

CR/FY-02 UCRRIC
Mail Stop 65115

Memorandum

To: Implementation Committee
Management Committee, Consultants, and Interested Parties
Meeting Attendees

From: Assistant Director, Upper Colorado River Recovery Implementation Program

Subject: Draft January 24, 2005, Recovery Implementation Committee Conference Call
Summary

Attached are the draft action and assignment summary and the general meeting summary from the recent Implementation Committee conference call. Please review these documents and contact me (303/969-7322, ext. 221) if you think any changes are necessary.

Attachment

- Summary -
Actions and Assignments
Recovery Implementation Committee–January 24, 2005

ASSIGNMENTS:

1. Clayton Palmer will provide the peer-reviewed cost analyses via e-mail.
2. Angela Kantola will provide data on additional costs to which Colorado and Utah have contributed (e.g., on nonnative fish management activities and CRDSS).

CONVENE: 9:00 a.m.

1. Request for Increased Authorization and Extension of Time for Construction for the Upper Colorado River Endangered Species Recovery Program and the San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program - John Shields introduced the draft proposal developed by some of the non-federal parties to the Program to seek additional authorization for capital expenditures for the Upper Basin Program in the amount of \$12.5 million, and time extensions for construction activities for both the Upper Basin and San Juan recovery programs. The estimate is based on Reclamation's latest estimate of the cost to complete the capital projects. In addition, the document would extend the authorized time period for construction from 2008 through FY 2010. The Management Committee was asked by the Implementation Committee to develop a strategy to address the Program's capital projects budget shortfall. The Management Committee formed an ad hoc committee of non-Federal participants which developed this proposal. The Management Committee has reviewed the proposal and with the exception of the environmental groups (who abstained from supporting the proposal because it lacks a cost-sharing component), recommended it to the Implementation Committee for approval. If the Implementation Committee does not object, some of the non-federal parties to the Program will take it to Washington, D.C. the week of February 7. Tom Pitts gave an overview of the proposal, noting that it is for federal funds only with no additional cost-sharing by States or power users. The cost increase is for the upper basin Program only, so it wouldn't be appropriate to have cost-sharing from New Mexico, anyway. John Shields noted that the proposal boils down to two additional years of appropriations to Reclamation at roughly the current level. Tom Pitts added that the San Juan Program has not yet identified all their capital projects, so the time extension through 2010 would allow them to do that. John Shields said the ad hoc group reviewed numerous options to make up the budget shortfall, but none other seemed feasible or as likely to succeed as this one. Tom Pitts emphasized the need to get this proposal to Congress this year, as Reclamation is already formulating their FY 08 budget. The Committee discussed the cost-sharing issue. John Shields said the power cost share has been greater than anticipated, as explained in the proposal.

Dan Luecke said cost-sharing is extremely important to the environmental groups and he's not entirely convinced that the non-Federal partners, have indeed, contributed more

than the anticipated 50%. Restoration programs inevitably have cost overruns and always seem to try put the burden on the Federal government. Dan said he recognizes the budget constraints of the non-federal partners, but emphasized that the federal budget is also very tight. The Committee discussed the increased costs to power and Clayton Palmer agreed to provide the peer-reviewed cost analyses via e-mail to Dan and everyone this afternoon. John Shields said Colorado and Utah also have contributed more than was anticipated to nonnative fish management activities and Tom Pitts noted that Colorado also has contributed additional funds for CRDSS. >Angela Kantola will provide data on these additional costs from her spreadsheets. Dan Luecke said he's willing to look at Clayton's analyses and discuss those as quickly as possible. Tom Pitts emphasized that Colorado simply doesn't have any more money and Tom Blickensderfer agreed, saying they're putting their last dollars from the species conservation trust fund into the Program this year. Pat Tyrrell noted that it appears the cost-sharing has not been sacrificed, and Tom Pitts added that it has perhaps just shifted somewhat between the states and power.

John Reber asked about Hartland passage and Maybell screening and Brent said they're not included in this proposal. Bob Muth said the Yampa PBO requires determining the severity of entrainment at major diversion structures (e.g., Maybell Ditch), but we don't know what that is. Brent Uilenberg reviewed the basis of the cost estimates in the current projections. They are conservative estimates, using the most recent cost estimates for fuel and steel, that don't allow for additional increases in those costs beyond annual 3% inflation rate.

Dan Luecke said the environmental groups would abstain at this point, and are willing to work on resolution as quickly as possible. Dan suggested one alternative to this proposal would be to prioritize projects (noting that one capital project in particular has especially escalated in cost, and in the view of the environmental groups, has a very modest benefit). Tom Pitts said he doesn't think we can cut and pare projects at this point (all the ones we've committed to are believed needed for recovery and are included in biological opinions, programmatic biological opinions, etc.).

John Shields asked if the Committee would not object to a non-federal subgroup visiting with folks in Washington, D.C. about this proposal (Committee *approval* would come sometime later via letters and statements of support of proposed legislation). Utah supported going forward with the proposal. Dan Luecke said the environmental groups would not object, but would ask that the group make it clear in D.C. that not all features are in place with the imprimatur of all Program participants. Tom Pitts said they would certainly honor that request. Participants in the February trip will include Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, water users, and possibly Leslie James for CREDA for some of the meetings.

2. Next meeting - The meeting scheduled for March 1, 2005, has been replaced by a Management Committee meeting, with the Implementation Committee giving the Management Committee proxy to approve the draft revised RIPRAP and draft Program

Guidance for FY 06-07. That Management Committee meeting will be in Salt Lake City, from 8 a.m. - 4 p.m. Tom Pitts recommended another Implementation Committee conference call before March trip to Washington, D.C. The next Implementation Committee meeting may not be scheduled until late August or early September, 2005.

ADJOURN: 10:15 a.m.

Attachment 1 - Participants

Colorado River Recovery Implementation Committee Conference Call, January 24, 2005

IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Julie Lyke for Ralph Morgenweck, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Brent Uilenberg for Carol DeAngelis, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Blickensderfer and Russell George, Colorado Department of Natural Resources
Tom Pitts, Upper Basin Water Users
Pat Tyrrell, Wyoming State Engineer's Office
Mike Styler, Utah Department of Natural Resources
John Reber, National Park Service
Leslie James, CREDA
Clayton Palmer, Western Area Power Administration
Dan Luecke, Western Resource Advocates
Program Director Bob Muth, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (nonvoting)

OTHERS:

John Shields, Wyoming State Engineer's Office
Sherm Hoskins and Robert King, Utah Department of Natural Resources
Angela Kantola, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Recovery Program
Gary Burton, Western Area Power Administration