

April 25, 2007

Biology Committee Meeting Draft Summary
April 23-24, 2007
Western Area Power Administration, Lakewood, Colorado

Biology Committee: Tom Chart, Tom Pitts, Misti Schriener (WAPA), Melissa Trammell, Kevin Gelwicks, Krissy Wilson, Bill Davis, Dave Speas, and Tom Nesler. The environmental groups were not represented.

Other participants: Dave Irving, Shane Capron (WAPA), Brian Beckley and Audrey Hopkins (Biomark), Bobby Compton (University of Wyoming), Pat Nelson, Chuck McAda, Angela Kantola, George Smith, Bob Muth, John Hawkins, Craig Walker, Tim Modde, Dan Alonso, Jana Mohrman, and Tom Blickensderfer.

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

Monday, April 23

1. Review/modify agenda – The agenda was modified as it appears below.
2. Tagging technology – Dave Speas introduced Brian Beckley from Biomark and Bobby Compton from the University of Wyoming. Dave reviewed possible applications of RFID fish monitoring in the Recovery Program, as discussed in the background material he e-mailed to the Committee on April 20. Brian Beckley gave a presentation on BioMark’s full-duplex in-river PIT-tag monitoring systems that read the 12mm SST PIT tags we’re currently using (but not our old 400Khz tags). The components of these systems are the transceiver/reader, antenna, enclosure, and power supply. The multi-plex transceiver has the advantage of auto-tuning. BioMark has 4 types of antennas: 1) rectangular or square pass-through antennas (up to 25’ x 4’) made out of fiberglass or poly; 2) flat plate antennas embedded in the substrate, 2.5 to 20 feet long with 12”-15” of vertical read range (can read through sediment, but are less efficient than pass-through antennas); 3) crump weir antennas, 6’ x 6’ with a 1’ crest (attached to the underside of the outlet slope, but cannot be installed on a metal structure); and 4) circular culvert antennas 4-5’ in diameter, attached to the end of or slid over existing pipe. Power supply options are thermoelectric generator, solar power systems, or batteries. Biomark also makes fish bypass or ladder antennas. Brian said a pass-through antenna should work at the Stirrup and Bonanza wetlands. Biomark is looking at ways of bringing the cost of these systems down (currently \$35-\$80K). Dave Speas said he believes this full duplex technology is best for long-term monitoring, but half-duplex may be an option for other applications.

Bobby Compton described the half-duplex system he designed to study fish movement past 5 fixed antennas in his study of river fragmentation. Advantages of a half-duplex system are large antennas (100-150’ wide), larger read range (~60 cm), less sensitivity to interference, lower cost (\$2,500-\$3,000), and lower power consumption (batteries last 1-2

weeks, depending on the number of fish detected). However, half duplex requires a different tag than the one we're now using. This tag is almost twice as large as our 12mm tags (23mm) and requires surgical implantation. [Oregon RFID](#) supplied the equipment for the system Bobby used. Bobby recommended papers posted at [Vince Tranquilli's website](#).

Craig Walker outlined Utah's plans for full-duplex monitoring of June sucker, the three species, and endangered fish for 2007-2008 and beyond. Utah plans to construct lower-cost PVC-encased antenna systems to be used with our existing full duplex tags and multiplex readers.

The Committee discussed possible applications of full and half-duplex technologies. A question was raised about using more than one kind of tag in a fish and potential interference; >Brian will test this.

3. Discuss plans for study of entrainment in Yampa River diversion structures – John Hawkins showed photos of the Maybell Ditch and discussed logistics and problems of access and sampling to determine if fish are becoming entrained. Tom Pitts hopes to meet with the Ditch Board in early June; >John Hawkins will provide Tom with a full description of the planned sampling. The Committee discussed other alternatives, including helicopter surveys and use of a fixed antenna from Biomark, but will focus on getting permission to do on-the-ground sampling this year.
4. Fish handling procedures handbook – John Hawkins discussed the draft handbook he's put together, noting this is part of a larger effort the Committee has discussed to make sure field staff are appropriately trained in fish handling. >John will change "procedures" to "guidance" and delete "U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service" from the cover page. Tom Nesler said when this is finalized, it can be cited in permit applications (rather than having to repeat the same protocol in each application). >Comments on the draft should be submitted to Tom Czapla and John Hawkins by May 31. >Tom Czapla will do a first-cut revision, and then send it out for broader review. >The Program Director's office will take the lead to incorporate comments, make revisions and get this document formalized.
5. Approve [March 7-8](#) meeting summary – The summary was modified to clarify carry-over assignments #5 and #7. >Angela Kantola will post the revised summary to the fws-coloriver listserver.
6. Review assignments from March 7-8 meeting - The Committee reviewed assignments from previous meetings (as were listed in the meeting agenda). Assignment updates, those still pending, and new assignments can be found in the assignment list in Attachment 1.

ADJOURN 4:30 p.m.

Tuesday, April 24

CONVENE 8:30 a.m.

7. Review and approval of Black Rocks humpback chub population estimate report – Chuck McAda discussed the low recapture rates and resulting low confidence intervals. Bill Davis asked if it's reasonable to assume that 2-3 weeks is adequate time for the fish to move from the central release point back to their place of capture. Chuck said he believes so, based on Kaeding's previous work, but can't say for sure. The sampling window is fairly narrow, but Chuck will consider spreading it out if/when possible. Chuck suggested that it might be appropriate to consider using different confidence intervals. On page 11, Dave Speas noted repetition in the second and third paragraph that needs to be eliminated. Dave commented that perhaps the capture history presented in Table 5 should be standard in population estimate reports. Krissy noted that there are two table 4's (table 3 is missing). The Program Director's office said population estimate reports need to include all the models and their rankings; and the author needs to substantiate why he/she chose the model they did. McAda includes some of this in Table A-2, but does not include all the models and their rankings. The Committee approved the report with the foregoing revisions. >Chuck will revise and finalize the report.

8. Review of draft umbrella floodplain management plan – Tim said he doesn't believe we currently have enough razorback larvae in the system for the floodplains to serve their nursery function, so the plan proposes using certain floodplains as acclimation sites for hatchery-produced fish at this time. Melissa suggested that the Committee should discuss which floodplains to use as "natural" sites and which to use for acclimation, as well as what breaches to deepen or lengthen, etc. Tom Pitts asked about NEPA compliance as it relates to the management plan and Pat Nelson said the compliance required depends on site ownership. Tom Pitts asked about costs and timeframes and suggested we need an implementation plan. Tom Chart referred to the Service's recent discussion, saying that the Service wants to get away from intensive management in the long-term, but has identified four priorities for the short-term (see e-mail posted to the fws-coloriver listserver by Tom on April 20). Melissa expressed concern that the draft plan leans too heavily toward growout ponds as opposed to natural floodplain functions. Bob Muth noted that we're evaluating survival of stocked razorback this year and that we're capturing more larval fish each year. Bob believes it would be appropriate to use Baeser Bend as a test site for what Tim is proposing. Tim mentioned bonytail, and Baeser may be used for both razorback and bonytail (if excess bonytail are available, which they should be). Hiring someone to do the pumping rather than purchasing a pump might reduce pumping costs. Krissy said she and Trina walked Baeser a few weeks ago and they couldn't find the breach. The breach area is very overgrown at this point. With regard to pumping water, it may be possible to get a temporary permit or transfer some water rights from Ouray NWR; >Jana will check on this, but cautioned that these processes can take ~6 months (which would preclude doing work at Baeser this season). Dan Alonso said Dennis Sorenson at the Vernal Utah Division of Water Resources office

might be helpful. Krissy asked about the Above Brennan site since it seems to have the required depth to over-winter fish; Tim said they've always had difficulty getting fish from that site. The Committee agreed to proceed with using Baeser Bend for larval razorback acclimation this year, if possible. Age-1 razorbacks will be stocked in the Stirrup this year. >Tim will prepare an annual operation plan and scope of work for Baeser (these may be one in the same). Bill asked about the objectives for Stirrup, suggesting a need for more specificity. The Stirrup evaluation would happen next year, but since fish will be stocked into the Stirrup this year, we have to decide what type of tag to use (half or full duplex). Craig Walker said UDWR plans to use a lower-cost PVC-encased antenna system with our existing full duplex tags and multiplex readers. With regard to the floodplain management plan, Melissa suggested deleting the reference to 17,500 cfs connection level. >Pat Nelson will make the necessary revisions to the floodplain management plan (and wrap in the Service priorities Tom Chart provided in his e-mail to the Committee), then it will be considered an interim plan, since it will be subject to change.

9. Schedule for FY 08-09 work plan development and approval – Angela Kantola reviewed the schedule, which appears in the Program Guidance posted to the fws-coloriver listserver on April 12, 2007. Scopes of work for ongoing and ongoing-revised biological and water acquisition projects are due to the Program Director's office by Friday, April 27. Then the Program Director's office will begin working (with technical committees and principal investigators) to review and refine the scopes of work and develop a recommended technical annual work plan that will be submitted to the technical committees for review by June 20. Technical committee comments are due to the Program Director and the Management Committee by July 20. The Management Committee will meet August 15 in Grand Junction and will discuss and approve projects for the FY 2008-2009 Work Plan at that time. (The Implementation Committee is expected to delegate their review and approval to the Management Committee.) Final FY 2008-2009 scopes of work will be distributed in the first quarter of FY 2008, although scopes of work for new starts and some nonnative fish management scopes of work may be delayed. As stated in the Guidance, the Recovery Program has not yet determined the process for soliciting scopes of work for new starts for FY 08 and 09, and as a result is **not** accepting scopes of work for new starts at this time. Interested parties are discouraged from preparing and submitting scopes of work for new starts until a formal request for proposals (RFP) is issued by the Bureau of Reclamation (most likely early each fiscal year), or until the Program determines an alternative course of action. There are five new starts in the FY 08-09 Program Guidance, of which the Program Director's office recommends competing three at this point through Reclamation's RFP process:
 - FY 08: Relationship of backwater development to sediment availability and peak flows in Reach 2 of the Green River
 - FY 08: Floodplain habitat vs. flow synthesis report
 - FY 09: Young-of-year Colorado pikeminnow abundance and condition, response of native fish to nonnative predator removal, and backwater topography (Effect of baseflow variability on backwaters).All three of these projects will require considerable data integration and synthesis. The Program Director's Office is hopeful that capable entities (which could include Argonne,

Larval Fishes Lab, SWCA, UDWR, USGS, and others) will consider responding to Reclamation's RFP. With regard to the razorback recruitment new start, the Program Director's Office believes this will be a fairly straightforward effort to put razorback suckers into a floodplain and monitor their departure via a PIT-tag detection array. Finally, the Program Director's Office recommends that the FY 09 new start on remote sensing of razorback sucker near a Green River spawning bar be considered a placeholder for now to allow time for some lab testing, etc. on the equipment this summer. The Committee agreed with this approach; >the Program Director's office will get the Management Committee's approval and then ask Reclamation to begin the RFP process (4 months minimum).

10. Review upcoming nonnative fish management activities and discuss public meeting schedules and agendas - Randy Hampton, Kara Lamb and Leslie James joined the Biology Committee by phone for this portion of the meeting. Pat Nelson noted that the Biology Committee has previously discussed need for help with I&E on nonnative fish management activities and held a joint meeting last year. Bob Muth said his main goal for today's meeting is to get feedback from the I&E professionals on Program-wide I&E needs (including those related to nonnative fish management). Randy Hampton reviewed agenda items from last week's I&E meeting, including: a report on the D.C. trip; nonnative fish management & related press materials going out later this week; deferring a substantial public attitude survey for now and conducting some mini-surveys with response cards; interpretive exhibits update; Elkhead Reservoir update (opens to the public May 5, with a formal dedication on July 11); 10,825 water; San Juan outreach activities; and Price-Stubbs fish passage. Pat Nelson said a public meeting is planned in Grand Junction, tentatively the evening of August 14 before the August 15 Management Committee meeting. Bob Muth suggested inviting Grand Valley irrigators. The meeting will consist of brief presentations like those at last year's public meeting in Craig with ample time for input and questions from the audience. Randy said he thinks we have some good things we can share with the area anglers (e.g., Elkhead Reservoir opening, sport fishing opportunities at other waters that CDOW manages, a bass structure project at Highline Lake). Kara said they've been getting good feedback from public in the upper reaches of the Colorado River (regarding releases from Coordinated Reservoir Operations, Ruedi releases, etc.). CDOW will take the lead for the public meeting in Grand Junction. Randy said they've taken the approach of going to the public and letting them know what we're doing. Tom Pitts asked if Wildlife Commissioners and state legislators would be invited (Pat Nelson noted there are new members on the Colorado Wildlife Commission); Randy said they would, along with County commissioners, etc. Tom Burke is the new chair of the Wildlife Commission and he's from Grand Junction. It would be helpful for Biology Committee members to come and hear what goes on at the meeting and especially for the biologists who are doing the work to be there to answer any specific questions about their projects. Tom Nesler said it would be good to have the Yampa River researchers at the Grand Junction meeting (Hawkins, Bestgen) as well as the Colorado River researchers. Randy suggested that the Biology Committee members also could be helpful in answering technical questions at the meeting. Members of the environmental and water user communities attending and showing support also would be very helpful. Kara encouraged identifying the key messages we want to communicate at

this meeting and focusing our presentations on those. Randy proposed continuing the exchange between the committees, but suggested that Biology Committee members come to I&E meetings in alternating years. The Biology Committee thought that was a good idea and agreed we want to continue to communicate.

a. Elkhead Lake Management Plan – CDOW has revised the plan based on comments received from Utah, Wyoming and the Service and sent it out. Bob Muth said the Service is satisfied their comments have been adequately addressed. Tom Nesler said CDOW will consider the Plan final if they don't hear anything back by the 4/27 comment date. >Kevin Gelwicks and Krissy Wilson will check to see if Wyoming and Utah are satisfied with the revisions. Pat said pike removal will start tomorrow and those fish will be translocated to Loudy-Simpson ponds; smallmouth bass removal will begin this Friday.

b. Nonnative Fish stocking procedures – The first meeting (web conference) with the revision task group (States and Service) is scheduled for May 17. Pat said we'd probably need some I&E support to get the word out once those procedures are revised and finalized.

11. Discuss plans for review and approval of nonnative synthesis reports – Pat Nelson said not all of the ten reports are in yet, but he been reviewing the ones he has received and then sending them out for peer and BC review with a one-month comment deadline. Not too many comments have been received on the reports sent out for review so far. Pat said he hasn't yet contacted anyone outside the Recovery Program for review. Pat would like to get the reports revised per comments received from peer and BC reviewers so they are adequate to help us plan future nonnative fish management activities, then perhaps send one or two examples of the synthesis reports to outside reviewers. Pat said he's looking for input on: 1) whether the report is scientifically sound and whether we are doing what we need to do to determine efficacy; and 2) what (if anything) we need to do differently to reach our goals. Biology Committee members suggested that we need outside sources to give a broader review of our overall nonnative fish management efforts rather than just on one or two specific projects. We likely need an overall synthesis report for that. Tom Nesler said he's concerned that some of the reports he's seen so far are more summaries than syntheses and data integration of 3 years of data. The Committee discussed the need for a broader synthesis and suggested an RFP may be in order. Craig noted that access to all of the raw data would be critical if we go that route. Tom Nesler suggested that we need to have someone prepare and lead syntheses presentations at the nonnative fish workshop. >The Program Director's office will prepare a recommendation for the Biology Committee on how to meet this larger synthesis need. >The Committee will discuss this on a conference call in June.
12. Review of White River flow recommendations and shortcomings - >The Program Director's office is summarizing the recommendations and shortcomings and will provide this to the Biology Committee in advance of the July 16 meeting.
13. Discussion of Price River flow recommendations report – Bob Muth recommends that UDWR take their existing data (and Cavalli's information) and perhaps work with

George Smith to develop base flow targets. Craig said he has some ideas, but they would involve some additional data collection. Krissy said she doesn't believe sufficient data were collected to establish base flow targets. Bob Muth doesn't believe we should spend much more time or effort on the Price (it ranked among the lowest of tributaries for contribution to recovery) and believes we try to make some very simple conclusions about base flows from the data we have. George recommended using the table of exceedances he prepared and working from that to establish passage flows (peak flows can never be recovered anyway). Craig recommended at least adding other tributaries in the area to the calculations; George said he thinks that's possible. Craig suggested it would be adequate to have flows that will attract fish in moderate to wet years (which George pointed out happens now). >Craig and George will work together to finalize the report using the table of exceedances that George provided. Craig will provide a report to George that discusses using surrogate streams, and if it seems appropriate, George will add that analysis. With regard to recovery, Melissa noted that she thinks the Price provides a substantial prey base for pikeminnow when it does have water.

14. Review reports due list - Angela Kantola distributed the updated list.
15. Schedule next meeting – The Committee will have a conference call May 9 at 1:30 p.m. to discuss the Stirrup scope of work. Another call will be scheduled in June to discuss how to proceed on the nonnative fish synthesis reports. The next meeting will be July 16 beginning at 1 p.m. through 3p.m. on July 17th in Grand Junction. Kevin will chair the July meeting, then Tom Chart will assume the chairmanship (with Krissy Wilson as vice-chair).
16. Other items: >Bob Muth will call Dave Campbell regarding options for compatibility between databases since the SJRIP is moving their database to FWS. With reference to recent discussions at the Management Committee, Kevin Gelwicks said Wyoming will be replacing him on the Biology Committee sometime this year, but Wyoming will maintain a representative on the Committee, and he will overlap with that person while they get up to speed.

ADJOURN 3:00 p.m.

Attachment
Assignments from March 7-8, 2007, meeting (Grand Junction)

Update on assignments completed or underway:

1. The Service will discuss Program activities with BLM and other agencies (e.g. NPS, BOR) to develop guidelines for the type of activities (e.g., major construction versus operational) requiring NEPA compliance. *1/18: Pat Nelson and Bob Muth spoke with Dan Alonso who's agreed to talk with BLM; Dan doesn't believe NEPA will be required. Pat will know more next week. 3/1: Dave Irving and Pat Nelson have been in contact with BLM. At present it appears that BLM is supportive of Recovery Program actions to assist in recovery of the endangered fishes. They requested that we submit proposals to them (in NEPA format; for their files) prior to proceeding with certain types of recovery activities (such as rotenoning, pumping, etc.). The need to develop such proposals would be determined on a case-by-case basis after making contact with BLM. 3/7: Pat said a programmatic NEPA will require more effort and he will begin to work on that as soon as he can. 4/23: Pat said this is on hold right now; we'll clarify roles and responsibilities for this during the 4/24 floodplain discussion. Site-specific NEPA, landowner permission, permits, water rights, Section 7, etc., will be the responsibility of the principal investigator.*
2. Krissy Wilson will get a proposal from Quent to repair the outlet structures on the endangered fish ponds at Wahweap and submit that to the Program. *3/7: Krissy said NRCS has re-committed to funding the stream restoration; once they see those plans (in ~2 weeks), Quent will be able to make an estimate on the cost to repair the outlet structures. 4/23: Krissy sent a scope of work to Tom Czapla; the cost estimate for repairs (Recovery Program portion) is \$31.2K. The estimate for the stream restoration is ~\$3.4M, but BLM has offered to donate rock, so UDWR should only need to match an additional \$80K.*
3. Tom Pitts will contact the Maybell ditch manager about access for John Hawkins' entrainment study. Pat will send the annual report for this project to the Biology Committee. *Tom Pitts has a meeting scheduled in early June.*
4. Tom Czapla and Craig Walker will determine what kind of tags to use in the fish to be stocked in the Stirrup wetland. Pat Nelson will look into measures for overwintering fish, including pumping water. *Based on PIT tag presentations and discussion during this meeting, the Biology Committee should decide on which PIT tag to use. However, these fish (~3,000) will be going out in June and if a larger tag than we're currently using is selected that needs to be surgically implanted, those tags will need to be ordered and time allotted for implanting. 4/23: Craig said UDWR will propose using full-duplex tags.*
5. Tom Czapla will develop a no-cost FY 07 scope of work to track getting YOY Colorado pikeminnow from the Green River for Dexter NFH. *In last years Annual Report, over 300 YOY Colorado pikeminnow were captured in the lower Green River reach. Over 75% of those were collected on the last day. Tom Czapla recommends putting a live well*

on the boat the last day of the trip to collect up to 100 YOY, then transporting them to the nearest location to meet a hatchery truck from Dexter. Patrick Goddard and Paul Badame will determine the best location to meet the hatchery truck (see email text, below). Normally from the confluence the sampling party heads up the Colorado River to Moab, but with a live well on board that may take some doing. They are also considering going back up the Green River to Mineral Springs. Dexter NFH is willing to make the trip with no cost to the program. The scope of work for project #138 should be modified to reflect this work with no additional costs. Patrick Goddard's 4/17 email said he and Paul had considered the options and believe it would be best to have a hatchery truck meet the boats at Mineral Bottom (mile 52) and they will bring whatever fish they catch upstream that day down to the truck (they also do a gear/people exchange here). They know of some good backwaters where they can capture YOY pikeminnow. They also could run downstream the next day and then run whatever fish we encounter in the next stretch back upstream. Both of these stretches are fairly productive, but Patrick doubts they will get more than a couple dozen of the juvenile CPM. They will conduct 3 trips this summer (May 9th through June 11th). They have live wells on the boats with recirculation water, but would be wary of holding fish >6-8 hours (and running up the Colorado from the confluence might be difficult with a full live well). The only difficulty they anticipate is that the road to Mineral Bottom washes out occasionally, but this usually can be anticipated.

6. Misti Schriener will talk to Clayton about the Committee's recommendations, including the desire for late-season backwater and aerial photography data, and then will e-mail a proposal to the Biology Committee. 4/24: *No proposal to date; pending Clayton Palmer's approval of funding. Misti said USGS has a hydrolab they are willing to loan. Misti said it's unclear at this point if Argonne will be recommending backwater or floodplain proposal.*

Assignments carried over or modified from previous meetings:

1. Tom Pitts will ask the WAC to adopt a report review procedure similar to the Biology Committee's. Tom Pitts will recommend changes to the Program Director's office for discussion at the next Biology Committee meeting. *Pending.*
2. Utah will work with Pat Nelson to submit/revise scopes of work to address white sucker removal. The white sucker scope of work was forwarded to the BC on 1/23/07; no comments/concerns have been received. A pre-season training session on hybrid identification has yet to be scheduled.
3. John Pitlick will revise the channel monitoring report, add Tom Pitts' comments and his responses to the appendix, and post the report to the Biology Committee by early January, and then the Committee will then have 2 weeks to respond. 3/7, 4/24: *Pending.*
4. CDOW will discuss whether they can do fyke netting for 98a (if not, perhaps FWS could work with Lori on this, CDOW will discuss). CDOW will work with Pat and John and Sam to determine how to accomplish 4 additional passes under 98a. There's another

concentration area near Maybell (RM 90-80) where additional removal was recommended by the workshop participants (again, 8 passes would be needed), but there might be public relations considerations. Sherm said CDOW will have to discuss the potential expansion of bass removal in RM 90-80; he will get a decision on this as quickly as possible. 3/7: *Pat said CDOW will allow fyke netting. CDOW will do an additional 4 passes within the South Beach reach; no permission to remove smallmouth bass from RM 80-90. The Biology Committee would like CDOW to work on making this possible in 2008. All bass not removed from Craig to Dinosaur will be marked.* 4/23: *Pat Nelson asked CDOW for a detailed response to each of the Biology Committee's requests, but that hasn't yet been received.*

5. The Program Director's office will send a memo to the Service's Ecological Services offices asking for annual reports on all contaminants-related RIPRAP actions. *Pending.*
6. The Program Director's office will provide the Biology Committee with a summary of what the White River flow recommendations report said and what the shortcomings were 4/23: *This will be provided to the Biology Committee in advance of the July 16 meeting.*
7. Craig Walker will provide a copy of the report on UDWR's June 2006 Dolores River fish community survey to the Program Director's office. *Tom Czaplá received an e-mail from Craig on April 5th indicated he was in the process of revamping the report for delivery to the Biology Committee by the end of April (and to Czaplá prior to that). Not yet received. 4/24: Craig is amending the report to include Valdez' data and will send a revised report to Tom Czaplá by the end of May.*
8. Bob Muth will talk to Dave Campbell about funding from the SJRIP for the cyprinid key. 4/24: *Pending (Chuck McAda and Darrel Snyder have been discussing this).*
9. Dave Irving will run Dave Speas' peer review request of the stock assessment by Bruce Haines and he and Dave Speas will discuss this with Tim Modde, also. 4/24: *Bruce and Tim will complete this by June 8.*
10. Tom Chart will finalize and e-mail the interim nonnative fish removal criteria to the Biology Committee with a note that it was approved by the Biology Committee. 4/24: *Tom Chart said Tom Nesler asked to change one of the criteria that is really a task to refine the criteria. Tom Chart will move that to the recommendations section and e-mail the criteria out as discussed above.*
11. Craig Walker will provide Tom Czaplá a copy of UDWR's agency review of the Westwater humpback chub report. Craig sent Tom the review comments from three agency reviewers (3-15-07), but no new draft addressing those comments. 4/24: *Craig will find out when the next draft will be provided.*

New Assignments:

1. Brian Beckley will test whether or using two types of PIT tags in a fish would cause interference.
2. John Hawkins will provide Tom Pitts with a full description of the planned sampling for Maybell Ditch.
3. John Hawkins will change “procedures” to “guidance” and delete “U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service” from the fish handling procedures cover page. Comments on the draft should be submitted to Tom Czapla and John Hawkins by May 31. Tom Czapla will do a first-cut revision, and then send it out for broader review. The Program Director’s office will take the lead to incorporate comments, make revisions and get this document formalized.
4. Angela Kantola will post the revised March meeting summary to the listserv. *Done.*
5. Chuck will revise and finalize the Black Rocks humpback chub population estimate report.
6. Jana will check on water rights for pumping water into Baeser Bend (it may be possible to get a temporary permit or transfer some water rights from Ouray NWR).
7. Tim Modde will prepare an annual operation plan and scope of work for Baeser Bend (these may be one in the same).
8. Pat Nelson will make the necessary revisions to the floodplain management plan (and wrap in the Service priorities Tom Chart provided in his e-mail to the Committee), then it will be considered an interim plan, since it will be subject to change.
9. The Program Director’s office will get the Management Committee’s approval and then ask Reclamation to begin the RFP process for three FY 08-09 new starts.
10. Kevin Gelwicks and Krissy Wilson will check to see if Wyoming and Utah are satisfied with the revisions to CDOW’s Elkhead Lake Management Plan.
11. The Program Director’s office will prepare a recommendation for the Biology Committee on how to meet the larger synthesis need for nonnative fish management reports. The Biology Committee will discuss this on a conference call in June.
12. Craig Walker and George Smith will work together to finalize the Price River report using the table of exceedances that George provided. Craig will provide a report to George that discusses using surrogate streams, and if it seems appropriate, George will add that analysis.
13. Bob Muth will call Dave Campbell regarding options for compatibility between databases since the SJRIP is moving their database to FWS.