

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY
June 4, 2009, Salt Lake City, Utah

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. Recognition of Bob Muth – John Shields presented an appreciation plaque to outgoing Program Director, Bob Muth, thanking him for his eight and a half years of excellent leadership of the Recovery Program (January 28, 2001—July 4, 2009), and wished him well in his new endeavors as Director of the Bozeman Fish Technology Center. The Management Committee held a dinner in Bob’s honor last night and there also will be a picnic for Bob the evening of June 24 in Lakewood; contact Angela Kantola or Mary Nelson if you would like to attend (see Angela Kantola’s 6/1/09 post to the fws-coloriver listserv). Doug Frugé said the Service has advertised the Program Director position government wide (open June 3—June 24) and hopes to have it filled within a few months. John Shields noted that a small committee assisted in making the selection last time and asked if the same would be true this time; Doug said he expected a panel might be formed once again. Leslie James said a group of stakeholders participated in interviews for the Glen Canyon program. Tom Pitts agreed it would be helpful to have a representative from the Management Committee on the panel. The Committee suggested that John Shields would be a good representative. Tom Pitts also is willing to participate if more than one Program participant would be helpful. >Doug will ask Mike Thabault and Julie Lyke if they feel this is appropriate. Angela Kantola will be Acting Program Director from July 5 until a new Program Director is on board.
3. Approve [April 2, 2009 web conference summary](#) – John Shields provided minor, editorial comments; >Angela will incorporate those and finalize the summary (*done*).
4. Follow-up on [2009 Congressional briefing trip](#) – Tom Pitts said they successfully briefed the delegations, including eight new House members. Most of the administration briefings were with temporary appointees pending nomination and confirmation or appointment of permanent staff. Tom expects strong support from the Department, as Secretary Salazar mentions the Recovery Program frequently.
 - a. Administration’s proposal for FY 2010 Program funding; support letters – Support letters to the appropriation subcommittees couldn’t be done until after the release of the President’s budget on May 5. The four Governors now have submitted letters as have water users (with more pending) and these letters demonstrate the grassroots support for the Program to Congress. Proposed joint delegation funding support letters have been drafted and John has offered to ask Representative DeGette to circulate them. A similar effort will be made on the Senate side. Leslie asked about the difference between the letters regarding the Reclamation versus Service constituent support letters; Tom said he tried to keep the letters to one page. John Shields added that the delegation letters deal with *how* the support is expressed so that it is not misinterpreted as a request for an

earmark. Doug expressed the Service's gratitude for Tom and John's work on this.
>John Shields will ask Colorado and Utah to help with the joint delegation letter.

5. Proposed amendment to the [Recovery Programs' legislation](#) to extend annual funding – Representative John Salazar (who is on the Appropriations Committee) introduced the annual funding legislation to extend the period of annual funding at current levels from FY11 to FY23. [H.R. 2288](#) has been referred to the House Committee on Natural Resources and likely will be referred to the Water and Power Subcommittee. There are currently nine cosponsors on the bill. Efforts are continuing to have all members of the four states' House delegation as cosponsors. Likely there will be a hearing on the bill (we hope to get the legislation passed before the end of the fiscal year). Potential issues are the Service's fee on funds transferred from Reclamation (currently 24%, but waived by half only in Region 6 of the Service through 2010, but the Service hasn't indicated a willingness to continue that waiver) and the Service's unmet annual \$200K commitment for the San Juan Recovery Program in Region 2.
6. [10,825 Alternatives](#) – Tom Pitts provided background, noting that the 15-Mile Reach PBO includes a provision agreed upon by east and west slope water users that 10,825 acre-feet of Ruedi Reservoir water allocated to endangered fish under previous biological opinions be replaced by water users. Tom has reported on the progress of this "10825 Project" over the last two years. East and west slope water users have reached agreement on the components of an alternative to replace this water, which include: 1) diverting historical agricultural water rights in the vicinity of Lake Granby for delivery to the 15-mile reach; and 2) providing half of the water under a new arrangement from un-contracted, unobligated Ruedi Reservoir water. Proposed legislation has been developed to permanently allocate the Ruedi water on a "non-reimbursable" basis to endangered fish uses. Converting this 5,412.5 acre-feet to a non-reimbursable status for both storage and operation and maintenance is consistent with congressional policy to have water dedicated to fish, wildlife, and recreational uses from Reclamation projects be non-reimbursable. Tom posted a copy of the proposed legislation (not yet been introduced) to the listserver on June 1. Tom is seeking comments from the non-federal parties to the Management Committee regarding this legislation. Dan Birch reviewed funding arrangements between the east and west slope water users. The proposed legislation would not address the obligation to repay Ruedi by 2018, but deal only with making the 5412 non-reimbursable. The 5412 af is only a fraction of the uncommitted Ruedi water. John Salazar's staff suggested attaching this to the annual funding legislation; however, the water users don't want to jeopardize that legislation, so the District proposes not attaching it until and unless it does not interfere with the annual funding legislation moving forward. Tom believes this will work since this the Ruedi language would address only a single issue of non-reimbursement, not the whole of Ruedi repayment. The bills may be combined in committee mark-up. John Shields said he'd like to learn more about the details of the proposal (remaining debt, etc.). >Randy Seaholm will update a relevant Board memo to better explain the issues, then >Tom Pitts will schedule a conference call of the non-federal Program participants (before the August Management Committee meeting).

7. Capital costs ceiling and OMID proposal – Brent Uilenberg reviewed capital cost indexing with the Committee and asked the Program to adopt the Orchard Mesa Irrigation District (OMID) Canal Automation Project as a capital project and budget \$16.5 million to fund its construction. Brent gave an overview of the package of information that Angela sent in three messages to the Committee on May 12. Brent walked through the schematic diagram, water that would be saved for the fish, and how the water would be protected. A very conservative estimate of the water savings is 17,000 af (Brent believes the actual savings will be closer to 30,000 af). This project would help improve the frequency that we meet the 15-Mile Reach flow recommendations (for both base and peak flows). Funding for this project is available under the authorized cost ceiling for the Program recently increased by [P.L. 111-11](#) (+\$15M) and the cost indexing methodology approved by the Bureau of Reclamation (+\$28M). An adequate balance would remain to construct a fish screen or barrier at Tusher Wash, complete the 24 Road Hatchery rehabilitation, and leave a contingency fund of ~\$11 million for future unknown capital project needs (which also would be indexed). The urgency for speedy approval is that the area where the re-regulating reservoir would be built is rapidly urbanizing and the site will become housing if we don't act quickly. Dan said the River District stepped up and entered into a contract to buy the property (\$1.25M) in April and must close on the property before early September. The CRWCD Board is willing to take some risk, but would like some assurance that the project is likely to move forward. (The Board's next meeting the third week of July.) CRWCD could buy the property then transfer title to the U.S., or they could transfer the property to OMID which would then transfer title to the U.S. (then that money would help establish a fund whose earnings would help pay for the annual O&M costs). Reclamation recommends the Program immediately work with CRWCD to secure property for a reregulating reservoir for this project and work with local, regional and State entities to develop a cost sharing agreement to fund an escrow account that would be utilized by OMID to pay increased O&M costs. Brent outlined a possible scenario for the O&M costs (which would still need to be negotiated): annual costs would be ~\$340K which could possibly come from: 1) increased power plant revenues; 2) interest on the \$1.25M; 3) some funding from Colorado (CWCB); and 4) some small fixed amount from the Recovery Program. The Water Acquisition Committee discussed this yesterday and has recommended that the Management Committee adopt this project with the caveat that acceptable cost-sharing agreements for O&M can be developed to reimburse the District for incremental O&M costs. If the Management Committee approves this proposal, Reclamation also can begin to work this into their 2012 budget proposal. Doug said the Service would support this proposal, but does have concerns about impacts to the Program's annual O&M funding, so the caveat regarding coming to acceptable cost-sharing agreements is important. The Management Committee added this project to the Program's approved capital projects list. Dan Luecke asked the Committee to establish a mechanism for more fully understanding this project. At their August meeting, > the Committee will schedule a future meeting (perhaps with the Water Acquisition Committee) in Grand Junction in late September or early October to more fully discuss the project and take a field tour. >Brent and Randy and Dan and OMID will work on the O&M agreement/concept to try to move it far enough forward to give the District the necessary comfort to close on the property. Brent noted that this certainly isn't a "done deal," at this point, but it allows us to move forward.

8. Extending the Program's cooperative agreement through 2023 – The Implementation Committee concurred with extending the [Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program cooperative agreement](#). A signing ceremony in conjunction with a Wyoming wind energy conference in Laramie around 13-14 August (which Wyoming is requesting that the Secretary attend) was suggested. (The ceremony might be held the afternoon of August 14, either in Laramie or in Denver.) However, responses from the Service's Washington office have not been forthcoming and the Service suggests simply routing the agreement for signature by the Secretary, the Governors, and the Administrator of WAPA if we haven't heard from Washington by June 12. >Brent also will contact Reclamation's liaison in Washington (Chris Cutler), and if we don't have a positive response from the Department by June 12, then Angela Kantola will determine the protocol for circulating the Agreement for signature and we'll proceed with that approach.
9. 2009 basin hydrology update – Jana Mohrman provided an update on the season's hydrological conditions and plans for fish flows (see Attachment 2). CROS operations happened quickly and smoothly this year. The Committee commended the participants for a job well done! The press release process also went very well this year and that will continue in future years.
10. Section 7 and related issues
 - a. [Summary of depletions](#); update on pending “de minimis” exclusion
 - Since 1988 (through March 31, 2009), the Service has consulted on 1,683 projects with a potential to deplete a total of 2,371,566 af in the Upper Colorado River Basin, of which 2,084,938 af are historic depletions.
 - The Service plans to issue a “de minimis” exclusion for future water projects having an average annual depletion of less than 0.1 acre-foot. This should become a reality within the next month or so after administrative details are addressed.
 - b. Update on Aspinall PBO & [EIS](#) – Bob Muth said the draft PBO is out for internal Service review; Brent Uilenberg said Reclamation is working on addressing comments received on the EIS.
 - c. Water Acquisition Committee update on Utah's Green River flow protection, pending Green River depletions, the Aaron Million project, and proposed Little Snake River project(s) – The Water Acquisition Committee discussed items related to Service concerns with upcoming projects on the Green River, Utah's concerns regarding the Million project, and the Recovery Program's concern about year-round flow protection down to the Duchesne River (and then down to the confluence with the Colorado River). Boyd Clayton provided an updated schedule, that will go into the Service's sufficient progress letter: “A schedule and outline of the steps required for both the year-round protection above the Duchesne (to occur in 2009) as well as flow protection below the Duchesne is needed: a) the public meeting held by August 31, and the protection finalized by December 31, 2009; and b) by September 30, 2009, a schedule outlining steps for year-round protection downstream of the Duchesne to the confluence with the Colorado River.” Jana Mohrman thinks the Program participants will want to

be involved and follow this closely. The Committee discussed Aspinall and the Black Canyon water right and John Shields asked that any other summaries on this topic be shared with the Management Committee. Randy believes it would be helpful for Reclamation and/or the Division Engineer to summarize operations each year for the first several years and >he will talk to the Division Engineer about this. (See also draft Water Acquisition Committee meeting summary.)

11. Sufficient progress – Doug Frugé said the Service provided a draft 2009 sufficient progress memo to the Management Committee for review on May 1 and requested comments by May 18. Comments were received (and largely incorporated) from Tom Pitts and follow-up has occurred with CDOW regarding their Yampa River Aquatic Management Plan and with Utah regarding Green River flow protection. With these revisions, the letter will be routed to the Regional Director for signature. Tom Pitts asked that the action items in the memo be put in tabular format for ease of Committee tracking; this is in Attachment 3, and the status will be updated in future meeting agendas and summaries.
12. 2009 work plan update – Most of the projects in the [FY 09 work plan](#) are well underway. 2007-2008 O&M costs for Elkhead releases (to be paid for 2009) have been generally agreed upon (\$70K total) and Reclamation and the District are working out the payment agreement. These costs need to be reflected in a scope of work, along with anticipated 2009 costs (to be paid in 2010). The nonnative synthesis contract has been awarded to CSU. Visits to potential weir sites (Duchesne and Yampa rivers) will occur the week of August 3. Independent of Program funding, CDOW is continuing work to modify upper Yampa River habitat to reduce nonnatives (with funds being raised and further work expected at the Chuck Lewis SWA in 2011). CDOW also will independently pursue their Colorado River fish community assessment (building on Rick Anderson’s previous work); Repairs to the Grand Valley hatchery should be underway shortly (in final negotiations with the contractor; estimated cost of ~\$500K shared between capital and annual base funds). The Program’s scientific library is expected to be available on CWCB’s public [Laserfiche web link](#) within the next month. Dave Speas said a representative from BioMark will be in the Grand Valley on September 29 to look at options for a PIT tag antenna on Price-Stubb (a first step to other potential applications of this technology).
13. Schedule for FY 2010-2011 work plan review and approval – The Program Director's office is working to review and refine the draft FY 2010-2011 scopes of work and develop a recommended technical annual work plan. These will be submitted to the technical committees for review on June 19. Technical committee comments due to the Program Director and the Management Committee by July 15. The Management Committee should meet by mid-August to discuss the recommended work plans and approve projects for the FY 2010-2011 Work Plan (The Implementation Committee may delegate their review and approval to the Management Committee).
14. Environmental groups’ representatives to the Management, Biology, and the Information and Education committees – Tom Iseman is leaving The Nature Conservancy, as he e-mailed the Committee. Mike Roberts will serve as the interim representative to the Management Committee until The Nature Conservancy determines how they will move

forward on this. Dan Luecke said Western Resource Advocates remains committed to the Program and has the funding necessary to continue Dan's involvement. Environmental groups have developed a scope of work for Biology Committee representation and have a list of potential candidates. Funding is available for the next year and they are committed to seeking funding beyond that time. Dan said they recognize they also need to fill a slot on the I&E Committee and are working on that, as well. John Shields said the Committee will help any way they can. John added that the environmental groups' participation on the D.C. trip is also very helpful; Dan agreed, but noted that they have to keep clear delineation of funding sources in this regard. The Program expressed appreciation for Tom Iseman's contributions; >Mike Roberts and Angela will ask Tom if he could come to Bob Muth's picnic on June 24 to receive his Program plaque.

15. Updates

- a. May 19 meeting with Grand Valley water users – Jana said these meetings continue to be very helpful. The Service reported on the biological information (including the good news about the Colorado pikeminnow captured above Price-Stubb) and the water organizations talked about operations. Brent is encouraged at the prospect of the water organizations pooling resources and sharing staff to maintain the fish screen structures. The next meeting will be this fall. Jana will be posting these meeting summaries to the listserv in the future.
- b. [Recovery goals](#) revision – Tom Czapla said the Service team had a conference call last week to review the draft responses to comments received in October. The response to comments from stakeholders should be sent out by the end of June, and the revised goals should go out for peer review at the same time (peer reviewers and timeframe to be determined). After peer review and subsequent revisions, the draft revised goals will be published in the Federal Register for public comment. Tom is aiming to get the goals revised by the end of the fiscal year, or at the very least, at the end of the calendar year. Dave Speas asked if Tom has been in contact with Lesley Fitzpatrick regarding Lake Mead population; Tom said yes and Lesley is preparing language in that regard (studies have shown the Lake Mead population is reproducing and expanding).
- c. Reports status – Angela Kantola provided an updated reports list. Reports on humpback chub population estimates are in draft (Desolation/Gray canyons) or in preparation (Black Rocks and Westwater); however, concerns about field and analytical methodologies need to be addressed and a workshop has been scheduled for June 15-16 in Grand Junction to begin these discussions. Dave Speas asked if he could attend the June workshop and Tom said most certainly. Krissy Wilson also will attend. The research framework project is closer to completion, but still delayed. Rich Valdez and Tom Czapla will work closely over the next 4–6 weeks to develop the draft final report incorporating the RIPRAP actions as they relate to the conceptual model and hypotheses. Jana will be applying TNC's modeling (Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration) to the Price River and White River flow recommendations, compare that to what George Smith prepared previously, then move forward on wrapping up these reports. Dave Speas said development in the upper Price River is inching forward, so

this is a very timely effort. Randy Seaholm said the Elkhead transit loss study will proceed this year. Tom Pitts said he thinks we need to be more aggressive with lat reports because in some cases, they hold up decision-making and adaptive management. Bob Muth added that we need to have good documentation for the reasons behind tardy reports and be sure we agree with that reasoning.

16. Upcoming Management Committee tasks, schedule next meeting (August in Cheyenne) – August 10-11 starting at 1 p.m. on the 10th and adjourning by noon on the 11th, perhaps at Little America (with a backyard BBQ at the Shields’ home on the evening of the 10th). The Program Director’s office will make the meeting arrangements. Agenda items will include review of the draft 2010-2011 work plan and scheduling an OMID field tour in late September/early October. Angela Kantola said the Program Director’s staff will be discussing how to handle meeting summaries while she is Acting Program Director, but if anyone has suggestions or wants to volunteer in that capacity, that would be welcome. Melissa Trammell suggested that Scott Durst or Sharon Whitmore from the San Juan Program might be able to help out.
17. Agenda items for September 24 Implementation Committee meeting – The next Implementation Committee meeting has been scheduled for September 24 from 10:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. at Tri-State’s office in Westminster, CO (the Committee having agreed that September is a better time for them to meet than February). Dave Mazour said lunch could be brought in if the schedule appears tight.
18. Other items – John Shields encouraged everyone to remain diligent and to maintain and continue to grow our organizational capacities, especially as we transition Program Directors.

ADJOURN 2:50 p.m.

Assignments

Carry-over from previous meetings:

1. The **Service** will meet to consider if it would be acceptable to screen the irrigation water and not the low-head hydropower water at Tusher Wash or if there are other ways (e.g., a weir wall) to achieve our objectives for screening Tusher Wash. *Discussions underway; but pending decisions on dam rehabilitation.*
2. The **Program Director’s office** will provide a more specific recommendation regarding establishing a basinwide recovery/conservation oversight team for the endangered fishes.
3. **Brent Uilenberg** will provide revised RIPRAP budget table ASAP. *Pending now that capital funds indexing has been determined.*

4. **John Reber** will notify Steve Guertin (and cc: the rest of the Implementation Committee and the PD's office) that he is now the Park Service's representative on the Implementation Committee.
5. **The Program Director** will further discuss with the Service developing a programmatic biological opinion for the White River when the Gunnison PBO nears completion.
6. **Tom Chart** will discuss with **UDWR** whether the Tusher Wash canal might be a potential site for a weir.

New Assignments

1. **John Shields** will ask Colorado and Utah to help with the joint delegation letter.
2. **Randy Seaholm** will update a relevant Board memo to better explain the issues related to the proposed Ruedi legislation, then **Tom Pitts** will schedule a conference call of the non-federal Program participants (before the August Management Committee meeting).
3. **The Committee** will schedule a future meeting (perhaps with the Water Acquisition Committee) in Grand Junction in late September or early October to more fully understand and discuss the OMID project and take a field tour.
4. **Brent Uilenberg, Randy Seaholm, Dan Birch, and OMID** will work on the O&M agreement/concept to try to move it far enough forward to give the District the necessary comfort to close on the property.
5. **Brent Uilenberg** also will contact Reclamation's liaison in Washington (Chris Cutler) about a signing ceremony to extend the Program's Cooperative Agreement. If we don't have a positive response from the Department by June 12, then **Angela Kantola** will determine the protocol for circulating the Agreement for signature.
6. **Randy Seaholm** will talk to the Division Engineer about Reclamation and/or the Division Engineer summarizing Aspinnall/Black Canyon operations each year for the first several years.
7. **Mike Roberts and Angela Kantola** will ask Tom Iseman if he could come to Bob Muth's picnic on June 24 to receive his Program plaque.

Attachment 1
Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee, Salt Lake City,
June 4, 2009

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg and Tom Ryan	Bureau of Reclamation
Randy Seaholm for Dan McAuliffe	State of Colorado
Robert King	State of Utah
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Doug Frugé for Julie Lyke	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Dave Mazour	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
John Reber	National Park Service
Mike Roberts	The Nature Conservancy
Clayton Palmer	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
Tom Chart	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Czapla	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (via phone)

Others:


Dan Luecke	Western Resource Advocates (via phone)
Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
Dave Speas	Bureau of Reclamation
Jana Mohrman	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Gene Shawcroft	Central Utah Water Conservation District
Krissy Wilson	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Linda Whetton	Bureau of Reclamation
Nancy Coulam	Bureau of Reclamation
Dan Birch	Colorado River Water Conservation District
Pat Bracken	Bureau of Reclamation
Melynda Roberts	Bureau of Reclamation
Kerry Schwartz	Bureau of Reclamation

Attachment 2 Hydrology Update






IMPACT OF EARLY SEASON RESERVOIR RELEASES IN THE GRAND VALLEY (As Measured at the Colorado River at Cameo Gage) 2009 CROS RELEASE





Coordinated Reservoir Operations

	<i>1997</i>	<i>1998</i>	<i>1999</i>	<i>2006</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>
<i>Green Mtn</i>	<i>3,568</i>	<i>12,482</i>	<i>11,010</i>	<i>6,788</i>	<i>2,101</i>	<i>14,094</i>
<i>Ruedi</i>	<i>693</i>	<i>5,106</i>	<i>3,602</i>	<i>6,297</i>	<i>4,848</i>	<i>5,858</i>
<i>Williams Fork</i>	<i>946</i>	<i>1,672</i>	<i>1,543</i>	<i>6,625</i>		<i>5,044</i>
<i>Granby</i>			<i>8,515</i>			
<i>Windy Gap</i>						<i>2,083</i>
<i>Willow Creek</i>			<i>6,631</i>			<i>2,753</i>
<i>Wolford</i>	<i>10,635</i>	<i>4,431</i>	<i>8,555</i>	<i>9,007</i>		<i>13,069</i>
<i>Total Ac-Ft</i>	<i>15,841</i>	<i>23,691</i>	<i>31,301</i>	<i>28,717</i>	<i>6,949</i>	<i>42,901</i>



ATTACHMENT 3

Action Items from the Draft 2009 Sufficient Progress Memo

ACTION ITEM	LEAD	DUE DATE	STATUS
<p>The Service will continue to closely follow the effectiveness of nonnative fish management actions and the responses of the endangered and other native fishes. Data should continue to be reported annually, and necessary changes to nonnative fish management actions should be made in a timely fashion.</p>	<p>FWS, CDOW, UDWR</p>		
<p>A research framework project was initiated in 2005 to conduct additional data analyses to further understand environmental variables and life-history traits influencing the dynamics of Colorado pikeminnow and humpback chub populations. The draft research framework report is behind schedule (originally due in 2007), but is expected in July 2009. Results will be used to refine hypotheses and direct management actions.</p>			
<p>The Flaming Gorge Technical Work Group (Reclamation, the Service, and Western) needs to continue to provide brief updates on current and projected Flaming Gorge operations at Biology Committee meetings.</p>			
<p>The Recovery Program and the Utah's State Engineer's office have been working on mechanisms to protect year-round flows in the Green River; however, this is behind schedule. A schedule and outline of the steps required for both the year-round protection above the Duchesne (to occur in 2009) as well as flow protection below the Duchesne is needed: a) the public meeting held by August 31, and the protection finalized by December 31, 2009; and b) by September 30, 2009, a schedule outlining steps for year-round protection downstream of the Duchesne to the confluence with the Colorado River.</p>			
<p>The Colorado Division of Wildlife will complete the Yampa River Aquatic Management Plan (with an Upper Yampa</p>			

<p>River northern pike strategy) by early July 2009. The Program will use this strategy and available information to evaluate the need to expand northern pike control upstream of Hayden to Steamboat Springs, possibly including removal efforts.</p>			
<p>Now that the Myton Diversion rehabilitation has been completed, the Program, Service, and Duchesne Work Group will work together to determine if any changes are needed in ongoing monitoring efforts necessary to evaluate the flow recommendations.</p>			
<p>Implementation of Coordinated Reservoir Operations (CROS) provided some peak flow augmentation in 2008; however, constraints on operations due to flooding concerns need further investigation to determine the feasibility of further enhancing CROS benefits.</p>			
<p>Work on Coordinated Facilities Operations Project (CFOPS) will resume and is expected to be completed in 2010, but a specific schedule needs to be developed by October 1, 2009.</p>			
<p>Close coordination will be maintained by meeting twice a year with Grand Valley water users and conducting conference calls as needed to discuss river conditions prior to the weekly Historic User Pool calls. The focus should be on taking full advantage of water savings brought about by operation of the Grand Valley Water Management project for late summer flow augmentation.</p>			
<p>The goal of the 10,825 Project is to have agreements signed with the Service prior to December 2009 committing east slope and west slope water users to permanent sources of Ruedi replacement water, as required by the Colorado River programmatic biological opinion.</p>			