

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

Salt Lake City, Utah

February 28, 2006

CONVENE: 9:00 a.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper - The agenda was modified as it appears below.
2. Approve November 22, 2005, meeting summary - Angela Kantola said per Leslie James request, she clarified under item #4 that the carry-over funds Utah identified to be de-obligated from the past three years would return to the Basin Fund, not to the Treasury, unless the Program spends it in FY 06. Tom Pitts asked that the Aspinall EIS item be noted as “Aspinall EIS/Gunnison PBO.” >Angela will post the revised summary to the listserv (*done*).
3. Funding/Budget
 - a. Confirmation of Colorado’s capital contributions - The Program Director’s office tally shows that Colorado still owes \$2,331,931.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Credit</i>	<i>Comments</i>
2001	Pond reclamation	\$251,800	Colorado still needs to review & substantiate this amount. <i>Tom Blickensderfer working to substantiate with CDOW.</i>
2001	N. pike exclusion assessment	\$20,000	
2002	Funds directly to NFWF	\$1,190,200	
2005	Elkhead enlargement	\$4,271,069	CRWCD and CWCB accountants confirming.
2006	Elkhead enlargement	\$2,331,931	Anticipated FY 06 contribution.
	TOTAL	\$8,065,000	Per PL 106-392.

Tom Blickensderfer reviewed these numbers. With regard to credit for storage of water in Highline Reservoir, Brent said he believes Reclamation paid Colorado \$150,000 for storage and that the Program funded the water quality study by USGS (\$172,500) (>Brent will check on these payments). Tom B. asked about a motion dated March 6, 2003, that discussed the \$172.5K for water quality and also discussed counting the \$150K as credit. (The Committee had approved that motion in concept, per the March 3, 2003 meeting summary.) In addition, Tom B. said CWCB asked him to request that the Committee credit Colorado for \$500K for the Elkhead feasibility study they conducted several years ago (mid to late-nineties). Brent Uilenberg said the Program is obligated to pay \$9.1M for Elkhead (\$8.7M +5% cost overruns); for any project cost overruns over this amount, the Program can either pay its pro rata share or take less water from Elkhead. Crediting Colorado \$500K for the feasibility study would create a significant shortfall in capital funds. Brent noted that the Program expended

considerable funds for Elkhead feasibility work prior to deciding to go ahead with the enlargement; therefore, if Colorado were to be given credit for the feasibility work they did, other parties would likely want credit for their previous work, as well. (Tom Pitts and others agreed, noting that we “reset the clock” with the long-term funding legislation PL 106-392, and it was agreed no one would get credit for previous contributions to capital projects [some of which were quite substantial].) Brent said that if the River District were willing to count the \$500K as part of the \$8.7M (reducing the Program’s Elkhead contract by \$500K without cutting back on the Program’s 5,000 af of water), that would be acceptable. Colorado’s request found little favor with the Committee, but if Colorado wants to make a formal request to the Program (outlining all the facts and the consequences), the Committee can schedule another discussion of this request. Robert King said he believes Colorado should meet the \$8.065M obligation they agreed to, as should each partner. Tom Blickensderfer agreed to back off this request for now and will report back as things develop this year in the General Assembly with Colorado’s Species Conservation Trust Fund. Tom B. said Colorado is requesting \$1,336,813 from the Fund this year, which, with amounts currently obligated to Elkhead, should square with the \$8.065M obligation.

- b. FY 07 depletion charge and annual contributions - Angela Kantola reviewed the draft table showing annual budget and depletion charge adjustments for FY 2007. These adjustments (with the exception of power revenues from the Bureau of Reclamation) are based on a 2005 Consumer Price Index increase of 3.4% over 2004. Reclamation power revenue contributions are calculated by CPI released in October, per PL 106-392 (using a planning figure of 3% [not 2.5% as draft table mistakenly indicated] until the CPI is released in October). Angela added that the \$697K in endangered species resource management funds are back in the Service’s budget for FY 07. Page 88 of the [Service’s budget justification document](#) reads: “The FY 2007 budget request for Recovery is \$65,879,000 and 488 FTE, a net program decrease of \$8,731,000 and 2 FTE from the 2006 enacted level. Within this amount the Service will continue to fund the Upper Colorado River Recovery Program, a partnership that implements and assists in recovery activities for the humpback chub, Colorado pike minnow, razorback sucker, and bonytail chub; and the Platte River Recovery Program which focuses on protecting and restoring the Platte River ecosystem.” Page BH-57 in the FWS section of the [FY 2007 DOI Bureau Highlights document](#) specifically says “This funding level will fund the Upper Colorado River and Platte River recovery programs at a level equal to that of 2006.” >Angela Kantola will add a footnote on the balance in the NFWF Section 7 funds account, finalize the draft table and post it to the fws-coloriver listserver (*done*). >Angela also will compile and post this table from the beginning of the Program. >Finally, Angela will provide a list of projects funded with Section 7 funds since the Program’s inception.
- c. Update on legislation to extend authorization to complete capital projects - Tom Pitts said the legislation passed the Senate December 16 and should be in a House consent bill within the next week or so.

4. Consultation update

- a. [Aspinall EIS](#) /Gunnison PBO process - (See also and summary of January 13, 2006, Gunnison PBO meeting e-mailed to Committee by Tom Pitts on February 9.) Action alternatives for the Aspinall EIS are to be drafted by the end of March, and the next meeting of the cooperating agencies and the hydrology subcommittee will be April 20 and 21 in Grand Junction. Brent said hydrology model development is proceeding well and the no action alternative has been basically agreed to. Brent said the Federal District Court hearing on the Black Canyon of the Gunnison reserved water right on March 9 could impact the EIS process, which currently does not address that water right. (*Note: this meeting was subsequently postponed.*) Tom Pitts said water users are concerned it could take 3-4 years to complete the Gunnison PBO if we wait until the Aspinall EIS is completed; therefore, their goal is to undertake a low level of work on the PBO (e.g., process, linkages, etc.) in parallel with the EIS process so that the PBO can be issued as soon as possible after the ROD is issued on the EIS. Tom P. said he hopes to begin drafting a layout of the process this May. Tom Iseman said they are in agreement (do some work in parallel, but not distracting from the EIS process). The Committee concurred with this approach. Brent said it will be very helpful if the local and regional water users can reach agreement on the geographic and chronological scope of the PBO.
- b. [Updated consultation totals](#) - Since January 1988, the Service has consulted on 868 projects with a potential to deplete a total of 2,068,131 af in the Upper Colorado River Basin (of which 1,799,466 af are historic depletions). Angela posted the most recent consultation list to the listserver on January 18, 2006.

5. Work Planning

- a. Colorado representation on the Biology Committee - Tom Blickensderfer said Tom Nesler is doing about three jobs at this point but expects to remain the Biology Committee representative until he can fill his old position in CDOW. The Committee encouraged Colorado to take whatever measures necessary to provide consistent representation on the Committee and to fill this position as soon as possible. Robert King introduced Krissy Wilson as Utah's new representative on the Biology Committee. Krissy replaces Matt Andersen as Utah's native aquatic species coordinator.
- b. FY 06-07 work plan/budget status and Biology Committee recommendations for new projects - Restoration of the \$697K in endangered species resource management funds to the Service's budget for FY 07 makes available an accumulation of ~\$400K that the Committee had asked the Program Director's office to carry over from FY 03-05 as a safeguard in case the Service's funding was not restored. In addition, Utah identified \$116K of carry-over funds, and the Program had obligated \$38.5K in FY 05 which was not needed to lease water from Steamboat Lake. Working with the Biology Committee, the Program Director's office identified additional work to be accomplished in FY 06 with

these funds, much of it on nonnative fish management activities:

Habitat restoration

Evaluation of pikeminnow entrainment in Yampa R. diversions (LFL) (\$6K) (too expensive to run an RFP process for a \$10-\$20K project)

Nonnative fish management

Middle Yampa pike removal expansion of smallmouth bass removal to South Beach (CDOW) (+~\$10K)

Effects of FG releases on Lodore/Whirlpool fish comm. (LFL) (\$70.8K)

Duchesne R. fish community and habitat sampling (FWS) (+\$16.1K)

Middle Yampa smallmouth/pike removal expansion & vehicle (LFL) (+\$45.3K)

Colorado R. smallmouth bass removal (FWS) (+\$20.3K)

Yampa R. fish response to nonnative removal (LFL) (+\$25K)

Nonnative fish isotope work (CDOW/CSU) (\$20K)

Add'l equipment (electrofischer/generator, GPS units, electric seine) (FWS) (\$13.3K)

Additional fish maintenance equipment (oxygen bottles, etc.) (All) (\$2K)

Propagation

Grand Valley fish hatchery facility increased energy costs (FWS) (+\$8K)

Monitoring and research

Vehicle for Yampa & middle Green larval surveys (and other projects) (LFL) (+\$22K)

Gunn. & Co. R. evaluation of stocked fish and larval reproduction (FWS) (+\$115K)

Cyprinid computer key 2/3 of FY 06 and 07 costs (LFL) (\$124.1K)

In addition, two projects have been identified which can best be funded through the "Section 7 funds" held at NFWF:

Standardize electrofishing equipment (Kolz) (\$10K, Section 7 funds)

Recovery goals and related technical assistance (Valdez, SWCA) (up to \$50K/year pending availability of funds)

The San Juan River Program has real funding problems and now cannot fund the cyprinid computer key. >Bob Muth will discuss with LFL what product could be provided with 2/3 of the funding and also will have further discussion with other potential funding sources.

The Committee approved these expenditures, with the exception of the cyprinid key, which now needs further investigation with regard to products and other funding sources.

- c. RIPRAP review - The Program Director's office e-mailed recommended RIPRAP revisions and draft RIPRAP assessment for technical committee review on February 22 and 23. The Biology and Water Acquisition committees will discuss these documents via conference calls on March 2. The Management Committee will review the technical committee comments on April 11.
6. Washington, D.C. Trip (March 8-14) plans - John Shields distributed a copier version of the briefing book, which is currently at the printer. Bob Muth says this year's briefing book really focuses on accomplishments. The non-Federal Program participants will once again ask their representatives to sign joint delegation support letters as in the past (and the governors' letters will be in the briefing book pocket). The Committee discovered an error on page 20 of the book (\$46M in the lower left hand corner of the table should be \$61M). (This was caught and corrected for the final printing and the corrected pdf file was posted to the website). John distributed fax copies of the non-

Federal Program participants' Congressional funding requests document.

7. Updates

- a. Coordinated reservoir operations - Tom Pitts reviewed the draft criteria for implementing coordinated reservoir operations to provide spring flows to improve habitat in the 15-Mile Reach, suggested a few editorial changes, and recommended that the Committee adopt this version (with one additional change requested by CWCB to change the April 25 - April 30 public meeting date time frame to May 1 - May 15th). The Committee accepted this document (Tom Iseman had no objections at the time of the meeting, but will check and let the Committee know if the environmental groups have any concerns). >Angela Kantola and George Smith will incorporate the changes (*done*), the WAC will look at those on Thursday and finalize the document, and George Smith will distribute a final version.
- b. Flaming Gorge ROD - The [Record of Decision](#) (ROD) approving the implementation of the Action Alternative analyzed in the Final Operation of [Flaming Gorge Dam Final Environmental Impact Statement](#) (EIS) was signed on February 16 and a copy e-mailed to the Committee on February 21. The next Flaming Gorge Working Group meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 13, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. in Vernal. John Reber said the National Park Service will likely request active membership on the technical work group. Randy Peterson clarified that the technical work group is not meant to be duplicative of the Flaming Gorge Working Group. Randy said Reclamation expects the Recovery Program would be very involved in the flow discussions. The Committee thanked Reclamation and all the cooperating agencies for their work to complete this.
- c. Capital projects
 - i. Elkhead Reservoir enlargement project - Bob Muth referred to the update provided by Dan Birch (e-mailed to the Committee on February 21, 2006). Brent said there are significant cost overruns which the Program will need to discuss when we have more information on the projected costs and other Program capital projects. The Committee discussed holding a meeting near Elkhead; perhaps at TNC's Carpenter Ranch.
 - ii. Options for rehabilitating the Myton townsite diversion dam - Brent Uilenberg said Reclamation has reviewed alternatives for rehabilitating the dam in order to provide and measure water to meet target flows in the Duchesne River flow recommendations. Brent distributed a proposal to partially rebuild the dam and install automated diversion gates (\$345,400). This project would be a good candidate for competition under Reclamation's Water 2025 Program; if successful, this would reduce the cost to the Recovery Program to ~\$172,600. >Utah will craft a proposal for a Water 2025 challenge grant. Letters of support submitted with the

proposal also will be important, so Utah will ask the Program partners for those. To make it clear that the matching portion is State funds, Utah could contribute some of their capital funds directly to this project in lieu of contributing to the NFWF capital funds account and/or we could use Section 7 funds. Tom Pitts proposed using Section 7 funds (current balance is ~\$362K). The Committee will get an update on this during the April 11 conference call agenda.

- iii. Thunder Ranch - Brent Uilenberg discussed Reclamation's work to rebuild the levee and armor the notch. That's been done, the remaining issue is wildlife/livestock control. The ranch owner objected to using dead tree barriers and Reclamation has agreed to install a crossbuck fence (\$20K).
 - iv. Price-Stubb fish passage - Brent Uilenberg described the Program's base fish passage alternative (#1) and alternative #2 which would include a boat passage paid for outside of Program funds. Brent is concerned that design and funds won't be in place for alternative #2 by the time the Program gets the additional Congressional funding needed to move forward on fish passage construction. >Brent Uilenberg will provide Angela Kantola with contact information so Program participants can encourage Palisade and their partners regarding the importance of having their design and funding ready to go. >Tom Blickensderfer will check on the conditions of the GOCO grant. This will be on the April 11 conference call agenda.
 - d. Humpback chub recovery goals lawsuit - Bob Muth said the Service issued a [press release](#) announcing its intention to begin the process of reviewing and updating recovery goals for the humpback chub in 2007. The Service also plans to update recovery goals for the other Colorado River endangered fishes – Colorado pikeminnow, razorback sucker and bonytail – beginning in 2007 as part of the five-year status review of these species.
 - e. Reports status - Angela Kantola distributed an updated reports list. Tom Pitts expressed concern about reports that become very overdue (e.g., Price River and Pitlick reports) and recommended immediately raising any report that reaches 90 days overdue to the Management Committee's attention.
8. Status and next steps for completing the HBC Genetics Management Plan - Gary Burton said the Adaptive Management Program for GCD Operations views this document as foundational for actions in the Grand Canyon directed at HBC population and habitat. The Program has been waiting for the Douglas' work to be completed before issuing the next draft of the plan. Indications are that Dexter NFH geneticists might lend expertise to completing the Plan if funding were available (\$50K from the lower basin). If this occurs, it would be important that Region 6 of the Service still reviews and supports the document. If Dexter wants to work on it, that would be fine; Region 6 would stay involved, Tom Czaplá would work with them, and it would remain a Service document.

Larry Gamble added that the Service's new peer review policy will apply to the results of the Douglas study.

9. Implementation Committee meeting schedule for 2006 and agenda items - >Management Committee members will check with their Implementation Committee members regarding meeting sometime in the last three weeks of September. (>Angela Kantola will provide an availability spreadsheet for Committee members to return.)

10. Upcoming Management Committee tasks and schedule next meeting - Conference call on Tuesday, April 11, from 1:30-3:30 p.m.(phone number 888-842-7194 ; passcode 209309); meeting on June 13 in Denver near DIA from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. >The Program Director's office will secure a location for the meeting. Conference call agenda items will include review of the RIPRAP revisions and draft RIPRAP assessment and updates on Myton Town diversion rehabilitation and Price Stubb fish passage. The Committee may hold their August meeting near Elkhead Reservoir (perhaps at TNC's Carpenter Ranch).

ADJOURN 3:10 p.m.

Assignments

1. Angela Kantola will post the revised November 22, 2005, meeting summary to the listserv (*done*).
2. Brent will check on the payments he believes Reclamation made to Colorado (\$150,000) for storage and that for the Highline Lake water quality study by USGS (\$172,500).
3. Angela Kantola will add a footnote on the balance in the NFWF Section 7 funds account, finalize the draft 2007 depletion charge and annual budget adjustments table and post it to the fws-coloriver listserv (*done*); Angela will also compile and post this table from the beginning of the Program.
4. Angela Kantola will provide a list of projects funded with Section 7 funds since the Program's inception.
5. Bob Muth will discuss with LFL what product could be provided with 2/3 of the funding for the cyprinid key and also will have further discussion with other potential funding sources.
6. Angela Kantola and George Smith will incorporate the changes in the CROS document (*done*), the WAC will look at those on Thursday and finalize the document, and George Smith will distribute a final version.
7. Utah will craft a proposal for a Water 2025 challenge grant. Letters of support submitted with the proposal also will be important, so Utah will ask the Program partners for those.
8. Brent Uilenberg will provide Angela Kantola with contact information so Program participants can encourage Palisade and their partners regarding the importance of having their design and funding ready to go.
9. Tom Blickensderfer will check on the conditions of the GOCO grant for Price-Stubb boat passage.
10. Management Committee members will check with their Implementation Committee members regarding meeting sometime in the last three weeks of September. Angela Kantola will provide an availability spreadsheet for Committee members to return.
11. The Program Director's office will secure a location for the Management meeting on June 13 in Denver near DIA from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee, Salt Lake City, Utah
February 28, 2006

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg and Randy Peterson	Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Blickensderfer	State of Colorado.
Robert King	State of Utah
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Larry Gamble	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Mazour	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
John Reber	National Park Service
Tom Iseman	The Nature Conservancy
Gary Burton and Heather Patno	Western Area Power Administration

Nonvoting Member:

Bob Muth	Recovery Program Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
----------	---

Recovery Program Staff:

Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
----------------	--------------------------------

Others:

Terry Hickman	Central Utah Water Conservancy District
Dave Speas	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
Krissy Wilson	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Larry Crist	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Mike Styler	Utah Department of Natural Resources