

**COLORADO RIVER RECOVERY PROGRAM
FY 2016-2017 PROPOSED SCOPE OF WORK**

Project No.: 128

Abundance estimates for Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River

Reclamation Agreement number *[if applicable & known]*: R14AP00001
Reclamation Agreement term *[if applicable & known]*: Oct. 1, 2014 – Sep. 30, 2018

Lead Agency: Larval Fish Laboratory (LFL)

Submitted by: Kevin Bestgen (Lead), John Hawkins, Gary White
Larval Fish Laboratory
Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology
Colorado State University
Ft. Collins, CO 80523
voice: KRB (970) 491-1848, JAH (970) 491-2777
fax: (970) 491-5091
email: kbestgen@colostate.edu

Robert Schelley
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
152 East 100 North
Vernal, UT 84078
voice: (435) 781-5315
fax: (435) 789-8343
email: MattBreen@Utah.gov

Tildon Jones
USFWS
Colorado River Fishery Project
1380 S. 2350 W.
Vernal, Utah 84078 (Jones)
Phone: (435) 789-0354
Email: Tildon_Jones@fws.gov

Katie Creighton/Julie Howard
Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
1165 So. Hwy 191, Ste 4
Moab, UT 84532
email: JulieHoward@Utah.gov

Date Last Modified: 5/21/2015 10:55:00 AM *[This field is set to update automatically.]*

Category:

- Ongoing project
 Ongoing-revised project
 Requested new project
 Unsolicited proposal

Expected Funding Source:

- Annual funds
 Capital funds
 Other (explain)

I. Title of Proposal: Abundance Estimates for Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin, Utah and Colorado

II. Relationship to RIPRAP:

See RIPRAP at <http://www.coloradoriverrecovery.org/documents-publications/foundational-documents/recovery-action-plan.html>

Green River Action Plan: Mainstem

- V. Monitor populations and habitat and conduct research to support recovery actions (Research, monitoring, and data management).
V.C. Population estimate for Colorado pikeminnow.
V.C.1. Middle Green River

III. Study Background/Rationale and Hypotheses:

Background.—Abundance estimates of endangered Colorado pikeminnow *Ptychocheilus lucius* are needed to better monitor population status and provide benchmarks against which progress toward recovery can be measured. The 1998 meeting of the *Interagency Standardized Monitoring Program (ISMP)* workgroup recommended obtaining abundance estimates for each population of endangered fish. The Genetics Management Plan identified a population (the Yampa-Green stock) of Colorado pikeminnow that inhabits the middle Green River (Middle Green River reach) from Lodore Canyon downstream to approximately the White River. The middle Green River stock includes fish in the Yampa River (Yampa River reach) and the White River (White River reach); the few fish captured in the Duchesne River are included in the middle Green River reach. The other Green River stock resides in the mainstem Green River downstream of the White River. Two reaches include the Desolation-Gray Canyon portion of the Green River (Desolation-Gray Canyon reach) and the lower Green River (lower Green River reach) from about the town of Green River, Utah, downstream to the confluence of the Colorado River. This scope of work outlines a procedure to obtain abundance estimates for juvenile (< 400 mm total length [TL]), recruit (400 to 449 mm TL) and adult (\geq 450 mm TL) Colorado pikeminnow in each of the five reaches of the Green River Basin, Colorado and Utah, as described above. From those reach estimates, an abundance estimate for each length-based life stage will be estimated for the entire Green River Basin.

Catch/effort data that describes abundance of juvenile/recruit/adult Colorado pikeminnow have been collected in the Colorado (three reaches), Green (five reaches), Yampa (three reaches), and White (two reaches) rivers from 1986 to 2000 under the auspices of the *ISMP*. Abundance estimates based on capture-recapture sampling were made from 2000-2003 in the middle Green River and from 2001 to 2003 in the lower Green River. Collectively, these data suggested increased abundance of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin until 2000 but abundance estimates indicated an apparent decline after that (Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007). Populations recovered in the 2006-2008 period, in response to increased survival rates and increased recruitment of young fish (Bestgen et al. 2010), but reduced capture rates from 2011-2013 indicate reduced populations; that data is presently being summarized in a draft report.

Recovery goals call for sampling on a three year on, two year off schedule and abundance estimates for the Green River population are due again from 2011 to 2013, with data analysis and summary in 2014, and then another round of sampling in 2016-2018. Therefore, this proposal outlines procedures to conduct capture-recapture sampling in 2016-2018 similar to that conducted from 2000 to 2003, 2006-2008, and 2011-2013 using uniquely marked animals so that the necessary abundance estimates can be calculated. Estimated costs for data analysis and reporting will be provided for 2019.

Parameter estimation models and assumptions.—Two general classes of models can be used to estimate abundance of animal populations in the wild and are differentiated based on assumptions about population demographics. The first class of models are closed population estimators. Closed population estimators have three main assumptions. The first is that the population is closed so that N , the true population size, is constant during the short-term annual sampling event. Geographic closure assumes that there is no immigration to or emigration from the population of interest. Demographic closure assumes no births or deaths within the sampling period. A second assumption that is often difficult to meet is that all individuals in the population have the same probability of being captured during each sampling occasion. Differences in capture probability among individuals are well-known in fish populations, often involving size related differences in susceptibility to the sampling gear. Another situation that may cause unequal probability of capture is a group of individuals that occupy a habitat type different than that used by most individuals in the population. Behavioral differences may also cause differences in capture probability among individuals. Capture probabilities may also vary among capture occasions because of changes in environmental conditions such as stream flow. A third assumption of closed abundance estimators is that previously marked animals can be reliably distinguished from unmarked animals.

The second class of models is open population estimators. Open population models are useful to estimate population abundance as well as the joint probability of survival/immigration, and births or recruitment/emigration (Burnham et al. 1987, Lebreton et al. 1992). This general model class is termed the Jolly-Seber (J-S) model (Jolly 1965, Seber 1965). Similar to closed population models, J-S population estimation models assume that tagged fish are representative of the population to which inferences are being made and that the fate of individuals is independent of each other. An assumption not common with closed abundance estimators is that fish in an identifiable class or group (e.g., adults) have the same survival and capture probabilities for each time interval. A consequence of this component in J-S population models is that all releases should be made within a short time period so that rates among individuals are the same. The J-S models do not generally require assumptions of no immigration/emigration, and no recruitment or mortality. An exception is that geographic closure is still important when population size is the parameter of interest. Although open models can estimate more and different parameters and have less restrictive underlying assumptions, abundance estimates generated from such models are often less precise than those for closed population models. Another disadvantage of abundance estimates calculated from open population models is that they are all based on model M_t , a model that allows for time varying probabilities of capture. Although time variation is likely among sampling occasions, J-S models assume no heterogeneity or behavioral response among individuals in the estimated population. Thus, abundance estimates calculated from open population models do not allow as thorough an evaluation of assumptions as do closed population models.

Robust design for capture-recapture studies.—The robust design attempts to capitalize on the strengths of closed and open population models by combining the use of each in an overall sampling and estimation program (Pollock 1982, 1990). The robust design employs sampling at two scales. Sampling occasions completed at closely spaced intervals (e.g. weeks) are used to estimate population size using closed population models. That level of sampling completed in

two or more consecutive years allows for estimation of population probabilities of capture, recruitment, and annual survival rates. The robust design approach was employed by Osmundson and Burnham (1998) and Bestgen et al. (2005; 2007; 2010) to estimate abundance and survival rates of Colorado pikeminnow in the Colorado River and the Green River, respectively. This approach offers advantages of both closed and open population estimation methods if certain assumptions are met. A particular advantage is that the robust design allows evaluation of heterogeneity effects within individuals among capture occasions. We can meet the requirements of the robust study design with the approach described below.

IV. Study Goals, Objectives, End Product:

Goals: Obtain accurate (unbiased) and reliable (precise) estimates of adult population abundance and survival of Colorado pikeminnow that occupy the Green River study area.

Objectives:

1. Complete a minimum of three sampling passes through the five Green River Basin reaches listed to capture sub-adult and adult Colorado pikeminnow:
 - a) Green River between the confluence of the White River upstream to the lower end of Whirlpool Canyon (i.e., upper Rainbow Park).
 - b) White River between the confluence of the Green River upstream to Taylor Draw Dam,
 - c) Yampa River between Deerlodge Park and Craig, excluding Cross Mountain Canyon,
 - d) Green River from the White River confluence downstream to near Green River, Utah, and,
 - e) Green River from downstream of Green River, Utah, to the confluence with the Colorado River.

The LFL and CDOW will attempt 3-8 sampling passes in the Yampa River, in part associated with bass and northern pike removal projects, in order to obtain a more precise and accurate Colorado pikeminnow abundance estimate.

2. Obtain highest possible rates of capture of Colorado pikeminnow within concentration habitats and maximize number of individuals marked and captured on each sampling occasion.
3. Obtain estimates of probability of capture and abundance for Colorado pikeminnow in each of the five reach and for the entire study area.

End Products: The end products are abundance and survival estimates for sub-adult and adult Colorado pikeminnow for each of the White, Yampa, and Green River populations. An overall estimate will also be calculated. The report for data gathered in the 2011-2013 period should be available in summer 2015; a report for data collected from 2016-2018 should be available in summer 2019.

Report Review schedule: Annual reports will be submitted each year. A final summary report for Green River Colorado pikeminnow data will be submitted to the Recovery Program Coordinator in summer 2019.

The Colorado pikeminnow analyses (including the Colorado River data analysis and the Green River data analysis and report) will include:

1. Abundance estimates for all reaches and the entire basin for all three years.
2. A summary of sampling effort and discussion of issues related to sampling efficiency.
3. A list of PIT tagged fish will be submitted to the database manager at the end of each year.
4. Depending on the wishes of the Biology Committee and the Recovery Program, other parameter estimates such as survival rates and population rates of change may be estimated.

V. Study Area

The Green River Basin, including Green River main stem, the lower White River, and portions of the Yampa River.

VI. Study Methods/Approach

We propose to conduct abundance estimation for sub-adult and adult life stages of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green, White, and Yampa rivers as outlined in the Study Area description. Investigators will thoroughly sample habitat where Colorado pikeminnow are known to congregate (concentration habitat) in each reach on three separate, consecutive occasions (passes) during springtime beginning just after ice-off and ending prior to or during runoff. Concentration habitats are usually shorelines, eddies, pools, flooded tributary mouths, and backwaters. This approach will permit annual abundance estimate calculations for populations by reach and also allows for a combined estimate for the study area. This sampling program conducted over a three-year period will fulfill the requirements of the robust design and also permit calculation of survival estimates for pikeminnow in the study area.

Annual sampling to estimate pikeminnow abundance.—Annual sampling will involve a minimum of three sampling occasions through the five river reaches identified above. The three sampling occasions will be conducted in spring between the time when ice off occurs and end prior to or during spring runoff before pikeminnow migration begins. Sampling will begin at the top of each major reach and proceed downstream. It is important to maximize the number of fish captured on each pass (Lebreton et al. 1992). Different gear types may be used in different sampling areas. Electrofishing will be the primary gear in main channel and small backwaters. Large backwaters and concentration areas may be sampled with a blocking trammel net and perhaps electrofishing. Gear use depends on habitat availability as well but will be applied as consistently as possible across reaches and rivers. The goal of using different gear types is to maximize capture probability on each pass.

Investigators will proceed downriver, sampling all available Colorado pikeminnow concentration habitat on each pass. Information recorded at each Colorado pikeminnow capture location will be major habitat type (e.g., main channel pool, main channel eddy, backwater, flooded tributary mouth), a specific capture and release location identified by a GPS unit, and

fish total length and mass. Each fish will be scanned for the presence of a PIT tag, making sure to follow standard Program protocols to ensure detection of tags with new and old frequencies. The fish will be tagged if it has not been previously marked, and the tag number recorded. The importance of back-up PIT tag scanners of both frequencies and adequate tagging supplies is critical to the success of this project. Scanning and tagging of all fish will reduce bias and result in the most accurate and precise abundance estimates possible. Tagged fish will be released in recovered condition at the point of capture.

After a single marking occasion is completed for the reach, they will proceed back to the upstream terminus and begin the second sampling occasion. A sufficient amount of time (e.g., 5-10 days) should elapse between the start of consecutive sampling occasions to allow for sufficient mixing of marked and unmarked fish. In the appropriate reaches, an *ISMP*-like sampling pass may be conducted within a primary sampling occasion to add to that data set.

Assumptions of closed population abundance estimators.—Fulfilling the assumptions underlying any abundance estimation model is a critical first step in the planning of a large field study. We have evaluated the assumptions of closed population abundance estimators in a previous study and feel confident that these assumptions can be met again (Bestgen et al. 2005). The first assumption that of constant N during short-term annual sampling, can be assumed because the size of the study area dictates that the only point of emigration/immigration from the population of interest would be to or from the lower Green River. The likelihood of movement is much reduced at that time of year because fish occupy small and stable home ranges. Lack of movement during that time period will also reduce movement of fish within the main study area from sampled reaches to areas that may receive little or no sampling effort such as canyons. Limiting the target group of fish to sub-adult and adult pikeminnow and limiting sampling to a relatively short time period in spring prior to migration, eliminates the possibility of additions to the population through recruitment. This fulfills the assumption of demographic closure.

The second assumption of equal probability of capture of individuals is unlikely to be met except in all but the most restricted conditions. However, techniques can be employed to reduce effects of heterogeneity among capture probabilities of individuals (e.g. size effects). Variation among capture probabilities among reaches and years can be reduced by explicitly modeling time effects. We also utilized total length as a covariate in previous analyses to account for a proportion of capture heterogeneity due to fish size differences (Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007; 2010). Previous studies have shown that behavior effects such as avoidance of capture gear are not generally important (Bestgen et al 2005; 2007; 2010). An exception may be for Colorado pikeminnow 800-mm TL or larger, which had very low recapture rates among years. The low number of those fish in samples suggested that bias of abundance estimates due to presumed behavior effects of those larger fish should be low. A separate study may be necessary to fully understand if those behavior effects are important, or if low recapture rates of large Colorado pikeminnow are due to other factors.

Another assumption is of accurate recognition of marked and unmarked animals. To ensure that this assumption is fulfilled, investigators need to make sure tag detection equipment is in good operating order, carefully scan each fish with old and new types of tag scanners, and make sure tags are detectable prior to insertion. This requires that the tagging protocol be diligently followed.

Study duration.—The robust design requires at least two years of data collection in order for a survival estimate to be calculated, but the addition of more years will increase the number of estimates possible, and their accuracy and precision. Although survival estimation is not a main goal of this study, such estimates are useful for other purposes related to determining recovery goals and for comparison with survival rates of Colorado pikeminnow in other systems or periods (Osmundson and Burnham 1998, Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007; 2010). A minimum of

three years of data will also yield three separate abundance estimates for pikeminnow in the study area, and will provide a consistency check for estimates among years.

Other considerations for FY 2016-2018.—This sampling design does not include canyon reaches because fish are presumed rare in those habitats during the non-spawning period (Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007; 2010). Another consideration in the decision not to intensively sample canyon reaches is the high level of logistics and effort needed to accomplish such sampling. We will use ancillary data collected in those reaches, such as was done from 2000 to 2003, 2006-2008, and 2011-2013 to evaluate that this consideration still holds (Bestgen et al. 2005; 2007; 2010).

Program Mark will be used to estimate abundance and survival estimates for Colorado pikeminnow in the study area. Program Mark is an omnibus data analysis program that allows exploration of a number of closed and open sampling design estimators for calculating estimates of abundance and survival. The robust design specifically incorporates closed model abundance estimation techniques, while survival is estimated from variants of the Jolly-Seber model.

VII. Task Description and Schedule (FY 2016-2019)

Because of the complexity and short duration of the sampling, and the need to use five relatively autonomous units to complete this work, we will continue to use a Standard Operating Procedure for field personnel to ensure a consistent sampling approach and timely completion of tasks. We will also have frequent conference calls with team members and field crews to discuss issues and problems. This will also provide an opportunity for each group to report on progress in completing tasks. The Larval Fish Laboratory will be responsible for routine coordination of the study. The Program Directors office will assist in resolution of problems related to timely completion of tasks.

Task 1. Feb.-March. Order and prepare equipment. This task relates to objectives 1 and 2.

Task 2. April. Secure sampling location access, final equipment preparation, and crew coordination. As occurred in FY 2013, this related to coordination among sampling crews, a review of sampling and fish handling practices, effort allocation among trips, permit requests, and other tasks. This task relates to objectives 1, 2, and 3. Several river reaches are relatively remote or on private property and will require reconnaissance to acquire permission and find boat launch and take-out sites.

Task 3. Apr.-June. 3-pass sampling. Relates to objectives 1-3.

Task 4. Jan.-Sept. Sampling team coordination, data entry, and analysis. Relates to four objectives 1-4.

Task 5. November-December. Write Recovery Program final summary report for data collected in each year in the 2016-2018 period, and prepare data analysis for Colorado pikeminnow data analysis. Relates to objectives 3 and 4. In 2019 this constitutes a final report summarizing all data collected.

Task 6. New and FY 2016 only. Razorback sucker abundance and survival estimation, Green River Basin.

The Recovery Program requested an analysis of razorback sucker data collected during Colorado pikeminnow abundance estimation from 2011-2013 to estimate their abundance and survival in the Green River Basin. For the funding proposed we will guarantee razorback sucker abundance estimates for the three Green River segments and the White River; we will examine Yampa data but are assuming right now that the few recaptures will preclude any useful estimation. Analyses will be completed essentially as for Colorado pikeminnow data described above. We will also conduct survival rate analysis, updating older analyses that were complete through 2008 and portions through 2011 (Zelasko et al. 2011, Bestgen et al. 2012). We are targeting survival estimates by Green River reach, middle Green River, Desolation-Grey canyons, and lower Green River, so that survival rates can be understood for those sections. Recall that those Monitoring Plan report (Bestgen et al. 2012) analyses showed Deso-Grey fish were never seen again so survival rates were very low. If there is sufficient funding, we will look into use of RZB PIT tag antenna array data including for the White River and Tusher Wash (which may fit well into the Deso-Grey survival question) but that may be beyond the scope of this project. A draft report is expected by the end of 2016.

VIII. FY-2016-2018 Work

- Deliverables, Due Dates, and Budget by Fiscal Year: For Colorado pikeminnow sampling, project summary report summer 2019 for data collected 2016-2018; annual reports to Program Directors Office by November each year. For razorback sucker data analysis, we anticipate beginning that work when funding is available in FY 2016. We expect that analysis and a draft report to be completed by the end of the calendar year 2016.

Budget by reach:

Larval Fish Laboratory, sampling and data analysis

Larval Fish Laboratory: Budget includes data analysis costs for Principal Investigator. Budget presented assumes that 1/2 of field-related expenses associated with Colorado pikeminnow abundance estimation will be covered under project 125, pike and smallmouth bass removal in the middle Yampa River and under CDOW sampling. Additional funds are to be used to attempt five or six full passes (at present three complete passes and sampling in concentration areas three more times will be completed under existing CDOW and CSU projects) for the Yampa River to improve precision of abundance estimates. We reduced our budget by \$7,350 (9%) per year because of efficiencies in data entry and analysis, but additional funding is needed in 2019 for final analysis and report preparation. Fringe benefits are 25% of the total amount of salaries in 2016. LFL overhead rate is 17.5% and is charged to all items. Fringe on salary and overhead are figured into costs for LFL items.

Travel: Travel costs for field work based on estimated per diem rates for Colorado State University for the area we are working in. Mileage is based on the standard rate for Motor Pool vehicles, which varies depending on age and size of the vehicle. We will use

\$ 0.50 per mile for 2015. Meeting costs include three nites of hotel, per diem, and mileage to travel to meetings. These include costs for two people.

Personnel: Salaries include 25% fringe rate, an estimate for 2016, plus overhead. Overhead is calculated on all items (including salary plus fringe rate) at 17.5%, per our agreement with BOR.

Supplies: Supplies are used in the conduct of field sampling and lab analysis of specimens and otoliths. Containers and preservatives are to hold field specimens and to curate specimens in the lab, preservative are formalin and ethanol for preservation of samples. Camping gear includes tents, kitchen supplies for field camping, and coolers. Nets include seines and trammel nets, disposable goods that need replacements due to attrition. Fyke nets are stationary gear for pike sampling and need to be replaced due to attrition. Tools for repairs include hammers, pitons, rock bags, wrenches, and other hand tools to assist with sampling and gear repair in the field. Raft gear includes personal flotation devices, straps and other rigging for rafts, oars, shocking boat booms, frame repair or replacement, and flooring. Estimated costs based on current prices procured from various online sources (local vendors for camping supplies, NRS rafting supplies, Christiansen Inc, for net supplies, Fischer Scientific for preservatives, sample jars).

Budget notes: Costs were reduced to accommodate Program requirements. This was accomplished by not building in raises in salary between 2013 and 2014 and decreasing costs for sample identification and other analyses; budget was static from 2011-2013. Increases needed to support mandated raises for personnel and if additional funds are available, increased sample costs should be added.

Task 6, **NEW and 2016 only**. Abundance and survival estimation for razorback suckers, Green River Basin.

Larval Fish Laboratory

FY 2016, Task 6, razorback sucker abundance estimation

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|-------------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 33 | 625 | \$20,625 |
| Biologist (d) | 198 | 375 | \$74,250 |
| Technician (d) | 14 | 145 | \$2,030 |
| | | | subtotal \$96,905 |
| Travel | | | |
| Meeting | 2 | 550 | \$1,100 |
| | | | subtotal \$1,100 |
| | | | Total \$98,005 |

Larval Fish Laboratory, FY2016

Tasks 1 and 2, Prepare sampling equipment, literature work, site visit, sampling team coordination

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 3 | 625 | \$1,875 |
| Biologist (d) | 5 | 375 | \$1,875 |
| Senior technician (d) | 5 | 226 | \$1,130 |
| Technician (d) | 2 | 145 | \$290 |
| | | | subtotal |
| | | | \$5,170 |
| Travel | | | |
| Per diem (d) | 4 | 50 | \$200 |
| Mileage (miles) | 750 | 0.5 | \$375 |
| | | | subtotal |
| | | | \$575 |
| | | | Total |
| | | | \$5,745 |

Task 3, complete 3 sampling passes, 10d ea, represents 1/2 the costs, other 1/2 covered by project 125, pike and bass removal in the middle Yampa River

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 10 | 625 | \$6,250 |
| Biologist (d) | 15 | 375 | \$5,625 |
| Senior technician (d) | 15 | 226 | \$3,390 |
| Technician (d) | 60 | 145 | \$8,700 |
| | | | subtotal |
| | | | \$23,965 |
| Travel | | | |
| Per diem (d) | 100 | 20 | \$2,000 |
| Mileage (miles) | 3600 | 0.5 | \$1,800 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-----|----------|----------|
| | | | subtotal | \$3,800 |
| Supplies | | | | |
| gas | 450 | 4 | | \$1,800 |
| oil | 20 | 3.5 | | \$70 |
| motor repair | 2 | 500 | | \$1,000 |
| nets, seines, pens | 9 | 75 | | \$675 |
| preservative | 1 | 33 | | \$33 |
| | | | subtotal | \$3,578 |
| | | | Total | \$31,343 |

Task 4, data entry and analysis

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Labor | | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 35 | 625 | \$21,875 | |
| Biologist (d) | 25 | 375 | \$9,375 | |
| Senior technician (d) | 38 | 226 | \$8,588 | |
| Technician (d) | 7 | 145 | \$1,015 | |
| | | | subtotal | \$40,853 |

Task 5, annual report preparation

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|---------|
| Labor | | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 10 | 625 | \$6,250 | |
| Biologist (d) | 3 | 375 | \$1,125 | |
| Senior technician (d) | 5 | 226 | \$1,130 | |
| Technician (d) | 5 | 145 | \$725 | |
| | | | subtotal | \$9,230 |
| Travel | | | | |
| Meeting | 1 | 600 | \$600 | |
| | | | subtotal | \$600 |
| | | | Total | \$9,830 |

Total tasks 1-5 \$87,771

Larval Fish Laboratory, FY2017

Tasks 1 and 2, Prepare sampling equipment, literature work, site visit, sampling team coordination

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 3 | 637.5 | \$1,913 |
| Biologist (d) | 5 | 382.5 | \$1,913 |
| Senior technician (d) | 5 | 230.52 | \$1,153 |
| Technician (d) | 2 | 147.9 | \$296 |
| | | | subtotal \$5,273 |
| Travel | | | |
| Per diem (d) | 4 | 50 | \$200 |
| Mileage (miles) | 750 | 0.5 | \$375 |
| | | | subtotal \$575 |
| | | | Total \$5,848 |

Task 3, complete 3 sampling passes, 10d ea, represents 1/2 the costs, other 1/2 covered by project 125, pike and bass removal in the middle Yampa River

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|-------------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 10 | 637.5 | \$6,375 |
| Biologist (d) | 15 | 382.5 | \$5,738 |
| Senior technician (d) | 15 | 230.52 | \$3,458 |
| Technician (d) | 60 | 147.9 | \$8,874 |
| | | | subtotal \$24,444 |
| Travel | | | |
| Per diem (d) | 100 | 20 | \$2,000 |
| Mileage (miles) | 3600 | 0.5 | \$1,800 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|-----|-----|----------|----------|
| | | | subtotal | \$3,800 |
| Supplies | | | | |
| gas | 450 | 4 | | \$1,800 |
| oil | 20 | 3.5 | | \$70 |
| motor repair | 2 | 500 | | \$1,000 |
| nets, seines, pens | 9 | 75 | | \$675 |
| preservative | 1 | 33 | | \$33 |
| | | | subtotal | \$3,578 |
| | | | Total | \$31,822 |

Task 4, data entry and analysis

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Labor | | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 35 | 637.5 | \$22,313 | |
| Biologist (d) | 25 | 382.5 | \$9,563 | |
| Senior technician (d) | 38 | 230.52 | \$8,760 | |
| Technician (d) | 7 | 147.9 | \$1,035 | |
| | | | subtotal | \$41,670 |

Task 5, annual report preparation

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost | |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|----------|
| Labor | | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 10 | 637.5 | \$6,375 | |
| Biologist (d) | 3 | 382.5 | \$1,148 | |
| Senior technician (d) | 5 | 230.52 | \$1,153 | |
| Technician (d) | 5 | 147.9 | \$740 | |
| | | | subtotal | \$9,415 |
| Travel | | | | |
| Meeting | 1 | 600 | \$600 | |
| | | | subtotal | \$600 |
| | | | Total | \$10,015 |

Total tasks 1-5 \$89,355

Larval Fish Laboratory, FY2018

Tasks 1 and 2, Prepare sampling equipment, literature work, site visit, sampling team coordination

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 3 | 650.25 | \$1,951 |
| Biologist (d) | 5 | 390.15 | \$1,951 |
| Senior technician (d) | 5 | 235.1304 | \$1,176 |
| Technician (d) | 2 | 150.858 | \$302 |
| | | | subtotal |
| | | | \$5,379 |
| Travel | | | |
| Per diem (d) | 4 | 50 | \$200 |
| Mileage (miles) | 750 | 0.5 | \$375 |
| | | | subtotal |
| | | | \$575 |
| | | | Total |
| | | | \$5,954 |

Task 3, complete 3 sampling passes, 10d ea, represents 1/2 the costs, other 1/2 covered by project 125, pike and bass removal in the middle Yampa River

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 10 | 650.25 | \$6,503 |
| Biologist (d) | 15 | 390.15 | \$5,852 |
| Senior technician (d) | 15 | 235.1304 | \$3,527 |
| Technician (d) | 60 | 150.858 | \$9,051 |
| | | | subtotal |
| | | | \$24,933 |
| Travel | | | |
| Per diem (d) | 100 | 20 | \$2,000 |

| | | | |
|--------------------|------|-----|------------------|
| Mileage (miles) | 3600 | 0.5 | \$1,800 |
| | | | subtotal \$3,800 |
| Supplies | | | |
| gas | 450 | 4 | \$1,800 |
| oil | 20 | 3.5 | \$70 |
| motor repair | 2 | 500 | \$1,000 |
| nets, seines, pens | 9 | 75 | \$675 |
| preservative | 1 | 33 | \$33 |
| | | | subtotal \$3,578 |
| | | | Total \$32,311 |

Task 4, data entry and analysis

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|-------------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 35 | 650.25 | \$22,759 |
| Biologist (d) | 25 | 390.15 | \$9,754 |
| Senior technician (d) | 38 | 235.1304 | \$8,935 |
| Technician (d) | 7 | 150.858 | \$1,056 |
| | | | subtotal \$42,503 |

Task 5, annual report preparation

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|------------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 10 | 650.25 | \$6,503 |
| Biologist (d) | 3 | 390.15 | \$1,170 |
| Senior technician (d) | 5 | 235.1304 | \$1,176 |
| Technician (d) | 5 | 150.858 | \$754 |
| | | | subtotal \$9,603 |
| Travel | | | |
| Meeting | 1 | 600 | \$600 |
| | | | subtotal \$600 |
| | | | Total \$10,203 |

Total tasks 1-5 \$90,971

Larval Fish Laboratory, FY2019, no sampling

Task 5, Final report preparation

| Item | Units | Cost/unit | Cost |
|----------------------------|-------|-----------|--------------------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Principal investigator (d) | 55 | 669.7575 | \$36,837 |
| Biologist (d) | 35 | 401.8545 | \$14,065 |
| Senior technician (d) | 30 | 242.1843 | \$7,266 |
| | | | subtotal \$58,167 |
| Travel | | | |
| Meeting | 1 | 600 | \$600 |
| | | | subtotal \$600 |
| | | | Total \$58,767 |
| | | | Total tasks 1-5 \$58,767 |

Middle Green River, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Vernal, 2016-2018

FY 2016

Task 1. Three pass sampling and associated trip preparation (UDWR–Vernal).

| | Rate | Hours/Units | Cost |
|---|----------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Project Leader | 35.48 | 120 | 4257.60 |
| Biologist II | 33.12 | 220 | 7286.40 |
| Journey Maintenance/Construction Specialist | 26.66 | 400 | 10664.00 |
| Technician II (Field Supervisor) | 23.80 | 240 | 5712.00 |
| Technician II (Assistant Crew Leader) | 17.48 | 240 | 4195.20 |
| Technician I | 16.23 | 720 | 11685.60 |
| Shuttle Drivers | 16.58 | 200 | 3316.00 |
| | | Subtotal | \$47,117 |
| Travel | | | |
| 4 trucks @ 12% of annual use ^a | 27200.00 | 0.12 | 3264.00 |
| Per diem (15 day trips x 6 people) | 13.00 | 90 | 1170.00 |
| | | Subtotal | \$4,434 |
| Equipment | | | |
| Boat fuel (gallons) | 4.00 | 168 | 672.00 |
| Boat oil (quarts) | 11.00 | 24 | 264.00 |
| Replacement props (average for steel & aluminum) | 150.00 | 10 | 1500.00 |
| Replacement water pump/impeller kit | 125.00 | 5 | 625.00 |
| Replacement fuel pumps | 75.00 | 2 | 150.00 |
| Fuel stabilizer | 30.00 | 5 | 150.00 |
| Oxygen sensor | 280.00 | 1 | 280.00 |
| Fuel injector | 115.00 | 1 | 115.00 |
| Steering helm assembly | 250.00 | 1 | 250.00 |
| Replacement lower units | 1300.00 | 3 | 3900.00 |
| Replacement gear box/remote assembly | 455.00 | 1 | 455.00 |
| Lower unit oil (5 gallons) | 160.00 | 1 | 160.00 |
| Electrofishing repair supplies ^b | | | 1800.00 |
| Misc. boat/motor repair and maintenance supplies ^c | | | 1120.00 |
| Sampling equipment ^d | | | 4480.00 |
| | | Subtotal | \$15,921 |
| | | Task 1 Total | \$67,472 |

(a) The State of Utah uses Automotive Resources Inc. for motor pool operations. Rental is approximately \$6,800/year/vehicle (includes fleet rental, mileage, and gas), which is based on the average annual cost for all trucks used in our program.

(b) Electrofishing repair supplies: anode/boom repairs & replacement (\$500), electrofishing safety mats (Tapeswitch-2 @ \$250/each), foot pedal (\$50), electrofishing plugs/connectors (\$250), annual electrofisher service (\$500)

(c) Boat/motor repair and maintenance: oil filters (5 @ \$20/each), grease (\$20), miscellaneous small motor parts/repair (\$500), shop supplies/tools/safety gear (\$500)

(d) Sampling equipment: batteries (\$200), waders (Simms-2 @ \$400/each), nets (Cummins-12 @ \$40/each), vials/envelopes/paper/notebooks (Forestry suppliers-\$250), data logger service (Juniper Systems-\$500), sunscreen/bugspray (\$150), first-aid supplies (\$100), water quality meter (YSI-\$800), scale (\$300), GPS unit (Garmin-\$400), livewell/buckets/measuring boards/PIT reader service (\$500)

Task 2. Data entry, analysis, and reporting (UDWR–Vernal).

| | Rate | Hours/Units | Cost |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Project Leader | 35.48 | 20 | 709.60 |
| Biologist II | 33.12 | 40 | 1324.80 |
| Technician II (Field Supervisor) | 23.80 | 80 | 1904.00 |
| | | Task 2 Total | \$3,938 |
| | | TOTAL | \$71,410 |

FY 2017

Task 1. Three pass sampling and associated trip preparation (UDWR–Vernal).

| | Rate | Hours/Units | Cost |
|--|----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Project Leader | 36.19 | 120 | 4342.75 |
| Biologist II | 33.78 | 220 | 7432.13 |
| Journey Maintenance/Construction Specialist | 27.19 | 400 | 10877.28 |
| Technician II (Field Supervisor) | 24.28 | 240 | 5826.24 |
| Technician II (Assistant Crew Leader) | 17.83 | 240 | 4279.10 |
| Technician I | 16.55 | 720 | 11919.31 |
| Shuttle Drivers | 16.91 | 200 | 3382.32 |
| | | Subtotal | \$48,059 |
| Travel | | | |
| 4 trucks @ 12% of annual use ^a | 27744.00 | 0.12 | 3329.28 |
| Per diem (15 day trips x 6 people) | 13.26 | 90 | 1193.40 |
| | | Subtotal | \$4,523 |
| Equipment | | | |
| Boat fuel (gallons) | 4.08 | 168 | 685.44 |
| Boat oil (quarts) | 11.22 | 24 | 269.28 |
| Replacement props (average for steel & aluminum) | 153.00 | 10 | 1530.00 |
| Replacement water pump/impeller kit | 127.50 | 5 | 637.50 |
| Replacement fuel pumps | 76.50 | 2 | 153.00 |
| Fuel stabilizer | 30.60 | 5 | 153.00 |
| Oxygen sensor | 285.60 | 1 | 285.60 |

| | | | |
|---|---------|---|---------------------|
| Fuel injector | 117.30 | 1 | 117.30 |
| Steering helm assembly | 255.00 | 1 | 255.00 |
| Replacement lower units | 1326.00 | 3 | 3978.00 |
| Replacement gear box/remote assembly | 464.10 | 1 | 464.10 |
| Lower unit oil (5 gallons) | 163.20 | 1 | 163.20 |
| Electrofishing repair supplies ^b | | | 1836.00 |
| Misc. boat/motor repair and maintenance supplies ^c | | | 1142.40 |
| Sampling equipment ^d | | | 4569.60 |
| | | | Subtotal |
| | | | \$16,239 |
| | | | Task 1 Total |
| | | | \$68,821 |

Task 2. Data entry, analysis, and reporting (UDWR–Vernal).

| | Rate | Hours/Units | Cost |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------------|---------------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Project Leader | 36.19 | 20 | 723.79 |
| Biologist II | 33.78 | 40 | 1351.30 |
| Technician II (Field Supervisor) | 24.28 | 80 | 1942.08 |
| | | | Task 2 Total |
| | | | \$4,017 |
| | | | TOTAL |
| | | | \$72,838 |

FY 2018

Task 1. Three pass sampling and associated trip preparation (UDWR–Vernal).

| | Rate | Hours/Units | Cost |
|---|----------|-------------|-----------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Project Leader | 36.91 | 120 | 4429.61 |
| Biologist II | 34.46 | 220 | 7580.77 |
| Journey Maintenance/Construction Specialist | 27.74 | 400 | 11094.83 |
| Technician II (Field Supervisor) | 24.76 | 240 | 5942.76 |
| Technician II (Assistant Crew Leader) | 18.19 | 240 | 4364.69 |
| Technician I | 16.89 | 720 | 12157.70 |
| Shuttle Drivers | 17.25 | 200 | 3449.97 |
| | | | Subtotal |
| | | | \$49,020 |
| Travel | | | |
| 4 trucks @ 12% of annual usea | 28298.88 | 0.12 | 3395.87 |
| Per diem (15 day trips x 6 people) | 13.53 | 90 | 1217.27 |
| | | | Subtotal |
| | | | \$4,613 |
| Equipment | | | |
| Boat fuel (gallons) | 4.16 | 168 | 699.15 |

| | | | |
|---|---------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Boat oil (quarts) | 11.44 | 24 | 274.67 |
| Replacement props (average for steel & aluminum) | 156.06 | 10 | 1560.60 |
| Replacement water pump/impeller kit | 130.05 | 5 | 650.25 |
| Replacement fuel pumps | 78.03 | 2 | 156.06 |
| Fuel stabilizer | 31.21 | 5 | 156.06 |
| Oxygen sensor | 291.31 | 1 | 291.31 |
| Fuel injector | 119.65 | 1 | 119.65 |
| Steering helm assembly | 260.10 | 1 | 260.10 |
| Replacement lower units | 1352.52 | 3 | 4057.56 |
| Replacement gear box/remote assembly | 473.38 | 1 | 473.38 |
| Lower unit oil (5 gallons) | 166.46 | 1 | 166.46 |
| Electrofishing repair suppliesb | | | 1872.72 |
| Misc. boat/motor repair and maintenance suppliesc | | | 1165.25 |
| Sampling equipmentd | | | 4660.99 |
| | | Subtotal | \$16,564 |
| | | Task 1 Total | \$70,198 |

Task 2. Data entry, analysis, and reporting (UDWR–Vernal).

| | Rate | Hours/Units | Cost |
|----------------------------------|-------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Labor | | | |
| Project Leader | 36.91 | 20 | 738.27 |
| Biologist II | 34.46 | 40 | 1378.32 |
| Technician II (Field Supervisor) | 24.76 | 80 | 1980.92 |
| | | Task 2 Total | \$4,098 |
| | | TOTAL | \$74,295 |

USFWS, Vernal, White River Budget, 2016-2018

2016

| Task Activity | | | |
|---|---------|-------|----------|
| Tasks 1-3 | | | |
| Labor | Rate | Total | |
| | \$/hr | hours | |
| GS-7 Biologist trip prep | \$28.44 | 96 | \$2,730 |
| 4 GS-5 Techs trip prep | \$24.96 | 144 | \$3,594 |
| Taylor Draw Dam to Rangely river bridge | | | |
| GS-7 Biologist | \$28.44 | 30 | \$853 |
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$24.96 | 72 | \$1,797 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$37.44 | 18 | \$674 |
| Rangely river bridge to Pipeline | | | |
| GS-7 Biologist | \$28.44 | 60 | \$1,706 |
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$24.96 | 144 | \$3,594 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$37.44 | 36 | \$1,348 |
| Pipeline to Enron (Cowboy Canyon) | | | |
| GS-7 Biologist | \$28.44 | 90 | \$2,560 |
| 4 GS-5 Tech | \$24.96 | 288 | \$7,188 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$37.44 | 72 | \$2,696 |
| Enron to Green River confluence | | | |
| GS-7 Biologist | \$28.44 | 60 | \$1,706 |
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$24.96 | 144 | \$3,594 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$37.44 | 36 | \$1,348 |
| GS-08 maintenance and equipment repair | \$38.72 | 196 | \$7,589 |
| Subtotal | | | \$36,654 |
| Travel, Per Diem, Equipment | | | |
| GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$313/mo | \$313 | 6 | \$1,878 |
| Vernal to Taylor Draw Dam round trip | | | |
| (3 trucks/trip x 118 mi/truck x \$0.31/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$329 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 2 boats/day x 1 day/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$144 |
| Vernal to Rangely river bridge to pipeline round trip (2 day trips) | | | |
| (3 trucks/trip x 273 mi/truck x \$0.31/mi x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$1,523 |

| | | | | |
|--|---------|----|----------|------------|
| trips) | | | | |
| Boat gas (12 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 2 boats/day x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | | \$576 |
| Vernal to pipeline/Enron (Cowboy Canyon) round trip (3 trucks/trip x 161 mi/truck x \$0.31/mi x 3 trips) | | | | \$449 |
| Shuttle Drivers (3 trucks/trip x \$170/truck x 3 trips) | | | | \$1,530 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 day/trip x 3 trips) | | | | \$648 |
| Per diem (5 people/day x \$30/person x 3 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | | \$1,350 |
| Vernal to Enron to Green River confluence round trip (3 trucks/trip x 194 mi/truck x \$0.31/mi x 3 trips) | | | | \$541 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | | \$432 |
| Honda 9.9hp 4 stroke motor replacement (2016 only) | \$2,351 | 1 | | \$2,351 |
| Maintenance/replacement of rafting gear (oars, repair kit supplies, raft repairs/patching, motor maintenance), sampling nets, electrofishing gear (generator maintenance, electrode replacement), safety equipment (life jackets, control pedals/mats), camping equipment (based on average annual expenses from prior years). | | | | \$5,000 |
| | | | Subtotal | \$16,752 |
| Tasks 4-5 | | | | |
| Labor | | | | |
| GS-12 Supervisory Fish Biologist | \$55.14 | 40 | | \$2,205.60 |
| GS-9 Admin Assist. | \$39.19 | 80 | | \$3,135.20 |
| GS-7 Biologist | \$28.44 | 80 | | \$2,275.20 |
| | | | Subtotal | \$7,616 |
| | | | Total | \$61,022 |

2017

| Task Activity | | | |
|---|---------|---------------|----------------|
| Tasks 1-3 | | | |
| Labor | | Rate \$/hr | Total hours |
| GS-9 Biologist trip prep | \$35.36 | 96 | \$3,395 |
| 4 GS-5 Techs trip prep | \$25.70 | 144 | \$3,701 |
| Taylor Draw Dam to Rangely river bridge | | | |
| GS-9 Biologist | \$35.36 | 30 | \$1,061 |

| | | | |
|--|---------|-----|----------|
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$25.70 | 72 | \$1,850 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$38.55 | 18 | \$694 |
| Rangely river bridge to Pipeline | | | |
| GS-9 Biologist | \$35.36 | 60 | \$2,122 |
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$25.70 | 144 | \$3,701 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$38.55 | 36 | \$1,388 |
| Pipeline to Enron (Cowboy Canyon) | | | |
| GS-9 Biologist | \$35.36 | 90 | \$3,182 |
| 4 GS-5 Tech | \$25.70 | 288 | \$7,402 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$38.55 | 72 | \$2,776 |
| Enron to Green River confluence | | | |
| GS-9 Biologist | \$35.36 | 60 | \$2,122 |
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$25.70 | 144 | \$3,701 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$38.55 | 36 | \$1,388 |
| GS-08 maintenance and equipment repair | \$39.74 | 196 | \$7,789 |
| Subtotal | | | \$39,174 |

Travel, Per Diem, Equipment

| | | | |
|---|-------|---|---------|
| GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$320/mo | \$320 | 6 | \$1,920 |
| Vernal to Taylor Draw Dam round trip | | | |
| (3 trucks/trip x 118 mi/truck x \$0.32/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$340 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 2 boats/day x 1 day/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$144 |
| Vernal to Rangely river bridge to pipeline round trip (2 day trips) | | | |
| (3 trucks/trip x 273 mi/truck x \$0.32/mi x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$1,572 |
| Boat gas (12 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 2 boats/day x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$576 |
| Vernal to pipeline/Enron (Cowboy Canyon) round trip | | | |
| (3 trucks/trip x 161 mi/truck x \$0.32/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$464 |
| Shuttle Drivers (3 trucks/trip x \$173/truck x 3 trips) | | | \$1,557 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 day/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$648 |
| Per diem (5 people/day x \$30/person x 3 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$1,350 |
| Vernal to Enron to Green River confluence round trip | | | |
| (3 trucks/trip x 194 mi/truck x \$0.32/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$559 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$432 |
| Maintenance/replacement of rafting gear (oars, repair kit supplies, raft repairs/patching, motor maintenance), sampling nets, electrofishing gear | | | \$5,000 |

(generator maintenance, electrode replacement), safety equipment (life jackets, control pedals/mats), camping equipment (based on average annual expenses from prior years).

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------|----|------------|
| | Subtotal | | \$14,562 |
| Tasks 4-5 | | | |
| Labor | | | |
| GS-12 Supervisory Fish Biologist | \$56.25 | 40 | \$2,250.00 |
| GS-9 Admin Assist. | \$39.98 | 80 | \$3,198.40 |
| GS-9 Fisheries Biologist | \$35.36 | 80 | \$2,828.80 |
| | Subtotal | | \$8,277 |
| | Total | | \$62,013 |

2018

| Task Activity | | | |
|---|---------|-------|---------|
| Tasks 1-3 | | | |
| Labor | Rate | Total | |
| | \$/hr | hours | |
| GS-11 Biologist trip prep | \$42.93 | 96 | \$4,121 |
| 4 GS-5 Techs trip prep | \$26.21 | 144 | \$3,775 |
| Taylor Draw Dam to Rangely river bridge | | | |
| GS-11 Biologist | \$42.93 | 30 | \$1,288 |
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$26.21 | 72 | \$1,887 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$39.32 | 18 | \$708 |
| Rangely river bridge to Pipeline | | | |
| GS-11 Biologist | \$42.93 | 60 | \$2,576 |
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$26.21 | 144 | \$3,775 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$39.32 | 36 | \$1,416 |
| Pipeline to Enron (Cowboy Canyon) | | | |
| GS-11 Biologist | \$42.93 | 90 | \$3,864 |
| 4 GS-5 Tech | \$26.21 | 288 | \$7,550 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$39.32 | 72 | \$2,831 |
| Enron to Green River confluence | | | |
| GS-11 Biologist | \$42.93 | 60 | \$2,576 |
| 3 GS-5 Tech | \$26.21 | 144 | \$3,775 |
| GS-5 Tech OT | \$39.32 | 36 | \$1,416 |

| | | | |
|--|---------|-----|------------|
| GS-08 maintenance and equipment repair | \$40.53 | 196 | \$7,945 |
| Subtotal | | | \$41,605 |
| Travel, Per Diem, Equipment | | | |
| GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$325/mo | \$325 | 6 | \$1,950 |
| Vernal to Taylor Draw Dam round trip (3 trucks/trip x 118 mi/truck x \$0.33/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$350 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 2 boats/day x 1 day/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$144 |
| Vernal to Rangely river bridge to pipeline round trip (2 day trips) (3 trucks/trip x 273 mi/truck x \$0.33/mi x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$1,622 |
| Boat gas (12 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 2 boats/day x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$576 |
| Vernal to pipeline/Enron (Cowboy Canyon) round trip (3 trucks/trip x 161 mi/truck x \$0.33/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$478 |
| Shuttle Drivers (3 trucks/trip x \$176/truck x 3 trips) | | | \$1,584 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 day/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$648 |
| Per diem (5 people/day x \$30/person x 3 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$1,350 |
| Vernal to Enron to Green River confluence round trip (3 trucks/trip x 194 mi/truck x \$0.33/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$576 |
| Boat gas (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 2 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$432 |
| Maintenance/replacement of rafting gear (oars, repair kit supplies, raft repairs/patching, motor maintenance), sampling nets, electrofishing gear (generator maintenance, electrode replacement), safety equipment (life jackets, control pedals/mats), camping equipment (based on average annual expenses from prior years). | | | \$5,000 |
| Subtotal | | | \$14,710 |
| Tasks 4-5 | | | |
| Labor | | | |
| GS-12 Supervisory Fish Biologist | \$57.38 | 40 | \$2,295.20 |
| GS-9 Admin Assist. | \$40.78 | 80 | \$3,262.40 |
| GS-11 Biologist | \$42.93 | 80 | \$3,434.40 |
| Subtotal | | | \$8,922 |
| Total | | | \$65,307 |

2019-No field work- \$0

2020-No field work -\$0

Green River Budget-FWS Vernal-White River confluence to Tusher Diversion

2016

| Task Activity | | | |
|---|---------------|----------------|----------|
| Tasks 1-3 | | | |
| Labor | Rate \$/hr | Total hours | |
| GS-12 Biologist trip prep | \$55.14 | 30 | \$1,654 |
| 4 GS-5 Techs trip prep | \$24.96 | 120 | \$2,995 |
| White River confluence to Swaseys (21 days) | | | |
| GS-12 Biologist | \$55.14 | 210 | \$11,579 |
| 4 GS-05 Tech | \$24.96 | 840 | \$20,966 |
| GS-05 Tech OT | \$37.44 | 168 | \$6,290 |
| Swaseys to Tusher diversion (3 days) | | | |
| 2 GS-05 Tech | \$24.96 | 48 | \$1,198 |
| GS-05 Tech OT | \$37.44 | 24 | \$899 |
| Subtotal | | | \$45,582 |
| Travel, Per Diem, Equipment | | | |
| GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$313/mo | \$313 | 6 | \$1,878 |
| Vernal to Ouray to Swasey's round trip (3 trucks/trip x 406 mi/truck x \$0.31/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$1,133 |
| Shuttle Drivers Ouray to Swasey's round trip (3 trucks x \$185/truck x 3 trips) | | | \$1,665 |
| Boat gas Ouray to Swasey's (12 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 trips) | | | \$432 |
| Per diem Ouray to Swasey's (5 people/day x \$30/person x 7 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$3,150 |
| Boat gas Swaseys to Tusher Diversion (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 1 boat x 3 trips) | | | \$72 |
| GS-08 Maintenance work | \$38.72 | 196 | \$7,589 |
| Honda 9.9hp 4 stroke motor replacement (2016 only) | \$2,351 | 1 | \$2,351 |
| Maintenance/replacement of rafting gear (oars, repair kit supplies, raft repairs/patching, motor maintenance), sampling nets, electrofishing gear (generator maintenance, electrode replacement), safety equipment (life jackets, control pedals/mats), camping equipment (based on average | | | \$5,000 |

annual expenses from prior years).

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Subtotal | \$23,270 |
| Tasks 4-5 | |
| Labor | |
| GS-12 Supervisory Fish Biologist | \$55.14 80 \$4,411.20 |
| GS-9 Admin Assist. | \$39.19 80 \$3,135.20 |
| Subtotal | \$7,546 |
| FWS Project Total | \$76,398 |

2017

| Task Activity | Rate \$/hr | Total hours | |
|--|---------------|----------------|----------|
| Tasks 1-3 | | | |
| Labor | | | |
| GS-12 Biologist trip prep | \$56.25 | 30 | \$1,688 |
| 4 GS-5 Techs trip prep | \$25.70 | 120 | \$3,084 |
| White River confluence to Swaseys (21 days) | | | |
| GS-12 Biologist | \$56.25 | 210 | \$11,813 |
| 4 GS-05 Tech | \$25.70 | 840 | \$21,588 |
| GS-05 Tech OT | \$38.55 | 168 | \$6,476 |
| Swaseys to Tusher diversion (3 days) | | | |
| 2 GS-05 Tech | \$25.70 | 48 | \$1,234 |
| GS-05 Tech OT | \$38.55 | 24 | \$925 |
| Subtotal | | | \$46,807 |

Travel, Per Diem, Equipment

| | | | |
|--|-------|---|---------|
| GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$320/mo | \$320 | 6 | \$1,920 |
| Vernal to Ouray to Swasey's round trip (3 trucks/trip x 406 mi/truck x \$0.32/mi x 3 trips) | | | \$1,169 |
| Shuttle Drivers Ouray to Swasey's round trip (3 trucks x \$189/truck x 3 trips) | | | \$1,701 |
| Boat gas Ouray to Swasey's (12 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 3 boats/day x 3 trips) | | | \$432 |
| Per diem Ouray to Swasey's (5 people/day x \$30/person x 7 days/trip x 3 trips) | | | \$3,150 |

| | | | |
|--|---------|-----|------------|
| Boat gas Swaseys to Tusher Diversion (6 gal gas/boat x \$4.00/gal x 1 boat x 3 trips) | | | \$72 |
| GS-08 Maintenance work | \$39.74 | 196 | \$7,789 |
| Maintenance/replacement of rafting gear (oars, repair kit supplies, raft repairs/patching, motor maintenance), sampling nets, electrofishing gear (generator maintenance, electrode replacement), safety equipment (life jackets, control pedals/mats), camping equipment (based on average annual expenses from prior years). | | | \$5,000 |
| Subtotal | | | \$21,233 |
| Tasks 4-5 | | | |
| Labor | | | |
| GS-12 Supervisory Fish Biologist | \$56.25 | 80 | \$4,500.00 |
| GS-9 Admin Assist. | \$39.98 | 80 | \$3,198.40 |
| Subtotal | | | \$7,699 |
| FWS Project Total | | | \$75,739 |

2018

| Task Activity | | | |
|--|---------------|----------------|----------|
| Tasks 1-3 | | | |
| Labor | Rate \$/hr | Total hours | |
| GS-12 Biologist trip prep | \$57.38 | 30 | \$1,721 |
| 4 GS-5 Techs trip prep | \$26.48 | 120 | \$3,178 |
| White River confluence to Swaseys (21 days) | | | |
| GS-12 Biologist | \$57.38 | 210 | \$12,050 |
| 4 GS-05 Tech | \$26.48 | 840 | \$22,243 |
| GS-05 Tech OT | \$39.72 | 168 | \$6,673 |
| Swaseys to Tusher diversion (3 days) | | | |
| 2 GS-05 Tech | \$26.48 | 48 | \$1,271 |
| GS-05 Tech OT | \$39.72 | 24 | \$953 |
| Subtotal | | | \$48,089 |
| Travel, Per Diem, Equipment | | | |
| GSA trucks x 3 trucks x 2 months x \$325/mo | \$325 | 6 | \$1,950 |
| Vernal to Ouray to Swasey's round trip | | | \$1,206 |

| |
|-------------------------------------|
| FY 2016 Costs for UDWR- Moab |
|-------------------------------------|

Tasks 1-3. Trip preparation and field sampling

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

| | Hourly Cost | Hours | Cost |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Project Leader | \$33.71 | 200 | \$6,742 |
| Biologist | \$30.76 | 1400 | \$43,063 |
| Technician | \$16.77 | 2400 | \$40,248 |
| | | subtotal | \$90,053 |

Food and Transport (current expense)

| | Rate | Quantity | Cost |
|---|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Fleet Costs (5 trucks for 10% of total fleet costs) | \$40,800.00 | 0.100 | \$4,080 |
| Food (8 people, 10 days, 3 trips) | \$30.00 | 240 | \$7,200 |
| | | subtotal | \$11,280 |

Equipment (current expense)

| | Rate | Quantity | Cost |
|--|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Camping gear repair/replacement: | | | \$2,077 |
| Sampling gear repair/replacement: | | | \$3,402 |
| Boating gear repair/replacement: | | | \$5,600 |
| Fuel for motors (30 gallons/trip) | \$4.00 | 300 | \$1,200 |
| Yamaha 60 HP Outboard (2014 actual cost) | \$5,897.00 | 1 | \$5,897 |
| | | subtotal | \$18,176 |

Tasks 1-3 subtotal **\$119,509**

Tasks 4-5. Sampling team coordination, data entry and analysis, reporting

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

| | Hourly Cost | Hours | Cost |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Biologist | \$30.76 | 160 | \$4,921 |
| | | subtotal | \$4,921 |

Tasks 4-5 subtotal **\$4,921**

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Grand Total FY 2016 | \$124,430 |
|----------------------------|------------------|

FY2017: Annual Report by November 2017.

FY 2017 Costs for UDWR- Moab (with 2% increase from FY16 on all line items)

Task 1-3. Trip preparation and field sampling

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

| | Hourly Cost | Hours | Cost |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Project Leader | \$34.38 | 200 | \$6,877 |
| Biologist | \$31.37 | 1400 | \$43,924 |
| Technician | \$17.11 | 2400 | \$41,053 |
| | | subtotal | \$91,854 |

Food and Transport (current expense)

| | Rate | Quantity | Cost |
|---|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Fleet Costs (5 trucks for 10% of total fleet costs) | \$41,616.00 | 0.1 | \$4,162 |
| Food (8 people, 9 days, 3 trips) | \$30.60 | 240 | \$7,344 |
| | | subtotal | \$11,506 |

Equipment (current expense)

| | Rate | Quantity | Cost |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Camping gear repair/replacement: | | | \$2,161 |
| Sampling gear repair/replacement: | | | \$3,539 |
| Boating gear repair/replacement: | | | \$5,826 |
| Fuel for motors (30 gallons/trip) | \$4.08 | 300 | \$1,224 |
| | | subtotal | \$12,751 |

Task 1-3 subtotal **\$116,110**

Tasks 4-5 . Sampling team coordination, data entry and analysis, reporting

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

| | Hourly Cost | Hours | Cost |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Biologist | \$31.37 | 160 | \$5,020 |
| | | subtotal | \$5,020 |

Tasks 4-5 subtotal **\$5,020**

Grand Total FY 2017 **\$121,130**

FY2018: Annual Report by November 2018.

FY 2018 Costs for UDWR- Moab (with 2% increase from FY17 on all line items)

Task 1-3. Trip preparation and field sampling

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

| | Hourly Cost | Hours | Cost |
|----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Project Leader | \$ 35.07 | 200 | \$7,014 |
| Biologist | \$ 32.00 | 1400 | \$44,803 |
| Technician | \$ 17.45 | 2400 | \$41,874 |
| | | subtotal | \$93,691 |

Food and Transport (current expense)

| | Rate | Quantity | Cost |
|---|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Fleet Costs (5 trucks for 10% of total fleet costs) | \$42,448.32 | 0.1 | \$4,245 |
| Food (8 people, 9 days, 3 trips) | \$31.21 | 240 | \$7,491 |
| | | subtotal | \$11,736 |

Equipment (current expense)

| | Rate | Quantity | Cost |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Camping gear repair/replacement: | | | \$2,204 |
| Sampling gear repair/replacement: | | | \$2,812 |
| Boating gear repair/replacement: | | | \$4,775 |
| Fuel for motors (30 gallons/trip) | \$4.24 | 300 | \$1,273 |
| | | subtotal | \$11,065 |

Task 1-3 subtotal **\$116,492**

Task 4. Sampling team coordination, data entry and analysis

Labor: salary + benefits + applicable overtime (personnel services)

| | Hourly Cost | Hours | Cost |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Biologist | \$32.00 | 160 | \$5,120 |
| | | subtotal | \$5,120 |

Task 4 subtotal **\$5,120**

| | |
|----------------------------|------------------|
| Grand Total FY 2018 | \$121,612 |
|----------------------------|------------------|

IX. Budget Summary

Excludes razorback sucker abundance estimation

| Year | LFL | UDWR, Vernal | FWS, White | FWS, Green | UDWR, Moab | Total |
|------|----------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| 2016 | \$87,771 | \$71,410 | \$61,022 | \$76,398 | \$124,430 | \$421,031 |
| 2017 | \$89,355 | \$72,838 | \$62,013 | \$75,739 | \$121,130 | \$421,075 |
| 2018 | \$90,971 | \$74,295 | \$65,307 | \$77,460 | \$121,612 | \$429,645 |
| 2019 | \$58,767 | | | | | \$58,767 |
| 2020 | no field work or reporting | | | | | |

Includes razorback sucker abundance estimation, task 6, 2016

| Year | LFL | UDWR, Vernal | FWS, White | FWS, Green | UDWR, Moab | Total |
|------|----------------------------|--------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|
| 2016 | \$185,776 | \$71,410 | \$61,022 | \$76,398 | \$124,430 | \$519,036 |
| 2017 | \$89,355 | \$72,838 | \$62,013 | \$75,739 | \$121,130 | \$421,075 |
| 2018 | \$90,971 | \$74,295 | \$65,307 | \$77,460 | \$121,612 | \$429,645 |
| 2019 | \$58,767 | | | | | \$58,767 |
| 2020 | no field work or reporting | | | | | |

X. Reviewers: Dr. Richard Valdez, Dr. Paul Holden, Doug Osmundson

XI. References

- Bestgen, K. R., J. A. Hawkins, G. C. White, K. Chrisopherson, M. Hudson, M. Fuller, D. C. Kitcheyan, R. Brunson, P. Badame, G. B. Haines, J. Jackson, C. D. Walford, T. A. Sorensen, and T. B. Williams. 2005. Population status of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin, Utah and Colorado. Larval Fish Laboratory Contribution 140. 112 pp.
- Bestgen, K. R., J. A. Hawkins, G. C. White, K. Chrisopherson, M. Hudson, M. Fuller, D. C. Kitcheyan, R. Brunson, P. Badame, G. B. Haines, J. Jackson, C. D. Walford, and T. A. Sorensen. 2007. Population status of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin, Utah and Colorado. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 136:1356-1380.
- Bestgen, K. R., J. A. Hawkins, G. C. White, C. D. Walford, P. Badame, and L. Monroe. 2010. Population status of Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River Basin, Utah and Colorado,

- 2006-2008. Final report to the Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fishes in the Upper Colorado River Basin. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, CO. Larval Fish Laboratory Contribution 161.
- Bestgen, K. R., K. A. Zelasko, and G. C. White. 2012. Monitoring reproduction, recruitment, and population status of razorback suckers in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Final Report to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, CO. Larval Fish Laboratory Contribution 170.
- Crowl, T. A. and N. W. Bouwes. 1998. A population model for four endangered Colorado River fishes. Draft Final Report. January 9, 1998. Ecology Center, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Utah State University, Logan.
- Jolly, G. M. 1965. Explicit estimates from mark-recapture data with both death and immigration-stochastic model. *Biometrika* 52:225-247.
- Lebreton, J. D., K. P. Burnham, J. Clobert, and D. R. Anderson. 1992. Modeling survival and testing biological hypotheses using marked animals: a unified approach with case studies. *Ecological Monographs* 62 (1):67-118.
- Osmundson, D. B. and K. Burnham. 1996. Status and trends of the Colorado squawfish in the Upper Colorado River. Final Draft report. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Grand Junction.
- Osmundson, D. B. and K. Burnham. 1998. Status and trends of the endangered Colorado squawfish in the Upper Colorado River. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 127:957-970.
- Pollock, K. H. 1982. A capture-recapture design robust to unequal probability of capture. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 46:757-760.
- Pollock, K. H., J. D. Nichols, C. Brownie, and J. E. Hines. 1990. Statistical inference for capture-recapture experiments. *Wildlife Monographs* 107:1-97. The Wildlife Society.
- Seber, G.A. F. 1965. A note on the multiple-recapture census. *Biometrika* 52:249-259.
- Tyus, H. M., and C. A. Karp. 1989. Habitat use and streamflow needs of rare and endangered fishes, Yampa River, Colorado. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological report 89(14). Washington, D.C.
- White, G. C., D. A. Anderson, K. P. Burnham, and D. L. Otis. 1982. Capture-recapture and removal methods for sampling closed populations. Los Alamos National Laboratory, LA-8787-NERP, Los Alamos, New Mexico.
- Zelasko, K. A., K. R. Bestgen, and G. C. White. 2011. Survival rate estimation of hatchery-reared razorback suckers *Xyrauchen texanus* stocked in the Upper Colorado River Basin, Utah and Colorado, 2004–2007. Final report to the Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fishes in the Upper Colorado River Basin. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, CO. Larval Fish Laboratory Contribution 162.