spent for publication charges: See PIP-12K

X. Status of Data Submission: Pioneer will submit a draft HEP report in January 2003.

XI. Signed: Gerry Roehm March 5, 2003
Principal Investigator Date