

Biology Committee Meeting
April 7-8, 2005
Grand Junction, Colorado

Biology Committee: Tom Chart, Tom Nesler, Tom Pitts, John Hawkins, Melissa Trammell, Kevin Gelwicks, Kevin Christopherson (Thursday only), and Dave Speas. Bill Davis participated via phone for portions of the meeting.

Other participants: Chris Keleher, Dave Irving, Pat Nelson, Trina Hedrick, Bob Muth, George Smith, Tom Czaplá, Rich Valdez, Rick Anderson, Tom Iseman, Chuck McAda, Melynda Roberts, Richard Beeman, and Angela Kantola. Amy Cutler participated via phone for agenda item #4

Assignments are indicated by ">" and at the end of the document.

1. Review Feb 10-11 meeting summary - The summary was revised to note that it was later agreed that catfish >10" from Yampa Canyon on the last day of sampling will be translocated to Rio Blanco Reservoir. >Angela Kantola will post the final summary to the listserver (*done*). The Committee reviewed assignments from that meeting. The Program Director's office still needs to respond to Tim Modde's stocking questions and also provide a draft report on how well we're complying with the genetics management plan. The States still need to check into the status of law enforcement activity to decrease angling mortality. Dave Speas still needs to compile questions folks would like to ask about O&M on various Grand Valley capital projects in preparation for a tour of those capital projects the next time the Committee meets in Grand Junction. Tom Nesler still needs to work with Kevin Bestgen to review the pikeminnow data and propose a density over the 74-mile reach. Tom also will work with Sherm Hebein to propose a specific smallmouth bass criteria (different than relative abundance).
2. Review report status spreadsheet - The Committee reviewed the revised list. >Kevin Christopherson will check on the status of the Price River report and post that information to the listserver. >Tom Pitts will check with the River District on the status of the Miller-Musseeter report. Trina Hedrick distributed corrected copies of the Trammell et. al nonnative cyprinid report. Tom Nesler distributed corrected covers and title pages for the Yampa pike exclusion report. >Angela Kantola will post a revised reports status list to the listserver.
3. Report review/acceptance: Investigation of nonnative fish escapement from Elkhead Reservoir, Project No. 118, Miller, Rees, and Ptacek - Tom Nesler said he would like to add "captured infrequently in slackwater habitats in the Yampa River downstream from Elkhead Reservoir" to the second part of the last sentence in the first paragraph of the executive summary (and will provide citations in the text). The recommendations in the report should be bulleted. Tom Nesler noted that we need to clarify that live fish were marked and returned to the reservoir near the boat ramp (page 5). Under the discussion section on page 16, clarify the source of the Elkhead Reservoir relative abundance data (Table 7). Kevin Christopherson noted that the fact that some of bluegill and crappie have become established in the middle Green River in Utah could be included as a

justification for screening. Kevin also suggested referencing Martinez' internal report that once Elkhead is enlarged, it may be better suited to management as a coldwater fishery (possible recommendation). Finally, Kevin suggested explaining why larval fish/eggs weren't considered (because it's not practical to screen them). Tom Pitts cautioned against getting too far beyond the scope of this report. Tom added that the screening recommendations (which don't follow from the report data, as several Committee members pointed out) came from the Biology Committee, not from this study, and that should be noted. Tom Nesler agreed clarify the recommendations that came from the Biology Committee rather than out of the report. Melissa suggested a caveat in the conclusions that outlet works was only operating at 5 cfs, not the full potential release. Dave Speas suggested deleting "quality" from "quality sportfishery potential" in the introduction. Angela Kantola said Gary Burton submitted a comment that it seems an obvious conclusion from the data presented that no nonnative sportfish should be stocked into Elkhead at any size less than the 10" criteria used for smallmouth bass taken from the river. Gary was unsure if this is current policy or just when escapement is documented, but it seems a reasonable management tool to prevent escapement of small fish during (and after?) construction. Tom Nesler noted that this is no longer a logical conclusion with his proposed addition regarding bluegill and crappie escapement. Tom added that bluegill and crappie >10" are basically trophy-size, so not stocking those species <10" would basically eliminate all stocking of these fishes in Elkhead. This would remove a forage fish management tool when we know that these two species don't seem to have any biological impact once they reach the Yampa River. (*Note: At the July 12, 2005, meeting, several Committee members suggested that, in fact, the impact of centrarchids in the Yampa River is unknown.*) Tom Nesler said this should be addressed in the Elkhead management plan, however (because it appears these two species leave the reservoir fairly quickly, they may not be significantly contributing to a forage base for smallmouth bass in the reservoir). Comments have already been submitted on that management plan, >Tom Nesler will have CDOW present the revised management plan to the Biology Committee. Tom said he believes he can make the recommended changes to the report without difficulty, so >he will make the changes (and discuss them with Bill Miller), then post the revised report to the Committee with changed areas highlighted, and give the Committee 2 weeks to approve the changes.

4. Report review/acceptance: Gunnison River/Aspinall Unit Temperature Study – Phase II, Project No. 107, Boyer and Cutler - Angela Kantola said Gary Burton provided the following comments: "The comments we (Dave Tomasko, ANL) provided to the authors were not completely satisfied by the responses provided. Attached are some of those comments restated for clarity. Please have the authors reconsider their responses in light of these. The primary concerns are: a) the lack of a sensitivity study to help define the uncertainty associated with the relative effect of changes in the input parameters; b) using reservoir temperatures to represent tributary inflow temperatures has the tendency to bias the results high; and c) using a yearly average error has a tendency to mask the degree of error associated with the critical period of May through October. I would not feel comfortable approving this report without these concerns being addressed." Amy said she would be willing to look at those comments and try to address them (although they've done all they can with the data collected). She suggested that Gary and Dave review her responses to the comments, however, because she believes she addressed the

comments fairly thoroughly. Tom Pitts suggested that it may be appropriate to address these concerns as uncertainties. Tom Nesler suggested that Amy first needs to review Gary's concerns and determine if they go beyond the limits of the data or if they arise from how the data were handled. Bill Davis asked how warm water can be delivered to a reservoir and expected to reach outlets 50-60' below the surface. Amy said that a small reservoir such as Blue Mesa would have ~20' buffer for a TCD. Bill Davis said he would review this again in the report. George Smith said he spoke with the anonymous reviewer who provided the bulk of the comments and that reviewer was satisfied with the responses and recommended that the Committee approve the report. Bill asked how the introduced warm water could possibly warm the water enough at the outlets from the thermally-stratified Morrow Point and Crystal reservoirs? Amy said Blue Mesa releases cold water that is received by the downstream reservoirs, that water is released fairly quickly with no time to warm. Warmer water released from Blue Mesa would carry downstream to Morrow Point because the introduced warmer water lowers the depth of the thermocline. Amy added that Blue Mesa is 8 times larger than Morrow Point and 37 times larger than Crystal reservoir. Bill remained unconvinced. Amy said that there is stratification in Morrow and Crystal, but with the TCD, the depth and temperatures of the stratification would change. Bill agreed to review these sections to see if the data convince him of this. Tom Pitts clarified that approving this report (once everyone's concerns are addressed) and a decision that a TCD on Blue Mesa is needed for recovery would be two very separate decisions. Tom asked about the estimate of error on the model outputs and Amy said the overall model error is <1 degree for the reservoir and <1 degree for the river. Tom said he has a hard time believing that the model is that good. Amy said they've based the model on 5,524 data points. Kevin Christopherson asked if the overall temperature of Blue Mesa would change and Amy said it does (but the change is not retained from year to year). >Amy will work with Bill Davis, Gary Burton, and Dave Tomasko (correspondence should be copied to the Biology Committee) to resolve their concerns by the end of April. Assuming those concerns are resolved, the report will come back to the Committee for approval via the listserver. The Committee will need to look specifically at the conclusions and recommendations (Tom Pitts noted that the report does not recommend a TCD, just reports the results of the model). After the report is finalized, the Biology Committee can discuss whether they want to make a recommendation regarding a TCD. Amy added: 1) that the Gunnison is very different from Glen Canyon; and 2) that the report does not state that a TCD at Crystal or Morrow Point would not work, but they wouldn't make as much of a difference as a TCD at Blue Mesa (obviously, TCD's at all 3 would further increase temperature).

5. CWCB request for Program adoption of 2-D modeling to determine instream flow recommendations - Tom Nesler said Rick responded to Tom Pitts' and the Program Director's office comments. Although Rick didn't respond individually to other comments, he thinks most of those were addressed in his responses to Pitts and Muth. Rick distributed a summary of the methodology, which is basically a GIS process. Rick clarified that in adapting this methodology to endangered fish, biological data do not have to be biomass data and hydraulic data do not have to be mean depth and velocity, rather the variables can be whatever is most appropriate for the species and life stage under consideration. Rick also noted he used the methodology for base flows, not for peak or flushing flows. Tom Nesler said CWCB believes this methodology would be a

good tool to provide the kind of data Colorado would need in order to legally protect base flows. Tom Pitts asked if CWCB is implying that they wouldn't file for legal protection of peak flows. John Hawkins noted that Nesler's memo says: "The Colorado Water Conservation Board was favorably impressed with this approach and asked both the UCRIP and SJRIP to consider this information and report back to the Board on the appropriateness of adopting this methodology as *the standard* for determining the instream flow needs of Colorado River endangered fish" (emphasis added). George Smith said the Service can't support adopting this methodology as *the standard*, rather they believe we need to use best data available at the time flow recommendations are made. George also said the Service also would like to see all the other reviewer comments addressed (noting that it's difficult to continue to ask people to provide reviews otherwise). Tom Pitts said we're being asked to adopt a methodology for endangered fish, yet Rick acknowledges he didn't use the methodology for endangered fish. Our methodologies for different river reaches are all different (e.g., Flaming Gorge, 15-Mile Reach, etc.), probably for good reason. Tom said he wouldn't endorse any one methodology to apply across the board. The intent of this report was to develop flow recommendations for native fish, not to develop a methodology for developing flow recommendations for endangered fish. Dave Speas asked if there's a lower limit on the size of the stream for this methodology and Rick said no. Dave also said that if the method would have to be adapted for endangered fish and there's discretion in how the curves are interpreted, it would seem the idea of a "standard" methodology is already compromised. Rick and Tom Nesler suggested it might be appropriate just to support an approach of using GIS or 2-D modeling and connecting it to a biological metric. Melissa asked whether CWCB would consider filing on existing flow recommendations if the Committee did not endorse this methodology. Melissa emphasized some of the comments she submitted that she'd like to see addressed. With regard to a standard methodology, Melissa suggested that criteria to select the curve also would need to be standardized. Tom Chart asked how Rick would apply the methodology to more rare animals that may be more diverse in their habitat use. Tom also asked how the importance of spring flows could be linked to this methodology. Pat Nelson noted that fish may be forced into marginal habitats due to the fish community in the main channel. Kevin Christopherson noted that although a number have criticisms have been raised, the alternative methods aren't perfect either. Kevin said he wouldn't support the method exclusively, but that he does believe it's a valid approach. Kevin Gelwicks agreed, adding that this approach alone may not work with endangered fish, so we need to remain open to other methodologies. John Hawkins agreed this 2-D modeling is scientifically valid and practical for what it was used for, but noted that it still carries the problems of PHABSIM (not accounting for other ecological processes, for example). Tom Pitts noted that tasks to evaluate flow recommendations are included in the RIPRAP, and we're in the adaptive management phase, but we're not currently asking the Board to legally protect flows. Tom Pitts said he thinks it would be a mistake for the Committee to take any action on this report. The Committee agreed. Melissa added that we do have some tributaries where we don't have flow recommendations where we could consider using this methodology. >Rick will still respond to the individual comments that addressed the methodology.

6. Update on potential new techniques for smallmouth bass and other non-native fish

control - Pat Nelson said that Pat Martinez won't be able to provide a report until December; but both he and Martinez are reviewing smallmouth bass literature (most of which is aimed at improving abundance) to glean clues for possible actions to reduce smallmouth bass. They're also looking at requirements at different life stages, etc. The spawning window appears fairly narrow and there may be opportunity to address that with flows. Pat said he's also looking at how to improve capture efficiency for all life stages of nonnative fishes, especially smallmouth bass. Bill asked where we would have the annual presentation of the latest methods and Tom Nesler said at the nonnative fish workshop. Bill emphasized our need to find more cost-effective methods to control nonnative fish, thus we need to get a process in place to review information and develop those techniques (Bill thinks we should add this to the RIPRAP and request a scope of work). Pat Nelson will continue to collect information about possible new techniques. John Hawkins emphasized the need not only to assess the tools we're using, but also our approaches (e.g., controlling fish at their source). Tom Nesler noted that we also need to look for methods to control species like carp, red shiner, etc., that we haven't yet determined how to control. For now, we will build this into the nonnative fish workshop, then we'll see where we need to go from there. John Hawkins suggested formally asking the nonnative fish researchers to identify the techniques that worked best.

7. Policy of retagging (PIT) every endangered fish captured with new technology-based tags - Kevin Christopherson said his crews are finding that the new readers read the old tags 95% of the time, thus he proposes just scanning with the new reader, if no signal received or it seems weak, scan with the old reader (and if a tag is picked up, tag it with a new tag). For population estimates, it may be appropriate to retag all the fish, however. The Committee agreed to this policy. Dave Speas noted that the cable length on the reader can affect tag readability. We also need to make sure the new tags will last as long as the old tags.
8. Middle Green River razorback sucker 2004 capture summary - Kevin Christopherson distributed a summary prepared by Ron Brunson for discussion at a future meeting. Kevin noted that the majority of the razorback sucker captured last year had been in the river two years or less, also, they are still finding the floodplain fish in a much higher ratio and for longer periods of time (see Table 2 of the handout).
9. Review/comment on "Research Framework for the Upper Colorado River Basin" (sent to BC on 4/1/05) - Bob Muth said he'd like the Committee to discuss the conceptual idea of this framework, and if they approve that, then he will get it developed into a formal scope of work for review. Tom Iseman said this idea was spurred by the apparent decline in pikeminnow and humpback chub (what's causing the decline, what are the management actions we need to take to reverse, are we on right track to recovery and how do we know, etc.?). Rich Valdez reviewed the objectives of this work. Tom Nesler expressed concern that the first objective could become overly burdensome (especially with regard to trying to agree on all the uncertainties). Melissa said she shares those concerns and asked what the model will tell us that we don't already have in the RIPRAP. Bob Muth said it may just boil down to a "repackaging" of what we're doing to show how all our recovery actions relate (e.g., it is probably not clear to someone looking at the RIPRAP that our selective passage facilities at Redlands and Grand Valley are also nonnative fish

control devices). Others agreed to the concept of “re-packaging” or cross-referencing and getting these ideas captured in a way that’s more easily grasped. Bob Muth said he thinks objectives #1 and #4 could be combined. Bob added that it might be appropriate to take the first step (develop the conceptual models and see how our recovery actions fit into those), then see where we want to go from there. Tom Pitts questioned our ability to link correlations between specific actions and responses in a multivariate environment. (Rich agreed we are not likely to be able to evaluate the actions independently.) Tom said he’d like to try to do objectives 1-4 for one species first. Rich suggested another approach would be to develop a conceptual model for all 4 species, then try to understand the correlates, then proceed with one species. Kevin Christopherson agreed that we have most of this information and it may well be useful to repackage it to better communicate what we’re doing, but we need to be careful to identify the audience and target it appropriately (Management and Biology committees). Bob Muth said objectives #1 & #4 apply to all 4 species, we probably only have enough data on pikeminnow for objectives #2 & #3. Tom Pitts agreed with the environmental groups’ comments that we need to clearly state the hypotheses behind the general Program activities and specific projects (Melissa added the San Juan Program did this recently and found it very helpful.) Melissa suggested deleting “appropriate and prudent” from objective #4 (the audit itself is a tool for determining if the management actions are effective). Tom Nesler said he agrees that objectives #1, 2, and 4 should be completed first, then determine how we want to move forward with the quantitative analyses in objective #3. The Committee agreed to the concept; >Bob Muth will get a detailed scope of work developed by April 21.

10. Committee review of FY 04 final annual reports - The Committee discussed the annual report process. Kevin Christopherson noted that requiring the reports by November before researchers can incorporate data, then requiring the researchers to revise the reports and add the data doubles the work for the researchers. Committee members said they do think it’s worthwhile to review specific reports (specifically those topics the Committee is not already spending time discussing). Kevin Gelwicks said it would be helpful to identify reports for which final completion reports won’t be submitted, and we probably want to pay more attention to those. Tom Czaplá said that annual reports have evolved from mostly a financial accounting to more of a reports on what data were collected (especially for population estimate reports and nonnative fish management reports), and agreed it is difficult for researchers to provide that level of data in November. Melissa noted that many of the annual reports summarize data from the previous year. Tom Nesler suggested that it would be best for Committee members to flag the 2005 reports they want to discuss in advance of the meeting to discuss them. Tom Chart said in reviewing the habitat restoration reports, he noted that GVIC improvements were made and it was reported as fully operational, yet we still had to salvage fish from the canal. Pat Nelson said it turns out that GVIC is not as “fully operational” as reported, and there are plans for the GVIC operators to tour the Redlands and Grand Valley Project screens to see if any of the improvements implemented in these new screens could be applied at GVIC to help it operate more smoothly.
11. Elkhead escapement issues and screen failure contingency strategy - Pat Nelson noted that access to the site first must be arranged with Ray Tenney. Also, the contractor will

call the PD's office immediately if anything goes wrong at the screen. Need to clarify that the focused sampling mentioned in items #3 and #5 are the 10 miles downstream from Elkhead Creek. Also, with regard to #5a, the River District won't provide an additional electrofishing crew. John Hawkins will release translocated smallmouth bass at the upper inlet release site (which won't require permission for access). >Tom Nesler will make corrections and distribute the final strategy. John Hawkins noted that if the screen did fail and we had to implement this strategy, we will need to do a news release to let the public know about the change. Pat said that if folks want to visit the site, flows in Elkhead Creek are expected to peak ~May 1, and Ray Tenney says the best time to visit would be on a Wednesday afternoon after lunch.

Friday, April 8

12. Review of Program propagation efforts better communication and analysis of the stocking program - Tom Czapla provided an updated draft summary table of fish stocked from 1995-2004 and described how he and Chuck McAda have been working up the data. Tom noted that until ~ the mid-1990's our stocking program was mostly a broodstock or refugia program, and now it has evolved into a full stocking effort. Over the course of our stocking efforts, the Program has stocked more than 89,000 razorback sucker, 44,000 bonytail, and 4,700 Colorado pikeminnow (not including fish stocked in floodplains). Chuck said he thinks there may be some missing and erroneous stocking data that can't be resolved. When the tables are completed, data that are missing will be appropriately indicated. Tom Nesler suggested that the tables don't need to be separated by stocking plan, that can be footnoted by year (break out the tables by species, years, and river reaches). Angela suggested the tables need explanatory footnotes. The Committee agreed it's worthwhile to compare numbers of fish stocked with numbers of fish we had intended to stock. Chuck said he needs to make the data submission requirements more restrictive. We need to make sure all of the required information (e.g., PIT-tag numbers, dates of stocking, location, etc.) is included in the hatcheries' annual reports. Tom Nesler suggested that hatcheries should be compiling monthly fish inventories and Czapla should be compiling those into annual propagation tables. Tom Czapla has asked hatchery managers to report details of upcoming stocking efforts so he can post that information to Program participants. >Tom Czapla will work with Tom Nesler and Chuck McAda to draft written procedures for who reports what stocking data to whom and when. Bob Muth recommended then getting the hatchery managers together to discuss the draft. Chuck pointed out that we also need to decide what data should be included in his master database. Table 2 presents a summary of razorback recaptures in the Colorado and Gunnison rivers. Chuck noted that this table is somewhat confusing. Chuck said that like Ron Brunson has found in the Green River, most razorback recaptures in the Colorado and Gunnison have been fish stocked in the last few years. Tom Czapla said this is what might be expected, as we only recently began stocking larger fish. Rich Valdez suggested comparing the stocked fish recapture rates with recapture rate for wild fish (not from multiple-pass population estimates), perhaps with wild Colorado pikeminnow recapture rates. Bill Davis commented that we don't have enough fish in the system to adequately evaluate the success of stocking or our other recovery actions. Bill suggested that we need an order of magnitude more fish in the system in order to evaluate their response to our management actions. Tom Czapla

noted that stocked razorback are producing larvae in the Gunnison and Green rivers and we need to give this natural recruitment a few more years. Bill suggested that if we were to change course and significantly increase stocking, we would need to do that now, as we're running out of time and money. The Committee reviewed Melissa's suggestions for stocking data to be reported. Tom Nesler suggested items b) iv, v, and vii listed under "coordinator" are more items for Biology Committee discussion than a coordinator report. Melissa pointed out that items b) ii and iii might only need to be addressed once. The Committee agreed the coordinator should prepare the information and present it for annual Biology Committee review.

13. Colorado pikeminnow stocking in 2005 (should fish be stocked above unscreened diversions) - Tom Nesler asked where these fish would be stocked if not above the diversions this year. Tom Pitts said it seems that if some fish survive, that's better than not putting any fish in those reaches at all. Bob Muth said the screens hopefully will be in place by July (although they still will have to be tested). Tom Chart said in light of the cost of raising these fish, he recommended stocking the fish below unscreened diversions in the San Juan River rather than above unscreened diversions in the Gunnison and Colorado rivers. Bob recommended an alternative: waiting to stock the fish into the Colorado and Gunnison until a month or so after the canals are screened (August or September). The Committee agreed. >Tom Czaplak will ask the Mumma hatchery if they can hold the fish until that time. If the screens aren't going to be operable by August or September, then we'll consider other options.
14. Review and approval of "Summary of nonnative fish management outreach efforts, 2004" - Pat Nelson said this was distributed in draft for review. Tom Nesler suggested the report is too detailed for broad, external distribution. Tom Pitts recommended editing it down and providing it to the researchers, etc. Pat Nelson noted we also need to provide the nonnative fish management policy to researchers each year. >Committee members will provide comments on the outreach summary to Debbie by April 15 and >Debbie will produce a summary document with the addition of notes regarding how the suggestions are being addressed (e.g., "being implemented," etc.) and send it back to the Management, Biology, and Information and Education committees and the researchers. John Hawkins recommended that in the future, we should let the interviewees know how the gathered information will be used. Pat said he'd also like to gather specific information from PI's in the field, DWM's, AWM's, etc. regarding what they're hearing from the public (number of contacts indicating opposition, etc.).
15. Requirements for Scope of Work budgets in 2005-2006 and the future - Dave Speas introduced Melynda Roberts and Dick Beeman of Reclamation's Acquisitions staff. Dick reviews each scope of work that Reclamation funds. Melynda prepares the paperwork and issues funding agreements. Dick discussed the regulations that outline allowable costs. Including more detailed information (see handouts that Dick provided and which were e-mailed by Dave Speas in advance of the meeting) in the scope of work to begin with reduces the likelihood that Reclamation will have to ask for more information later (which delays funding approvals). John Hawkins asked about unplanned expenses (e.g., boat motor breakdown, etc.) and Dick said repairs and maintenance are valid costs to include in scopes of work. Dick said that if overhead of

any kind (e.g. fringe benefits) is included in labor rates, that needs to be noted. Although the sample proposal Dick provided contains a line item for contingency, contingencies are not likely to be allowed (by Program committees or by Reclamation) unless they are fully explained and justified. >Angela Kantola will work with Dick to revise the sample budget in the FY 06-07 Program Guidance to meet Reclamation's requirements and try to get that sent out to everyone by April 15. Tom Pitts asked about competitive bidding. Melynda said there will be some competitive bidding for 2006 projects, but it hasn't yet been decided on which projects. The competitive bids have to be advertised on Grants.gov for 60 days. Dave said the RFP will draw heavily on Program Guidance. It is still unclear what projects will be competed. Existing cooperative agreements won't be competed; Dave is going to determine the agreement expiration dates (most are September 2006; Colorado goes to 2008). Melynda said the review of what needs to be competed will be raised to the Regional Director level (in light of the potential conflicts between Reclamation's legal mandates, States' and Service legal mandates, etc.).

16. Schedule next meeting - July 12-13 in Grand Junction, starting at 8:00 a.m. on the 12th, through 4 p.m. on the 13th. >The Program Director's office will try to get the La Sal room at the Holiday Inn for the meeting. Agenda items will include: review of draft FY 06-07 work plan; Middle Green River razorback sucker 2004 capture summary;

Adjourn: 11:20 a.m.

Assignments

1. Angela Kantola will post the final February 10-11 summary to the listserver (*done*).
2. Kevin Christopherson will check on the status of the Price River report and post that information to the listserver.
3. Tom Pitts will check with the River District on the status of the Miller-Musser report.
4. Angela Kantola will post a revised reports status list to the listserver.
5. Tom Nesler will have CDOW present the revised Elkhead management plan to the Biology Committee.
6. Tom Nesler will make the changes to the Elkhead escapement report (and discuss them with Bill Miller), then post the revised report to the Committee with changed areas highlighted, and give the Committee 2 weeks to approve the changes.
7. Amy Cutler will work with Bill Davis, Gary Burton, and Dave Tomasko (correspondence should be copied to the Biology Committee) to resolve their concerns by the end of April. Assuming those concerns are resolved, the report will come back to the Committee for approval via the listserver.
8. Rick Anderson will still respond to the individual comments that addressed the methodology in his 2-D modeling approach.
9. Bob Muth will get a detailed scope of work developed for the research framework by April 21.
10. Tom Nesler will make corrections and distribute the final Elkhead screen failure contingency strategy.
11. Tom Czapla will work with Tom Nesler and Chuck McAda and draft written procedures for who reports what stocking data to whom and when.
12. Committee members will provide comments on the nonnative fish management outreach summary to Debbie Felker by April 15.
13. Debbie Felker will produce a summary nonnative fish management outreach document with the addition of notes regarding how the suggestions are being addressed (e.g., "being implemented," etc.) and send it back to the Management, Biology, and Information and Education committees and the researchers.
14. Angela Kantola will work with Dick Beeman to revise the sample budget in the FY 06-07 Program Guidance to meet Reclamation's requirements and try to get that sent out to everyone by April 15.

15. The Program Director's office will try to get the La Sal meeting room at the Holiday Inn for the July 12-13 meeting in Grand Junction.