



Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Dated: February 17, 2012

October 12, 2011, Management Committee Meeting Final Summary
[Country Inn and Suites](#), 4343 N Airport Way, Denver, Colorado, 303/375-1105

CONVENE: 10:00 a.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper – The agenda was revised as it appears below.
2. Approve [August 10-11, 2011 meeting summary](#) – Angela Kantola posted a revised draft to the listserver on August 22. The summary was approved as revised.
3. Legislative and Congressional activities
 - a. The non-Federal Program participants' recent report to Congress – On October 10, Tom Pitts sent the Committee a copy of the draft report that the non-Federal Program participants submitted in draft to Water & Power Subcommittee staff on October 6. The report addresses the role of stocking in recovery, the status of the fish, and cost-sharing by Federal and non-Federal Program participants.
 - b. New cost-sharing calculations (and getting those incorporated into future *Program Highlights* budget pie charts) – **Replacement Power Costs:** The cost-sharing information included in the draft report to the Water & Power Subcommittee staff is shown in Attachment 3. It is somewhat different than the *Program Highlights* pie charts in that it shows non-federal contributions including replacement power costs of \$37,400,000. This is the estimated cost of replacing power by WAPA or CREDA members resulting from operation of Flaming Gorge Reservoir to meet endangered fish needs. That lost power has to be replaced with purchases from other sources. The initial legislation passed in 2000 included an estimate of \$15 million through 2008 as estimated by WAPA (WAPA's original study estimated \$22M; the legislation recognized \$15M). In 2006, an amendment authorized additional capital project expenditures through 2010 and recognized an additional \$7.1 million in replacement power costs as estimated by WAPA, bringing the total to \$22.1 million. An amendment passed in early 2009 added \$56 million in estimated power replacement costs through 2023. The \$37.4 million is the annualized cost from 2001-2011 based on the total estimated cost of \$78.1 million for 2001-2023. The replacement power costs are considered non-federal contributions, and are based on estimates provided by WAPA. Actual power replacement costs attributable just to Flaming Gorge are not currently being tracked, but Clayton said this can be done (and for Aspinall, as well). The Flaming Gorge EIS included an estimate that the impact of the action alternative, which backcasted to include similar impacts which were implemented in 1995 (via the 1992) Biological Opinion, was \$8.58 million per year (about twice the estimate in the authorizing legislation). For FY95 through FY11, the total would be \$145.86 million. However, this begins prior to the reauthorization period in P.L. 106-392. For

11 years, the cost would be \$94.4 million. The Flaming Gorge estimate was not used in the draft report to Congress because it has not been recognized in P.L. 106-392. We need to determine which estimate to use in the new legislation. The Committee agreed the power replacement costs should be included in our cost reporting. Tom Pitts proposed that >Western report actual costs going back to 2001 and provide the annual power replacement cost for the previous year each January for the *Program Highlights* document. Clayton said Western can do this (via modeling to determine how the dam would have been operated but for endangered fish considerations). John Shields suggested footnoting these contributions to explain that calculation and the assumptions. Clayton and Leslie said they don't believe Western will be able to provide the cost estimate back to 2001 by this January, however (and the 2011 estimate may be \$0 in light of the high flows this year). Therefore, we won't put these actual power replacement costs into the briefing book until 2013 (suggest Western provide the actual costs to the Management Committee for review by July 2012), but will use the \$37.4M annualized estimate in the 2012 *Program Highlights*, with a footnote explaining that these estimates will be verified beginning in 2013. With regard to Aspinall, Tom Chart asked how Western will tease out operations related to the Black Canyon water right versus endangered fish releases; Clayton said they would not attribute Black Canyon releases to endangered fish. **Other Costs:** Program participants have incurred substantial costs due to participation in the Program. Most of these costs are not currently considered as non-federal costs or non-federal contributions. Should they be? If so, how do we track and recognize them? Native American tribes, water users, and other parties have been contributing costs that we haven't shown (e.g., the Granby component of 10,825 which is estimated at \$16M, \$1.25M contributed by Colorado for GVWM and \$1.5M for OMID, CRWCD contributed property for OMID, etc.). After discussing a range of options, the Committee agreed to show the costs identified in parentheses above, but decided not to try to track smaller additional contributions (e.g., technical committee costs by Program participants not currently reporting those, various indirect costs not currently reported by Federal and State Program participants, etc.) or costs for participation in the Management Committee and above. >Tom Chart will ask Dave Campbell to work with the SJCC to determine their additional costs not currently reported.

- c. The meeting to be scheduled between Reps. Bishop and McClintock – John Shields said he and Tom Pitts have contacted Kiel Weaver to discuss this. The annual funding legislation will be introduced in the House after this meeting.
 - d. How the legislation may address “cutgo” requirements – John Shields said he and Tom Pitts have contacted Kiel Weaver to discuss this, also.
 - e. Scheduling a Congressional conference call after the legislation is introduced – John Shields said this will be scheduled as soon as a bill is introduced.
4. FY 2012 Budget Update – As reported to the Implementation Committee, Reclamation pre-obligated FY11 appropriated funds to make the Upper Colorado and San Juan recovery programs' FY12 budgets essentially whole. However, this was a one-year solution, only, so the Program has to get the legislation passed for 2013 and beyond.

5. Flaming Gorge Trigger – On 9/30/11, the Biology Committee discussed Tom Chart’s draft responses to Reclamation's recent questions about how the Recovery Program intends to incorporate new information presented in the Floodplain Synthesis (Bestgen et al. 2011) regarding the timing of Green and Yampa river spring peak hydrology (floodplain inundation in Reach 2) and the presence of larval native suckers. (See 9/26/11 e-mail from Tom Chart and Biology Committee meeting summary posted to fws-coloriver listserver October 11.) The responses discuss how we would apply this larval trigger in an experimental context. To put those responses into a study plan context this winter, the Biology Committee formed an ad hoc committee (which Kirk LaGory will likely chair on behalf of Western). Tom anticipates the spring flow request letter would then reference the study plan. Following that, Reclamation will address whether they have the flexibility to implement that experimentation/study plan under the ROD. Clayton said Western supports field studies needed to support the policy questions regarding timing and magnitude of releases. Reclamation has been able to achieve the 18,600 cfs target for several years, but achieving that target post-Yampa peak would take much more water from Flaming Gorge.
6. Process for Reviewing Flaming Gorge Flow & Temperature Recommendations – On 9/30/11, the Biology Committee discussed how and when the Recovery Program will assess / evaluate Muth et al. 2000 as per recovery action # I.D.2 in the Green River mainstem portion of the RIPRAP and the broader Program progress on information needs identified in the Green River Study Plan. Tom Pitts suggested also addressing questions Western raised some years ago about the flow recommendations and floodplain inundation as part of this process; Clayton and others said those are being addressed. Robert King asked if this study plan and review of the flow recommendations could affect Utah’s modeling and assessment of flow protection. Tom Chart said he doesn’t see anything at this point that would cause any major changes in the flow recommendations and encouraged Utah to continue full speed ahead. Tom Chart said he outlined for the Biology Committee how we will fill in data gaps and begin the overall evaluation of the flow recommendations in 2013 (Tom would like to revise the RIPRAP to reflect that; Angela has noted this in her RIPRAP file).
7. Price River Report – Tom Chart said Price River investigations in the mid-90’s found relatively strong concentrations of juvenile and adult pikeminnow (Recovery Program report, Cavalli 1999); however, the USGS stream gage in the lower Price River was not in operation during that study. The new information caused the Service to reinstate consultation on the Narrows project. A resulting RPA in that consultation directed the Recovery Program to further assess endangered fish flow needs in the Price River. A follow-up Recovery Program study occurred during very dry hydrologies and didn’t add much to the previously-collected information. UDWR drafted a minimum flow recommendation (53 cfs) in 2005, but the Biology Committee didn’t think enough data had been collected to support this. An attempt was made to use 1996-1997 flow data collected in the San Rafael River, a nearby tributary, as a surrogate to approximate flow conditions in the lower Price River during Pete Cavalli’s 1996-1997 field work. In this position paper, Tom and Jana characterized the local hydrology by looking at three nearby gages that were operational in 1996 and 1997 to direct them to similar exceedances in the available Woodside, Utah (lower Price River) hydrologic record. Based on this, they made the case that 30 cfs was likely the minimum flow during the summer and fall of 1996 in the lower Price River. They determined that this minimum currently occurs in ~50% of years. The paper also recognizes the importance of the Price River for other native fishes (and those

fishes as forage for endangered fish), recommends minimizing years when the river goes dry, and recommends identifying a pool of fish water to keep the river wet. The Biology Committee considered the revised draft report on September 30. Water users still want to discuss some technical issues on the hydrologic analyses with Tom Chart and Jana Mohrman, but the Biology Committee is ready to approve the report assuming those issues are resolved to Tom Pitts' and the Committee's satisfaction. Tom Pitts also has some policy concerns with the report dealing with consistency with the Section 7 Agreement and how it treats compliance for water projects on tributaries. Tom Pitts hopes to provide a summary of these concerns by the end of the month. Ultimately, the report will come to the Management Committee for approval. The Service has said they would like to see the report completed this fall to keep their Section 7 consultation considerations in step with the Narrows EIS. Tom Chart will be working with Tom Pitts and the Biology Committee to get the report back to the Management Committee as quickly as possible (a Management Committee conference call may be needed).

8. Capital projects update and approval to use NFWF capital funds to determine solution to the manganese problem at Ouray NFH – Brent Uilenberg updated the Committee on the OMID O&M account. The OMID canal check structures will be the first construction item in 2012-2013. The Horsethief Rearing Ponds contract went to Kissner Construction and the project came in under the original estimate. The ponds are scheduled for completion early summer 2012, assuming we don't have an unusually severe winter. Brent's been working with the Program Director's office regarding issues of importing fish from Horsethief into Utah. Tom Czapla said Krissy Wilson told him a variance should only be needed for whirling disease, but UDWR recommends waiting until we're about a year out from stocking to seek that variance in case there's more than one aquatic invasive species we have to address. Tom Chart recommended seeking the variance now. Brent said ~300' of levee was damaged at Thunder Ranch during the high spring flows and will be repaired next March. The Biology Committee would like to be able to hold water at greater depth at that site, but before committing installing a gate structure, Reclamation and the Committee have recommended a temporary earthen plug at the Thunder Ranch outlet channel to determine if the site can retain water. Clayton said perhaps current research may help inform to what degree we might want to use Thunder Ranch as a flow thru vs. single breach floodplain site. The Hogback Fish Barrier contracts are now in place in the San Juan Program; Brent would like to award a contract in late 2012. If we get \$5.8M of capital funds in FY12, Brent would like to move the \$2.8M identified for the San Juan in 2013 into 2012 and reduce OMID by that amount for 2012. This may push OMID completion to 2015, depending on budgets. Brent reported that outside of the Program, Reclamation has been working with the Service on a Selenium Management Plan and Colorado has been pursuing Funds, so we may see ~\$20M of irrigation system improvements in the Gunnison Basin (this will allow Reclamation to meet commitments in the Aspinall BO). Brent referred to the \$27K proposal for a contractor to review the Ouray NFH manganese problem and recommend a solution (see 9/28/11 e-mail from Angela Kantola). Tom Czapla said what may be needed is an additional filter to allow improved operation. Brent also discussed the \$6,500 for the OMID cultural resources survey. The Committee approved both expenditures.

9. Updates

- a. [10,825 Alternatives](#) & agreements update and Status of Ruedi legislation – Tom Pitts

provided an update on the Lake Granby (~\$16M) and Ruedi permanent sources. NEPA is underway and Tom Pitts recently requested Program participants let Reclamation know of their support for the preferred alternative and FONSI. Hopefully, the ROD will be completed by the end of November and contract negotiations concluded in early to mid-2012. The legislation piece is on hold until after the contract with the River District is done (2012).

- b. Aspinall [EIS](#) – Brent Uilenberg said comments were accepted from cooperators in September and are being incorporated in the final EIS. The intent is to complete a final EIS by April 2012 (and be able to operate to provide fish flows in the spring). Clayton Palmer said Western as a cooperating agency would like to see a draft ROD. John Shields said he also would like to see a draft ROD and thinks other Program participants would, as well. If it's not possible for Reclamation to share the draft ROD with cooperators and the Management Committee, >Reclamation will notify the Committee. Clayton said Western wants to see the ROD completed, but they want to make sure it's right. Therefore, they would like the Service to consider the implications for sufficient progress if the preferred alternative weren't implemented this spring. Tom Pitts noted it may be difficult for the Service to answer this since they consider progress and fish status basinwide in making their sufficient progress call. Tom Chart agreed, but reiterated the Service's Western Colorado Area Offices's specific concern that future water depletions continue to tier off the Gunnison PBO.
 - c. Draft Basin-wide Nonnative and Invasive Aquatic Species Prevention and Control Strategy – Tom Chart said the draft strategy was sent to the Biology and Management committees on 8/29/11 and comments have been received from several people. After we get tacit buy-in from the Biology and Management committees, we'll seek external peer review. Comments were officially due October 3, but the Nonnative Fish Subcommittee will meet November 28 (with participation from Randy Hampton or someone else from the Information and Education Committee), so comments may still come in until then. Pat is meeting with the States (with law enforcement participation) to discuss illicit stocking next week.
 - d. Lake Nighthorse Campbell fish stocking – Harry said Colorado Parks and Wildlife issued a draft management plan that included stocking of nonnative warmwater fishes; then withdrew that plan with the intent to re-issue it after the San Juan Program develops nonnative fish stocking procedures. Draft procedures are being considered, but New Mexico apparently is not yet comfortable with it (it could require them to change statute). Eventually, Colorado does need to re-issue a draft lake management plan.
 - e. Recovery plan schedule and recovery timelines – Tom Czapla is incorporating Service comments (Regions 6, 8, and 2) for the 5-year status reviews for bonytail and razorback sucker and hopes to have those in the surnaming process within the next two weeks with the intent of finalizing them by the end of 2011.
10. Review previous meeting assignments and sufficient progress action items – See Attachments 2 and 4.

11. Washington, D.C., briefing trip – In light of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference March 12-17 (during which many Service staff are unavailable), and Leslie James' being unavailable March 22-23, the Committee proposed holding the D.C. briefing meetings March 14-19, with John Shields and a few others flying out late on the 20th in case any meetings have to be scheduled for the morning of the 20th. John Shields will >contact the Capitol Visitor's Center to get the luncheon meeting room on the 16th. >John also will let the San Juan Coordination Committee know about these proposed dates.

12. Upcoming Management Committee tasks, schedule next meeting. The Committee scheduled a webinar for February 13 from 9-3 with a break for lunch from 12-1. Committee members are encouraged to attend the annual researcher's meeting in Grand Junction January 24-25. Shields went to river restoration conference last month; USBR has prepared a summary of the river restoration efforts they're involved with across the west. John said it was interesting to hear Mike Connor say he'd like Reclamation to become as well known for restoring rivers over the next decade as they've been known for building reservoirs in the past. John said Andrea Gerlak at the University of Arizona spoke at the conference; she's studied collaborative efforts across the west and John might like to invite her to come talk to the Management Committee at some point (a la a retreat/brainstorming effort); the Committee thought this was a good idea.

ADJOURN: 3:38 p.m.

Attachment 1: Attendees
Colorado River Management Committee, Denver, Colorado, October 12, 2011

Management Committee Voting Members:

Brent Uilenberg	Bureau of Reclamation
Rebecca Mitchell	State of Colorado
Tom Pitts	Upper Basin Water Users
John Shields	State of Wyoming
Julie Lyke	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Melissa Trammell	National Park Service
Mike Roberts (via phone)	The Nature Conservancy
Clayton Palmer	Western Area Power Administration
Leslie James	Colorado River Energy Distributors Association
Robert King	State of Utah

Nonvoting Member:

Tom Chart	Recovery Program Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
-----------	---

Recovery Program Staff:

Tom Czapla	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Angela Kantola	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Others

Jerry Wilhite	Western Area Power Administration
Michelle Garrison	Colorado Water Conservation Board
Dave Speas (via phone)	Bureau of Reclamation
Harry Crockett	Colorado Parks and Wildlife
Adam Bergeron	The Nature Conservancy

Attachment 2

1. The **Management Committee** will consider naming a floodplain site for Pat Nelson. *The Service's Grand Junction field office is considering what might be an appropriate location. We do have a memorial to Pat on the pikeminnow bench at Walter Walker SWA.*
2. The **Program Director's office** will ask Ouray NWR to document their floodplain management recommendations in their draft FY 12-13 easement scope of work (and also ask how the Program might better participate in the Refuge's planning process). *Pending: See related discussion in the October 12, 2011 meeting summary regarding Thunder Ranch, which addresses one of ONWR's and the BC's highest priorities. PD's office is discussing with Ouray NWR.*
3. By September 30, 2011, as required in the RIPRAP, the **Water Acquisition Committee** will review mechanisms of current flow protection under the PBO's for the Yampa and Colorado rivers to determine if additional mechanisms or instream flow filings are needed at this time (and this will be reviewed every 5 years). This discussion will include whether or not depletion accounting is working (are we able to adequately document depletions); however, the depletion accounting does not need to be completed in order to determine if additional mechanisms or instream flow filings are needed at this time. Peak flows on the Yampa should be discussed, but a peak flow recommendation may be the first step in this process. *7/19/11: WAC began discussing this; tabled until next call. 10/12/11: Mike Roberts has discussed with Jana and suggested RIPRAP language: "The WAC can revisit the question of flow protection in the Yampa River at any point during, but not to exceed, five years to determine if instream flow filings or other protective mechanisms are appropriate at that time." The notes section of the RIPRAP reporting status would be updated to read: "At the terminus of this five year interval, the WAC determined that additional and permanent protection, in the form of instream flow filings, was not deemed necessary at this time." The WAC will consider this on their next conference call. Melissa Trammell said NPS is funding a synthesis of available sediment information, which may provide information for a peak flow recommendation.*
4. **Tom Pitts** will work with **Clayton Palmer and Brent Uilenberg** and provide a list of additional Program contributions to be added to the Program's budget pie chart that appears in each year's briefing book. *In process; see discussion in agenda item #3.b.* For the 2012 *Program Highlights*, we will use the \$37.4M annualized estimate. By July 2012, **WAPA** will complete modeling and report actual power replacement costs going back to 2001. Subsequently, **WAPA** will provide annual power replacement cost for the previous year each January for inclusion in the *Program Highlights* pie charts. Those pie charts will include a footnote explaining the calculation and assumptions (the 2012 footnote will explain that these are annualized estimates which will be verified beginning in 2013). **Program participants** will identify other significant costs that have not previously reported (e.g., the Granby component of 10,825 which is estimated at \$16M, \$1.25M contributed by Colorado for GVWM and \$1.5M for OMID, CRWCD contributed property for OMID, etc.). **Tom Chart** will ask **Dave Campbell** to work with the SJCC to determine their additional costs not currently reported.
5. **Brent Uilenberg** will modify the OMID scope of work to reflect the ITRC contract to design

the SCADA system. The **PD's office** will post the revised SOW to the web. *Pending.*

6. The **Service and Biology Committee** will work on answering the questions Reclamation has raised about the Flaming Gorge trigger and the **Management Committee** will receive updates. *During their September 30, 2011 webinar, the BC recommended an ad Hoc effort to develop a "Larval Trigger Study Plan" which is intended to be responsive to Reclamation's question and will inform future Recovery Prom spring flow requests.*
7. **John Shields** will prepare and share a separate summary of the roundtable discussion with the San Joaquin River Restoration Program participants. *Pending.*
8. If it's not possible for Reclamation to share the draft Aspinall ROD with cooperators and the Management Committee, **Reclamation** will notify the Management Committee. Western would like the **Service** to consider the implications for sufficient progress if the preferred alternative weren't implemented this spring.
9. **John Shields** will contact the Capitol Visitor's Center to get the luncheon meeting room on the March 16th. **John** also will let the San Juan Coordination Committee know about the proposed March 14-19, 2012 dates for the D.C. briefing meetings.

Attachment 3

From Non-Federal Program Participants 9/30/11 Draft Report To Water & Power Subcommittee

Table 9. Cost Sharing of Upper Colorado (1989-2011) & San Juan (1992-2011)

Endangered Fish Recovery Programs

NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS	
<i>SOURCE</i>	<i>AMOUNT</i>
Colorado	\$19,489,100
New Mexico	\$1,482,180
Utah	\$5,593,900
Wyoming	\$2,474,200
Jicarilla Apache Tribe	\$19,000
Southern Ute Indian Tribe	\$1,589,234
Replacement Power Costs*	\$37,400,000
Power Revenues – Capital Funding	\$16,993,620
Water Users	\$8,594,400
Subtotal Non-Federal Contributions	\$93,635,634
POWER REVENUE BASE FUNDING	
<i>SOURCE</i>	<i>AMOUNT</i>
Annual Funding – Power Revenues	\$93,090,607
Subtotal Power Revenue Base Funding	\$93,090,607
FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS	
<i>AGENCY</i>	<i>AMOUNT</i>
Bureau of Reclamation (Capital)	\$79,809,039
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service	\$28,739,824
Bureau of Indian Affairs	\$6,461,000
Bureau of Land Management	\$350,000
Subtotal Federal Appropriations	\$115,359,863
OTHER FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS	
<i>SOURCE</i>	<i>AMOUNT</i>
Bureau of Reclamation: Capital Cost Credit for Ruedi Reservoir Releases (beginning in FY03)	\$6,615,000
Subtotal Other Federal Contributions	\$6,615,000
TOTAL	\$308,701,104

*Based on replacement power costs (annualized) recognized by Congress in P.L. 106-392, 2001-2011.

General – Upper Basin-wide				
#	Recommended Action Items	Lead	Due Date	Status
1	Cory Williams to send revised draft sediment report to USGS editorial by June 1, then revise & send to BC/WAC for final approval by August 1.	USGS	8/1/11	Sent to BC/WAC July 22; BC/WAC review webinar scheduled for October 13. 10/13/11: Report approved with minor revisions.
2	The Program Director's office will work with the signatories to the Nonnative Fish Stocking Policy to develop a Nonnative Fish Strategy that squarely addresses the issue of illicit stocking (draft due 9/1/11).	USFWS-PD	9/1/11	Draft strategy sent to BC 8/29/11. Tom Chart also sent a letter to the States about illicit introductions and addressing this issue in the nonnative fish strategy. 10/12/11: Pat Martinez, the Service, and the Upper Basin states will meet on October 17, 2011 to discuss illicit introductions.
3	The Larval Fish Lab is scheduled to submit the draft razorback monitoring plan by May 31, 2011.	LFL	5/31/11	Behind schedule, but larval razorback monitoring is included in draft FY12-13 Work Plan in project #22f, #160 & #163, as well as an additional placeholder,
4	The Program Director's Office will monitor results from ongoing humpback chub population estimates (Deso-Gray 2010-2011; Black Rocks and Westwater 2011-2012 and monitoring (Cataract Canyon annual CPUE; Yampa River information gathered through nonnative fish management projects). The Program Director's Office will convene a panel to discuss humpback chub genetics and captivity and identify actions necessary to ensure the survival and recovery of humpback chub and an implementation plan for those actions in 2011.	USFWS-PD		The Program Director's Office has assembled an ad hoc group (three geneticists and Rich Valdez, Melissa Trammell, and Brandon Albrecht) to work on a humpback chub genetics management plan. They will have an initial conference call in early November.
Green River				
5	The Program Director's Office will provide a draft Upper Basin Nonnative Fish Strategy for Program review by September 1, 2011. This strategy will identify actions needed to prevent introduction of new invasive species and also identify actions to eliminate newly-emerging invasives such as burbot and gizzard shad.	USFWS-PD	9/1/11	Draft strategy sent to BC 8/29/11. The NNF SubComm is scheduled to meet on Nov 28, 2011 to discuss / review.
6	The Program Director's Office will provide a final draft Role of the Price River in Recovery of Endangered Fish and the Need for Flow Management for Program review by July 1.	USFWS-PD	7/1/11	Provided. Submitted 6/21/11 and discussed at 7/11-12/11 BC meeting. BC discussed on September 30 webinar; Tom Chart, Jana Mohrman, and Tom Pitts discussing technical issues; Tom Pitts will provide summary of policy issues to Management Committee.
7	The Tusher Wash Ad Hoc Group is gathering information (literature review to be completed in summer 2011, and a potential mortality study, if needed and funding available) to develop a screening recommendation.	Tusher Wash Ad Hoc Group		10/12/11: PD's office asked Reclamation if description/specifications of the current Tusher hardware could help us understand if it can be retrofitted. PD's office reconvening ad hoc group to discuss who should do the literature review.
Yampa River				
8	The Water Acquisition Committee will review mechanisms of current flow protection under the RIPRAP for both the Yampa and Colorado rivers to determine if additional mechanisms or instream flow filings are needed at this time (this will be reviewed every 5 years). As part of this review, the Committee will discuss the need for peak flow protection (which would require a peak flow recommendation).	WAC		7/19/11: WAC began discussing this; tabled until next call. MC: WAC needs to make call on whether instream flow filings currently necessary AND add language to RIPRAP to allow review before 5 more years, if needed. Also need to consider whether additional mechanisms for flow protection are needed. 10/12/11: Language has been proposed for WAC consideration.

9	CWCB will create a Consumptive Uses & Losses Report for 1975-2009, compare those to the old 1975-1998 numbers, and compare their new estimates for 1975-1998 to 1999-2009. The StateCU model will be completed by June 1, 2011; Subsequently, meetings will be held with TNC to discuss StateMOD. CWCB, the Service, and the Water Acquisition Committee also should discuss whether we are able to adequately document depletions.	CWCB, FWS, TNC, WAC	6/1/11	8/11/11: CWCB intends to produce this report by 12/31/11.
10	CSU will complete the programmatic synthesis of smallmouth bass removal efforts (2012) which will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the Program's removal efforts as well as a thorough assessment of escapement.	CSU-LFL	8/31/2012	Draft final report due to Recovery Program 8/31/2012.
11	CSU will conduct a programmatic synthesis of northern pike removal efforts (2011-2012) which will evaluate current removal efforts in the context of northern pike life history throughout the Yampa River drainage. The Service supports the Program Director's Office recommendation that there be additional emphasis on northern pike control above Hayden.	CSU-LFL	6/30/13	Draft final report due to Recovery Program 6/30/13.
White River				
12	The Program Director's Office will submit a draft flow recommendations report to BC/WAC by July 1, 2011. Program participants have initiated efforts to develop a White River Management Plan that likely will lead to a programmatic biological opinion.	USFWS-PD	7/1/11	Draft report submitted July 1, 2011. Jana updated Biology Committee on comments received (some of which are conflicting) during September 30 webinar. Comments due November 2.
Colorado River				
13	Recovery Program participants will consider options and opportunities for meeting flow recommendations on a more consistent basis after completion of 10,825 EA and agreements.	Program	Pending	
14	Recovery Program participants will complete the final CFOPS report by September 30, 2011.	Program	9/30/11	2008, 2009, and 2010 CROS reports that will allow completion of the assessment of the potential benefits of CFOPS distributed. Conference call held 8/3/11, schedule revised: draft report to CFOPS team by 10/11/11, to WAC 11/18/11; final to Program 12/16/11.
15	The Service will document condition of a surrogate species (white sucker) below the Grand Valley Irrigation Company return pipe (begins July 2011).	USFWS	2011	This work had to be deferred to 2012 due to high flows. Results and recommendations to be documented in the 2012 annual report.
16	CDOW and the Recovery Program have coordinated with Parks so that the 2011 unscreened outlet release will be scheduled in the summer when oxygen is depleted at depth to prevent fish escapement. The Recovery Program also will coordinate with Parks to revise the scope of work accordingly (to assure that unscreened outlet releases only occur when oxygen levels are ≤ 2 mg/l).	CP&W	2011	In progress and SOW revised.
Gunnison River				
17	The Aspinall Study Plan will begin to be implemented in FY11. Reclamation will complete the final Aspinall Environmental Impact Statement by December 31, 2011.	Program/Reclamation	2011	SOW at http://www.coloradoriverrecovery.org/documents-publications/work-plan-documents/sow/10-11/rsch/163.pdf . Final ROD now expected in early 2012 prior to spring runoff.