

PREFACE

This document was originally finalized on October 15, 1993. Part One received a minor revision on March 8, 2000, to accommodate programmatic biological opinions. Part Two has been revised to accommodate annual updates, designation of critical habitat for the endangered fishes, and development of specific recovery goals for each of the species.

PART ONE: Section 7 Consultation, Sufficient Progress, and Historic Projects Agreement

Sections 4.1.5, 4.1.6, and 5.3.4 of the Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fish Species in the Upper Colorado River Basin (Recovery Program) outline procedures for consultation pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act on water projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin. The Section 7 Agreement (including Section 7 Consultation, Sufficient Progress, and Historic Projects Agreement) was developed by Recovery Program participants to clarify how Section 7 consultations will be conducted on water depletion impacts related to new projects and impacts associated with historic projects (existing projects requiring a new Federal action) in the Upper Basin.

PART TWO: Recovery Implementation Program Recovery Action Plan

The Recovery Implementation Program Recovery Action Plan (RIPRAP) was developed by the Recovery Program participants in support of the Section 7 Agreement using the best, most current information available and the recovery goals for the four endangered fish species. It identifies specific actions and time frames currently believed to be required to recover the endangered fishes in the most expeditious manner in the Upper Basin. The RIPRAP is the Recovery Program's long range plan. It contains dates for accomplishing specific actions over the next 5 years and beyond. The RIPRAP will serve as a measure of accomplishment so that the Recovery Program can continue to serve as a reasonable and prudent alternative for projects undergoing Section 7 consultation to avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to the continued existence of the endangered fishes as well as to avoid the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

PART ONE:

RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
SECTION 7 CONSULTATION, SUFFICIENT PROGRESS,
AND HISTORIC PROJECTS AGREEMENT

Agreement

Section 7 Consultation, Sufficient Progress, and Historic Projects

Recovery Implementation Program for the Endangered Fish Species in the Upper Colorado River Basin

October 15, 1993

Revised March 8, 2000

I. Background

The Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fish Species in the Upper Colorado River Basin (RIP) is intended to go considerably beyond offsetting water depletion impacts by providing for the full recovery of the four endangered fishes. The RIP participants recognize that timely progress toward recovery in accordance with a well-defined action plan is essential to the purposes of the RIP, including both the recovery of the endangered fishes and providing for water development to proceed in compliance with State law, Interstate Compacts, and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Recovery activities which result in significant protection and improvement of the endangered fish populations and their habitat need to receive high priority in future planning, budgeting, and decision making. The RIP participants accept that certain positive population responses to RIP initiatives are not likely to be measurable for many years due to the time required for the endangered fishes to reach reproductive maturity, limited knowledge about their life history and habitat requirements, sampling difficulties and limitations, and other factors. The RIP participants also recognize that further degradation of endangered fish habitats and populations will make recovery increasingly difficult.

II. RIP Recovery Action Plan (RIPRAP)

The Recovery Action Plan (RIPRAP) identifies actions currently believed to be required to recover the endangered fishes in the most expeditious manner possible in the upper basin. It has been developed using the best information available and the recovery goals established for the four endangered fish species. By reference, the RIPRAP is incorporated and considered part of this agreement. The RIPRAP will be an adaptive management plan because additional information, changing priorities, and the development of the States' entitlement may require modifications to the RIPRAP. The RIPRAP will be reviewed annually and modified or updated, if necessary, by September 30 of each year or prior to adoption of the annual work plan, whichever comes first. The RIPRAP will serve as a guide for all future planning, research, and recovery efforts, including the annual work-planning and budget decision process.

The RIP is intended to provide the reasonable and prudent alternatives for projects undergoing Section 7 consultation in the upper basin. While some recovery actions in the RIPRAP are expected to have more direct or immediate benefits for the endangered fishes than others, all are considered necessary to accomplish the objectives of the RIP. Recovery actions which protect or improve habitat conditions and result in more immediate, positive population responses will be most important in determining the extent to which the RIP provides the reasonable and prudent alternatives for projects undergoing Section 7 consultation. In general, these actions will be given highest priority in the RIPRAP.

The Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) will determine whether progress by the RIP provides a reasonable and prudent alternative based on the following factors:

- a. Actions which result in a measurable population response, a measurable improvement in habitat for the fishes, legal protection of flows needed for recovery, or a reduction in the threat of immediate extinction.
- b. Status of fish population.
- c. Adequacy of flows.
- d. Magnitude of the impact of projects.

Therefore, these factors were considered in the development and prioritization of the recovery actions in the RIPRAP.

III. Framework for Agreement

The following describes the agreement among RIP participants on a framework for conducting Section 7 consultations on depletion impacts related to new projects (as defined in Section 4.1.5 a. of the RIP) and impacts¹ associated with historic projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin. This agreement is meant to supplement and clarify the process outlined in Sections 4.1.5, 4.1.6 and 5.3.4 of the RIP. This agreement applies only to the four Colorado River endangered fishes in the Upper Colorado River Basin, excluding the San Juan River, and is not a precedent for other endangered species or locations.

1. Activities and accomplishments under the RIP are intended to provide the reasonable and prudent alternatives which avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to the continued existence of the endangered Colorado River fishes (hereinafter the "reasonable and prudent alternative") resulting from depletion impacts of new projects and all existing or past impacts related to historic projects with the exception of the discharge by historic projects of pollutants such as trace elements, heavy metals, and pesticides. However, where a programmatic biological opinion applies, the appropriate provisions of such an opinion will apply to future individual consultations.

The RIP participants intend the RIP also to provide the reasonable and prudent alternatives which avoid the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat, to the same extent as it does to avoid the likelihood of jeopardy. Once critical habitat for the endangered fishes is formally designated, the RIP participants will make any necessary amendments to the RIPRAP to fulfill such intent.

2. The RIP is intended to offset both the direct and depletion impacts of historic projects occurring prior to January 22, 1988 (the date when the Cooperative Agreement for the RIP was executed) if such offsets are needed to recover the fishes. Under certain circumstances, historic projects may be subject to consultation under Section 7 of the ESA. An increase in depletions from a historic project occurring after January 22, 1988, will be subject to the depletion charge. Except for the circumstances described in item 11 below, depletion charges or other measures will

¹ All impacts except the discharge of pollutants such as trace elements, heavy metals, and pesticides.

not be required from historic projects which undergo Section 7 consultation in the future.

3. The Bureau of Reclamation (BR) and the Western Area Power Administration will operate projects authorized and funded pursuant to Federal reclamation law consistent with its responsibilities under Section 7 of the ESA and with any existing contracts. No depletion charge will be required on depletions from BR projects as long as BR continues its contributions to the RIP's annual budget.
4. The FWS will assess the impacts of projects that require Section 7 consultation and determine if progress toward recovery has been sufficient for the RIP to serve as a reasonable and prudent alternative. The FWS will use accomplishments under the RIP as its measure of sufficient progress. The FWS will also consider whether the probable success of the RIP is compromised as a result of a specific depletion or the cumulative effect of depletions. Support activities (funding, research, information and education, etc.) in the RIP contribute to sufficient progress to the extent that they help achieve a measurable population response, a measurable improvement in habitat for the fishes, legal protection of flows needed for recovery, or a reduction in the threat of immediate extinction. Generally, sufficient progress will be evaluated separately for the Colorado and Green River subbasins (but not individual tributaries within each subbasin). However, the FWS will give due consideration to progress throughout the upper basin in evaluating sufficient progress.
5. If sufficient progress is being achieved, biological opinions will identify the activities and accomplishments of the RIP that support it serving as a reasonable and prudent alternative.
6. If sufficient progress is not being achieved, biological opinions for new and historic projects will be written to identify which action(s) in the RIPRAP must be completed to avoid jeopardy. Specific recovery actions will be implemented according to the schedule identified in the RIPRAP. The FWS will confer with the Management Committee on the identification of these actions within established timeframes for the Section 7 consultation. For historic projects, these actions will serve as the reasonable and prudent alternative as long as they are completed according to the schedule identified in the RIPRAP. For new projects, these actions will serve as a reasonable and prudent alternative so long as they are completed before the impact of the project occurs. The FWS has ultimate authority and responsibility for determining whether progress is sufficient to enable it to rely upon the RIP as a reasonable and prudent alternative and identifying actions necessary to avoid jeopardy.
7. Certain situations may result in the FWS determining that the recovery action in previously rendered biological opinions are no longer serving as a reasonable and prudent alternative. These situations may include, but are not limited, to:
 - a. Critical deadlines for specified recovery actions are missed;
 - b. Specified recovery actions are determined to be infeasible; and
 - c. Significant new information about the needs or population status of the fishes becomes available;
8. The FWS will notify the Implementation and Management Committees when a situation may result in the RIP not serving as a reasonable and prudent alternative.

The Management Committee will work with the FWS to evaluate the situation and develop the most appropriate response to restore the RIP as a reasonable and prudent alternative (such as adjusting a recovery action so it can be achieved, developing a supplemental recovery action, shortening the timeframe on other recovery actions, etc.).

9. The RIP is responsible for providing flows which the FWS determines are essential to recovery of the endangered fishes. Whether or not a Section 7 review is required, the RIP will work cooperatively with the owners/operators of historic projects on a voluntary basis to implement recovery actions needed to recover the endangered fishes.
10. The responsibility for the efficiency and effectiveness of the RIP, and for its viability as a reasonable and prudent alternative, rests upon RIP participants, not with individual project proponents. RIP participants fully share that responsibility.
11. If the RIP cannot be restored to provide the reasonable and prudent alternative per item 8, above, as a last resort the FWS will develop a reasonable and prudent alternative, if available, with the lead Federal Agency and the project proponent. (RIP participants recognize that such actions would be inconsistent with the intended operation of the RIP). The option of requesting a depletion charge on historic projects or other measures on new or historic projects will only be used in the event that the RIPRAP does not or can not be amended to serve as a reasonable and prudent alternative. In this situation, the reasonable and prudent alternative will be consistent with the intended purpose of the action, within the Federal Agency's legal authority and jurisdiction to implement, and will be economically and technologically feasible.
12. This agreement becomes effective upon adoption of the RIPRAP by the Implementation Committee. Until the RIPRAP is adopted, the FWS will use the procedures in this agreement and the January 1993, draft RIPRAP as the basis for identifying reasonable and prudent alternatives.
13. Experience may dictate a need to modify this agreement in the future. This agreement may be modified or amended by consensus of all the RIP participants. A review of the agreement may be initiated by any voting member of the Implementation Committee.

PART TWO:

RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
RECOVERY ACTION PLAN
(RIPRAP)

**RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
RECOVERY ACTION PLAN
(RIPRAP)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	RECOVERY PROGRAM PURPOSE	1
1.2	SPECIES RECOVERY GOALS	1
1.3	RECOVERY ACTION PLAN PURPOSE	2
1.4	ESTIMATED COST OF RECOVERY ACTIONS	2
1.5	MEASURING PROGRESS TOWARD RECOVERY AND SCHEDULING RIPRAP ACTIVITIES	3
1.6	RECOVERY ACTION PLAN STRUCTURE	3
2.0	DISCUSSION OF RECOVERY ACTION PLAN ELEMENTS	4
2.1	I. IDENTIFY AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT)	4
2.2	II. RESTORE AND PROTECT HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE)	6
2.3	III. REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT)	8
2.4	IV. CONSERVE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES)	9
2.5	V. MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT)	10
2.6	VI. INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT FOR THE ENDANGERED FISHES AND THE RECOVERY PROGRAM (INFORMATION AND EDUCATION)	11
2.7	VII. PROVIDE PROGRAM PLANNING AND SUPPORT (PROGRAM MANAGEMENT)	11
3.0	DISCUSSION OF SUBBASIN RECOVERY PRIORITIES	11
3.1	GREEN RIVER	11
	3.1.1 Importance	11
	3.1.2 Recovery Actions	12
3.2	YAMPA AND LITTLE SNAKE RIVERS	13
	3.2.1 Importance	13
	3.2.2 Recovery Actions	14

3.3	DUCHESNE RIVER	15
3.3.1	Importance	15
3.3.2	Recovery Actions	16
3.4	WHITE RIVER	16
3.4.1	Importance	16
3.4.2	Recovery Actions	16
3.5	COLORADO RIVER	16
3.5.1	Importance	16
3.5.2	Recovery Actions	17
3.6	GUNNISON RIVER	19
3.6.1	Importance	19
3.6.2	Recovery Actions	19
3.7	DOLORES RIVER	20
3.7.1	Importance	20
3.7.2	Recovery Actions	20
4.0	RECOVERY ACTION PLANS	21
4.1	GENERAL RECOVERY PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTION PLAN	22
4.2	GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM	27
4.3	GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: YAMPA AND LITTLE SNAKE RIVERS	30
4.4	GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: DUCHESNE RIVER	33
4.5	GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: WHITE RIVER	34
4.6	COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM	35
4.7	COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: GUNNISON RIVER	41
4.8	COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: DOLORES RIVER	44
5.0	RECOVERY ACTION PLAN BUDGET PROJECTIONS	45
6.0	LITERATURE CITED	46
	APPENDIX: CRITICAL HABITAT ANALYSIS	A-1

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 RECOVERY PROGRAM PURPOSE

The purpose of the Recovery Implementation Program for Endangered Fishes in the Upper Colorado River Basin (Recovery Program) is to recover the humpback chub (*Gila cypha*), bonytail (*G. elegans*), Colorado pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*), and razorback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*) while existing and new water development proceeds in the Upper Basin (i.e., Upper Colorado River Basin upstream of Glen Canyon Dam, excluding the San Juan River; Cooperative Agreement, 1988) in compliance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et. seq.*). Further, the Recovery Program is intended to serve as a reasonable and prudent alternative to avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to the continued existence of the endangered fishes and to avoid the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat in Section 7 consultations on depletion impacts related to new projects and all impacts (except the discharge of pollutants such as trace elements, heavy metals, and pesticides) associated with historic water projects in the Upper Basin.

1.2 SPECIES RECOVERY GOALS

The overall goal for recovery of the four endangered fishes is to achieve naturally self-sustaining populations and to protect the habitat on which those populations depend. Recovery plans for these species have been developed under Section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1990a, 1990b, 1991, 1998), and the final rule determining critical habitat was published in the *Federal Register* on March 21, 1994 (59 FR 13374; Appendix). The recovery plans provide a biological and research-oriented approach to recovery and include a recommendation for detailed management and site-specific implementation plans. They refer to species recovery in both the Upper and Lower basins, but fail to include specific demographic criteria for self-sustaining, viable populations and site-specific management actions/tasks to minimize or remove threats.

On August 1, 2002, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) completed final recovery goals for the endangered fishes that will serve as amendments and supplements to the existing recovery plans (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d). According to Section 4(f)(1) of the Endangered Species Act, these recovery goals describe what is necessary for downlisting and delisting each of the species by identifying site-specific management actions/tasks necessary to minimize or remove threats; establishing objective, measurable criteria that consider demographic and genetic needs for self-sustaining, viable populations; and providing estimates of the time to achieve recovery.

In the context of the recovery goals, recovery of humpback chub, bonytail, and razorback sucker is considered across the Upper and Lower basins (each basin is treated as a “recovery unit”), with separate recovery criteria developed for each of the two recovery units. Recovery of Colorado pikeminnow is considered necessary only for the Upper Colorado River Basin (including the San Juan River subbasin). The

Recovery Program and the San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program provide for the coordinated implementation of management actions/tasks that contribute to recovery in the Upper Basin recovery unit.

1.3 RECOVERY ACTION PLAN PURPOSE

This Recovery Implementation Program Recovery Action Plan (RIPRAP) has been developed using the best, most current information available and the recovery goals for the four endangered fish species. The RIPRAP is intended to provide an operational plan for implementing the Recovery Program, including development of the Recovery Program's annual work plan and future budget needs. Specifically, the RIPRAP identifies the feasible actions that are necessary to recover the endangered fishes, including schedules and budgets for implementing those actions. The RIPRAP also identifies the specific recovery actions that must be accomplished in order for the Recovery Program to serve as a reasonable and prudent alternative to avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to the continued existence of the endangered fishes and to avoid the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat in Section 7 consultations for depletion impacts of new projects and all existing or past impacts related to historic water projects (except impacts from contaminants) in the Upper Basin, in accordance with the October 15, 1993 Section 7 Agreement (Revised March 8, 2000). The RIPRAP was developed in support of that Agreement.

1.4 ESTIMATED COST OF RECOVERY ACTIONS

The estimated total budget for the Recovery Program from FY 2004–FY 2008 is approximately \$76.1 million (see Section 5.0 on page ??). Funding for the Recovery Program is expected to come from the following sources:

- a. An annual operating budget of approximately \$5.7 million, totaling roughly \$11.6 million from FY 2004–FY 2008 as it is adjusted annually for inflation. The source of these funds will be: Western Area Power Administration and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (hydropower revenues); the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and the States of Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming. Additional annual funding will come from water development depletion fees. Under the Recovery Program, proponents of new water projects which undergo Section 7 Endangered Species Act consultation have agreed to pay a one-time depletion fee based on a project's average annual depletion. The rate is adjusted annually for inflation and as of October 1, 2002 it was \$15.93 per acre foot. The actual rate of water development has not been projected.
- b. Approximately \$64.5 million will be spent between FY 1999 and FY 2008 for capital projects, including: acquisition of water and water rights to implement and maintain adequate instream flows for the fish; building fish passages and hatcheries; and restoring flooded bottomlands. P.L. 106-392 authorized this funding in October 2000 and P.L. 107-375 extended construction authority from 2005 to 2008. The capital funding total is capped at \$62 million plus adjustments for inflation to the Federal portion; however, the

actual cost of any one capital project will depend on final planning, design and budgeting. Costs for individual projects will be modified to more accurately reflect expected costs as the work plans are updated annually.

1.5 MEASURING PROGRESS TOWARD RECOVERY AND SCHEDULING RIPRAP ACTIVITIES

To achieve recovery in the Upper Basin, it will be essential to fully implement all of the actions in the RIPRAP; this will be accomplished only through cooperation by all Program participants. In general, actions will be scheduled such that recovery will be achieved in the most expeditious and cost-effective manner possible. However, decisions associated with ongoing Section 7 consultations may require some adjustment in the schedule to ensure recovery of the endangered fishes while water development continues.

Recovery actions likely to result in a measurable population response, a measurable improvement in habitat for the fishes, legal protection of flows needed for recovery, or a reduction in the threat of immediate extinction have been determined by the Service to be most important in determining the extent to which the Recovery Program provides the reasonable and prudent alternatives to jeopardy for projects undergoing Section 7 consultation. These actions are identified by the carat ">" in the Action Plans. Actions that the Service believes will contribute to the RIPRAP serving as a reasonable and prudent alternative to adverse modification of critical habitat are identified by an asterisk (*). These carated and (or) asterisked actions will generally be given highest priority.

The Recovery Program continually evaluates the outcome of completed RIPRAP actions to determine their effectiveness in helping to achieve recovery. Ultimately, success of recovery efforts will be measured by species response (change in population size, distribution, composition, etc.). However, it may be many years before such responses are evident. In the interim, the Recovery Program also will gage its progress towards recovery by accomplishment of the actions identified in the RIPRAP.

1.6 RECOVERY ACTION PLAN STRUCTURE

The substance of the RIPRAP is in Section 4.0, the Recovery Action Plans. It is here that the specific recovery actions are listed. The first Recovery Action Plan identifies general recovery program support activities important to the success of the Recovery Program. The following two Recovery Action Plans are for the Green and Colorado rivers and their subbasins in the Upper Basin. Each action plan is arranged by specific activities to be accomplished within the "recovery elements" listed below:

- I. Identify and protect instream flows;
- II. Restore and protect habitat;
- III. Reduce negative impacts of nonnative fishes and sportfish management activities;
- IV. Conserve genetic integrity and augment or restore populations;

- V. Monitor populations and habitat and conduct research to support recovery actions;
- VI. Increase public awareness and support for the endangered fishes and the Recovery Program (in the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan only); and
- VII. Provide program planning and support (in the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan only).

The Recovery Action Plans (Section 4.0) have been formatted as tables for ease of scheduling and tracking activities. A general discussion of activities under each recovery element and of recovery priorities in each subbasin is found in Sections 2.0 and 3.0, respectively. Projected budgets are broken out in Section 5.0.

2.0 DISCUSSION OF RECOVERY ACTION PLAN ELEMENTS

The Recovery Action Plan tables contain only very brief descriptions of recovery actions planned in each subbasin. In this section, recovery activities are explained in more detail, as they apply Upper Basin wide.

2.1 I. IDENTIFY AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS

Recovery cannot be accomplished without securing, protecting, and managing sufficient habitat to support self-sustaining populations of the endangered fishes. Identification and protection of instream flows are key elements in this process. The first step in instream-flow protection is to identify flow regimes needed by the fish. In the Recovery Program, determining flow needs is primarily the responsibility of the Service (in cooperation with other participants). Factors considered in determining flow needs include: flow effects on reproduction and recruitment; flow effects on food supplies and nonnative fishes; and interrelationships between flow and other habitat parameters believed to be important for the fish, such as channel structure, sediment transport, substrate characteristics, vegetative encroachment, and water temperature. Flow recommendations (for all or certain seasons) have been or are being developed for most river reaches targeted for recovery in the Upper Basin. Flow recommendations often are made in stages, with initial flow recommendations based on the best available scientific information, historic conditions, and extrapolation from similar reaches. Recommendations then are refined following additional field research. Downstream of Flaming Gorge Dam on the Green River and dams of the Aspinall Unit on the Gunnison River, test flows were provided while research was conducted to determine more precise flow recommendations. That research has been completed and final flow recommendations for the Green River downstream of Flaming Gorge Dam have been approved. Flow recommendations also have been completed for the Colorado, Yampa and Duchesne rivers. An initial flow report was completed for the White River; however, due to shortcomings in the study design, additional research may be necessary in the future to develop meaningful flow recommendations. In 2004, flow recommendations will be completed for the Little Snake River, the Yampa River below the Little Snake River, and the Colorado River below the Green River. A strategic plan has been

developed to identify geomorphic research needed to refine the flow recommendations and address the Recovery Goals.

Colorado

Flow protection mechanisms are organized according to their initial or dominant attribute. If a change in the ownership of a water right (by purchase, lease, etc.) is central to flow protection, then flow protection is placed under "Acquire." A change in water right ownership to protect flows will usually be accompanied by a legal proceeding to change the nature or use of the water right, but this proceeding is still considered to be part of the "acquisition" of flow protection. Except for acquisition of conditional water rights in Colorado, such water rights acquisition also will result in physical alteration of flow conditions and will not just protect existing conditions.

Where flow protection involves filing for a new water right, it is placed under "Appropriate." With this mechanism, the ownership of the water right is established in the first instance, rather than being conveyed to a subsequent owner. In Colorado, the appropriation of an instream water right follows a structured process developed by the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) in 1997. The process begins with a Service flow recommendation, which is reviewed by CWCB and the Colorado Division of Wildlife (CDOW). Then CWCB issues a notice of intent to appropriate, followed by their approval to appropriate. Finally, the Attorney General must make a water court filing to confirm the appropriation and to avoid postponement of the appropriation's priority date. It may take 3 to 4 years from the notice of intent to appropriate to obtain a decree from the water court, depending on the nature of any litigation over the filing. In appropriation, the water right will have a relatively junior priority date (the date CWCB issued the notice of intent to appropriate), and only existing flow conditions can be protected. In most cases, this process has lacked support and thus proven to have limited use in the Recovery Program. Therefore, the Recovery Program adopted a programmatic biological opinion (PBO) approach on the Colorado River and will apply a similar approach to other rivers (such as the Yampa and Gunnison). Recovery Program participants anticipate that this process will prove effective in protecting instream flows for the endangered fishes. The Recovery Program and CWCB will reevaluate the need for instream-flow filings 5 years after each PBO is in place.

Flows also may be protected through the physical alteration of flow conditions by reoperating a reservoir or other component of an existing or new water project. This kind of flow protection is placed under "Deliver" in the Recovery Action Plans and will usually involve both a change of water right ownership, including the lease of storage water, and a change in the legal nature of the water rights. (A management agreement between Federal agencies also may be involved, as in the case of the Aspinall Unit, and compensation will be required where storage water is already under contract.)

Utah

Legal protection of flows in Utah will be achieved differently than in Colorado. Several approaches can be taken under Utah water law to protect instream flows, including:

1) acquiring existing water rights and filing change applications to provide for instream flow purposes; 2) withdrawing unappropriated waters by governor's proclamation; 3) approving presently filed and future applications subject to minimum flow levels; and 4) with proper compensation, preparing and executing contracts and subordinating diversions associated with approved and perfected rights. Although current Utah water law may not fully provide for all aspects of instream-flow protection, Utah does believe they can provide an adequate level of protection.

Utah examined available flow protection approaches and determined that the strategy they will use most commonly will be to condition the approval of presently filed and new applications, making them subject to predetermined streamflow levels. To accomplish this, the State Engineer adds a condition of approval to water-right applications (within the area) filed after the policy is adopted. The condition states that whenever the flow of the Green River (or other streams) drops below the predetermined streamflow level, then diversions associated with water rights approved after the condition is imposed are prohibited. Based on past legal challenges to the State's authority to impose conditions associated with new approvals, it was determined that this is within the authority of the State Engineer. This approach does not specifically recognize an instream-flow right; however, it does protect the flows from being diverted and used by subsequently approved water rights. This approach was adopted as policy by the State Engineer. The policy requires that presently filed and new applications to be approved are subject to the summer and fall flow recommendations. As flow recommendations are finalized and accepted (e.g. winter and spring flows in the Green River), the policy will be applied to address those flows as well. This strategy of conditioning the approval of presently filed and new applications also may be combined with the others listed above and with appropriately contracted reservoir reoperations.

2.2 II. RESTORE AND PROTECT HABITAT

Important elements of habitat protection include restoring and managing in-channel habitat and historically flooded bottomland areas, restoring passage to historically occupied river reaches, preventing entrainment at diversion structures (if warranted), enhancing water temperatures, and reducing or eliminating the impacts of contaminants.

Historically, Upper Colorado River Basin floodplains were frequently inundated by spring runoff, but today much of the river is channelized by levees, dikes, rip-rap, and tamarisk. Fish access to these flooded bottomlands has been further reduced by decreased peak spring flows due to upstream impoundments. Numerous studies have suggested the importance of seasonal flooding to river productivity, and flooded bottomlands have been shown to contain large numbers of zooplankton and benthic organisms. Floodplain areas inundated and temporarily connected to the main channel by spring flows appear to be important habitats for all life stages of razorback sucker, and the seasonal timing of razorback sucker reproduction suggests an adaptation for utilizing these habitats. Restoring access to these warm and productive habitats would provide the growth and conditioning environments that appear crucial for recovery of self-sustaining razorback sucker populations. In addition, Colorado pikeminnow also

use these areas for feeding prior to migrating to spawning areas. Inundation of floodplain habitats, although most important for razorback sucker, would benefit other native fishes by providing growth and conditioning environments and by restoring ecological processes dependent on periodic river-floodplain connections. Restoration of floodplain habitats could be achieved through a combination of increased peak flows, prolonged peak-flow duration, lower bank or levee heights, and constructed inlets.

The Recovery Action Plans contain tasks to identify and restore important flooded bottomland habitats. During 1994, the Recovery Program completed an inventory of floodplain habitats for 870 miles of the Colorado, Green, Gunnison, Yampa, and White rivers. From the list of inventoried habitats, high-priority sites have been screened for restoration potential. Site acquisition began in 1994 and continued through 2003. In 2003, the Program completed the razorback floodplain habitat model and drafted floodplain management plans for the Green and Colorado rivers. Based on the model and these management plans, the Program has shifted from screening additional floodplain sites for potential restoration/acquisition to focusing on sites already acquired or otherwise available for management. Success will be measured by the response of the endangered fish populations.

The General Recovery Program Support Action Plan contains tasks to develop an issue paper on floodplain restoration and protection. This paper identified legal, institutional, and political strategies to enhance and protect floodplain habitats for the endangered fishes and ameliorate the effects of levees, diking, rip-rap, gravel mining, and other forms of floodplain development. Phase 1 of the issue paper identified what floodplain restoration and protection is needed for the endangered fishes; Phase 2 determined how to accomplish that restoration and protection. The issue paper evaluated responsibilities of the Recovery Program, Recovery Program participants, and other agencies involved in floodplain development, regulation, and management, and their roles and responsibilities with respect to endangered species.

Passage barriers have fragmented endangered fish populations and their habitats, resulting in confinement of the fishes to 20 percent of their former range. Blockage of Colorado pikeminnow movement by dams and water-diversion structures has been suggested as an important cause of the decline of this species in the Upper Basin (Tyus 1984; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1991). Restoring access to historically occupied habitats via fish passage ways was identified in the Colorado Squawfish [Pikeminnow] Recovery Plan (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1991) and in the recovery goals (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2002c) as one of several means to aid in Colorado pikeminnow recovery.

The Recovery Action Plans contain tasks to assess and make recommendations for fish passage at various dams and diversion structures. The need for passage already has been determined at four sites: Redlands, Grand Valley Irrigation Company (GVIC), Price Stubb, and the Grand Valley Project. The need for passage at Hartland is being reassessed. Passage has been restored at the Redlands Diversion Dam on the Gunnison River and at the GVIC diversion on the mainstem Colorado River near

Palisade, Colorado. Activities are underway to restore passage at Price-Stubb and the Grand Valley Project.

Diversion canals have been found to entrain native and endangered fishes. Construction of fish screens to prevent entrainment of adult and subadult fish is in the planning and design stage at Tusher Wash and Redlands and construction is underway at the Grand Valley Project. Construction of a screen at the GVIC diversion canal was completed in 2002. The need for screening at Hartland is being reassessed.

A number of potentially harmful contaminants (including selenium, petroleum derivatives, heavy metals, ammonia, and uranium) and suspected contaminant "hot spots" have been identified in the Upper Basin. It is the intent of the Recovery Program to support and encourage the activities of entities outside the Recovery Program that are working to identify problem sites, evaluate contaminant impacts, and reduce or eliminate those impacts.

2.3 III. REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Fifty-two fish species occur in the Upper Basin, but only 13 of those are native species. Many of the nonnative fishes have been successful due to changes in the river system that favor their survival over that of native fishes. Competition with and predation by nonnative species (not including salmonids) is widely assumed to have played a role in the decline of the endangered fishes (Tyus and Saunders 1996). However, evidence of direct impacts of introduced species on native fishes is difficult to obtain (Schoenherr 1981) and often is masked by human-caused habitat alterations (Moyle 1976).

Recovery Program activities related to nonnative fishes initially focused on identifying impacts/interactions and developing nonnative fish stocking procedures. A nonnative fish control strategy has been developed to identify and prioritize options for controlling or removing nonnative fishes from river reaches occupied by the endangered fishes as well as other reaches that serve as production areas for nonnatives that subsequently disperse into occupied habitat. Through 2005, emphasis will be focused on the control activities identified in the strategy. All nonnative fish control activities will be evaluated for effectiveness and continued as appropriate.

The States and the Service also have developed final procedures for stocking of nonnative fishes in the Upper Basin. The procedures are designed to reduce the impact on native fishes due to stocking of nonnative fishes in the Upper Basin and clarify the role of the States, the Service, and others in the review of stocking proposals. A memorandum of understanding has been signed by the States and the Service implementing the Stocking Procedures.

2.4 IV. CONSERVE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS

Species recovery depends on protecting and managing species genetic resources. This is a complex activity that includes: determining the genetic stocks of the endangered fishes; protecting those stocks in refugia; planning, developing, and operating propagation facilities; propagating genetic stocks for research, information and education, and augmentation or restoration; and planning, implementing, and evaluating augmentation or restoration of genetic stocks in the wild. Stocking is only an interim tool in the Recovery Program because recovery, by definition, implies that the populations or stocks will be self-sustaining in the wild. The success of augmentation and restoration stocking is dependent on prior or concurrent implementation of other recovery actions such as flow protection, habitat restoration, and management of nonnative fishes. This dependency is reflected in the schedule of subbasin-specific actions in Section 4.0.

The Recovery Program has recognized the need to increase augmentation and restoration stocking (primarily for razorback sucker and bonytail), both for recovery of the species and to establish fish in the system to be able to demonstrate that habitat and instream flow activities are having an effect on endangered fish recovery. Early stocking efforts concentrated on razorback sucker and bonytail. The Recovery Program now is concentrating on implementing an integrated stocking plan developed for bonytail, Colorado pikeminnow, and razorback sucker.

Studies to confirm genetic stocks have been vital to genetics management of the endangered fishes. Stocks are being protected in refugia to develop broodstocks and guard against catastrophe. Representatives of stocks thought to be in immediate danger of extinction are brought into refugia immediately. Refugia populations of genetic stocks are developed using paired breeding matrices to maximize genetic variability and maintain genetic integrity.

Most of this work is included under the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan because it applies Upper Basin wide. Subbasin-specific activities of augmenting or restoring genetic stocks are placed under the subbasin Action Plans. Augmentation or restoration plans are being implemented, fish produced, and river reaches restored and augmented with those fish. The effects of these augmentation efforts need to be monitored and evaluated.

Four basic documents are used to plan, implement, and coordinate genetics management and artificial propagation for the endangered fishes. These are the Genetics Management Guidelines, Genetics Management Plan, Annual Facilities Operations Plan, and Coordinated Hatchery Facility Plan (Facility Plan). All four of these plans have been developed and will be revised or updated as needed.

The Genetics Management Guidelines document provides the rationale, genetics concepts, and genetic risks to be considered in genetics-management planning and implementation. For example, it indicates that a fish population is the fundamental unit

of genetics management and that its definition and characterization, relative to other populations, are important. Genetic surveys have been part of the identification and characterization process. Further, the prioritization and genetics management required for each population is determined by its relative population status, demographic trends, and genetics data derived from the surveys.

The Genetics Management Plan is the operational document. It tells the "what, who, when, where" of implementation. It identifies specific objectives, tasks, activities, and type of facilities necessary to accomplish Recovery Program goals, i.e., protect population genetic integrity or restore a self-sustaining population in nature. It is the action plan developed for implementation, directed by the Recovery Program goals, and structured along the format presented in the Genetics Management Planning Guidelines document.

Genetics management requires a great deal of operational activity. Refugia and propagation facilities have been planned, built, and are now operated in a coordinated fashion. For this reason, the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan contains a task to produce an Annual Facilities Operational Plan. Based on the Genetics Management Plan, this Annual Facilities Operational Plan provides specific annual guidance for propagation: numbers of adults and family lots needed from each population, number of fish needed in each family lot, and where these fish will be raised and maintained.

Facilities are required to meet long-term (5 years or more; augmentation and restoration stocking) needs. The plans for these facilities are the Coordinated Hatchery Facility Plan and the Facilities Plan. These plans, in accordance with the Genetics Management Plan, define facilities required to meet propagation needs, identify fish needs that can be met by existing facilities, and recommend expansion or modification of existing facilities.

2.5 V. MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS

This category consists primarily of research and monitoring activities that have application to more than one of the foregoing elements. In the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan, this element includes: monitoring populations and habitat and annually assessing changes in habitat and population parameters (i.e., population estimates); determining gaps in existing life-history information and recommending and conducting research to fill those gaps; and improving scientific research and sampling techniques. Research activities are identified for each subbasin only to the extent that such activities are related to another recovery action in that subbasin. Such identification now, however, does not preclude further research in that subbasin that may be identified later or that is identified in the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan.

2.6 VI. INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT FOR THE ENDANGERED FISHES AND THE RECOVERY PROGRAM

Public information and education is crucial to the Recovery Program's success. A strategic, multi-faceted information and education program is being implemented to: develop public involvement strategies at the beginning of any and all projects; educate target audiences (including the public and elected officials) about endangered fish and increase their understanding of and support for the recovery of these fish at local, state and national levels; provide opportunities for the public to participate in activities that support recovery; and improve communication and cooperation among members of the Recovery Program.

Numerous site-specific activities are undertaken to promote understanding of, and support for, Recovery Program actions and to involve the public in decisions which may impact specific locations in the Upper Basin. These include public meetings, presentations, exhibits and distribution of Recovery Program publications.

The information and education program continues to develop a number of products including a newsletter (two to three times per year); up-to-date fact sheets; educational video(s); interpretive signs and displays; bookmarks; Congressional briefing documents; and a public website. In addition, the Recovery Program actively seeks news media coverage of its activities. Special educational publications are produced as needed.

2.7 VII. PROVIDE PROGRAM PLANNING AND SUPPORT

This work also is placed entirely under the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan. Recovery Program planning and support includes planning and tracking recovery activities, participation in Recovery Program committees, and managing, directing, and coordinating the overall Recovery Program. Another important program support activity involves securing the funding necessary to implement the Recovery Program.

3.0 DISCUSSION OF SUBBASIN RECOVERY PRIORITIES

Following is a summary of the importance of the various subbasins in the Upper Colorado River Basin to the endangered fishes and a brief discussion of the major actions directed at recovering the endangered fishes in these subbasins. A more detailed accounting of the activities, including funding requirements and schedules is found in Sections 4.0 and 5.0.

3.1 GREEN RIVER

3.1.1 Importance

The Green River system supports populations of humpback chub, Colorado pikeminnow, and razorback sucker, and it historically supported bonytail. The importance of the Green River to the endangered fishes has been established by the

Recovery Program and recognized by many biologists. The Colorado Squawfish [Pikeminnow] Recovery Plan (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1991) listed the Green River as the highest priority area for recovery of the species, and the recovery goals (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2002c) consider the Green River subbasin as the center of the Upper Basin Colorado pikeminnow metapopulation. Habitat in Desolation and Gray canyons supports a self-sustaining humpback chub population, and the last known riverine concentration of bonytail was in the Green River within Dinosaur National Monument (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1990a, 1990b, 2002a, 2002b). Recovery plans for humpback chub (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1990a) and bonytail (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1990b) identified the Green River in Desolation and Gray canyons and in Dinosaur National Monument as important to recovery. The Green River supports the largest known wild population of razorback sucker in their natural riverine habitat (Lanigan and Tyus 1989; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1998, 2002d).

3.1.2 Recovery Actions

Recovery actions in the Green River have focused on refining the operation of Flaming Gorge dam to enhance habitat conditions for the endangered fishes. A biological opinion was issued on the operation of Flaming Gorge Dam in 1992. This opinion contained seasonal flow recommendations for the Green River at Jensen, Utah, and called for additional research under a specific set of research flows to collect information needed to refine the flow recommendations (particularly flow recommendations for spring and winter) and to develop flow recommendations for other areas of the Green River. The effects of the test flows on the endangered fishes and their habitat were evaluated through a variety of studies through 1997, and a final report including revised flow recommendations has been completed (Muth et al. 2000). National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance on reoperation of Flaming Gorge Dam is ongoing and is expected to be completed in 2004. A new biological opinion will be completed following NEPA compliance; however, this will not prevent operation of the dam in accordance with the 1992 opinion in the interim.

Flow recommendations also have been or are being developed for some tributaries to the Green River, such as the Yampa, White, and Duchesne rivers. Tributary and mainstem flow recommendations will be carefully coordinated to address recovery needs from an Upper Basin wide perspective.

An element of the 1992 Flaming Gorge Dam biological opinion identified the need to protect dam releases from possible diversion in the occupied habitat of the endangered fishes. The initial focus of this effort was to legally protect Flaming Gorge releases in the Green River down to the confluence of the Duchesne River for the months of July through October. Flow protection for the remainder of the year (November–June) and downstream to Canyonlands National Park will be addressed by Utah following issuance of the final Environmental Impact Statement and biological opinion on reoperation of Flaming Gorge Dam.

Other Green River activities involve restoration of bottomlands adjacent to the Green River that flood in the spring and provide important habitat for razorback sucker and

Colorado pikeminnow. Levees have been breached to restore eight sites (274 acres) and perpetual easements have been acquired on six properties (1008 acres).

Projects to identify nonnative fish control strategies for the Green River have been implemented. Active control of northern pike (*Esox lucius*) began in 2001. Active control of smallmouth bass will begin in 2004.

Refuge (captive) populations of razorback sucker collected from the Green River are being maintained at the Ouray National Fish Hatchery, Ouray, Utah, with backup broodstock being maintained at Wahweap State Fish hatchery, Big Water, Utah. A plan for augmenting razorback sucker in the Green River using hatchery propagated fish was developed and is currently being implemented. Stocking of bonytail in Lodore Canyon was initiated in 2000 in accordance with a stocking plan developed by the State of Colorado. The integrated stocking plan requires stocking of bonytail and razorback sucker in the Green River near Jensen and Green River, Utah.

Population estimates began in 2001 for Colorado pikeminnow in the entire Green River subbasin (report due in March 2004). Population estimates for humpback chub in Desolation and Gray canyons were conducted in 2001 and 2002, and expanded in 2003..

Contamination of water in Stewart Lake and Ashley Creek near Jensen, Utah, with selenium may adversely affect razorback sucker. The Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) are actively pursuing clean-up activities in these areas independent of the Recovery Program.

3.2 YAMPA RIVER AND LITTLE SNAKE RIVER

3.2.1 Importance

The Yampa River is the largest remaining essentially unregulated river in the Upper Colorado River Basin, and its inflow into the Green River, 65 miles downstream of Flaming Gorge Dam, ameliorates some effects of dam operation on river flow, sediment load, and temperature (Muth et al. 2000). Holden (1980) concluded that flows from the Yampa River, especially spring peak flows, were crucial to the maintenance of the Green River's "large-river" characteristics and, therefore, very important to maintaining suitable conditions in the Green River downstream of the confluence. The Yampa River supports resident subadult and adult Colorado pikeminnow, contains one of the primary Colorado pikeminnow spawning areas in the Upper Basin and is a major producer of fish for the entire Green River subbasin (Tyus and Karp 1989). A small but apparently self-sustaining population of humpback chub exists in the Yampa River in Dinosaur National Monument (Tyus and Karp 1989; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1990a, 2002a). Spawning aggregations of adult razorback sucker have been observed near the mouth of the Yampa River, and adult razorback sucker have been captured upstream to the mouth of the Little Snake River (Tyus and Karp 1989). The lower portion of the Yampa River was part of the historic range of bonytail and is associated with some of the most recent captures of this very rare fish. The Bonytail Recovery

Plan (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1990b) identified the Yampa River within Dinosaur National Monument as a high priority recovery and/or restoration site.

The Little Snake River provides approximately 28% of the Yampa River's flow and 60% of the Yampa River's sediment supply. The sediment supply of the Little Snake River is believed to be important to the maintenance of backwater nursery areas utilized by young Colorado pikeminnow in the Green River (Smith and Green 1991). Adult Colorado pikeminnow have been captured in the Little Snake River upstream to near Baggs, Wyoming, and humpback chub have been captured in the lower 10 miles of the Little Snake River (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2002a, 2002c).

3.2.2 Recovery Actions

Recovery actions in the Yampa River are focused on control of nonnative fishes and maintaining and legally protecting the flow regime required to recover the endangered fishes. To achieve these objectives, the Recovery Program has developed a draft Yampa River Management Plan which identifies management actions necessary to provide and protect the needs of the endangered fishes while existing depletions for human use continue and water resources are developed to serve foreseeable future human needs in the Yampa River basin (Roehm 2003). The plan proposes to augment Yampa River base flows in accordance with the Yampa River flow recommendations (Modde et al. 1999). Of thirteen alternatives identified and evaluated in the Plan, enlargement of Elkhead Reservoir provided the most reliable water supply at a moderate cost. Environmental compliance and permitting for the enlargement are underway. The Program would purchase 5,000 af of permanent storage out of the 12,000 af Elkhead enlargement and lease an additional 2,000 af on an as-needed basis.

Colorado filed for a junior instream-flow water right for the Yampa River between the confluences of the Williams Fork and Little Snake rivers in December 1995. Forty-eight statements of opposition were filed against these filings in State water court.

As a result of concerns expressed by the Service and other Program participants, CWCB withdrew the baseflow and recovery flow instream-flow filings on the Yampa and Colorado rivers. With the recent approval of the PBO for the upper Colorado River upstream of the Gunnison River confluence, CDOW staff has been instructed to develop new flow recommendations. The current methodology for instream flow filings may not apply to warm-water rivers and is under review by CDOW.

Beginning 5 years after the Management Plan and a PBO are completed for the Yampa River, the Recovery Program and CWCB will review CDOW's new flow recommendations and the performance progress of the PBO. During the fourth year of the first 5-year period, the Recovery Program and CWCB will develop a process for assessing the need for further instream-flow protection for the endangered fishes. On completion of this review, a determination will be made regarding the need for additional instream-flow protection for the endangered fishes.

The Recovery Program has evaluated several low-head agricultural-water diversion dams on the Yampa River for Colorado pikeminnow passage. A variety of existing diversions between Craig, Colorado, and Dinosaur National Monument were inventoried in 1994–1995. Several diversions were identified as possible barriers to fish migration under certain conditions. However, due to uncertainties about whether these diversions were in fact barriers to Colorado pikeminnow movement during the migration period, a study was conducted to determine threshold flows for adult Colorado pikeminnow passage on the Yampa River between Craig and Dinosaur National Monument. It was determined that these barriers present little if any problem to fish movement during the periods when Colorado pikeminnow migrate to and from spawning habitats downstream.

In studies on the Green River, researchers documented that young Colorado pikeminnow constituted 5% of the diet of northern pike, even though young Colorado pikeminnow made up a much smaller portion of the available food base in the river. Researchers estimated that a single northern pike could consume 100 or more young Colorado pikeminnow per year. Also, northern pike are known to prey on native roundtail chub (*Gila robusta*) and may also feed on humpback chubs in the Yampa River. Colorado has completed a fisheries management plan for the Yampa River basin. Smallmouth bass in the Yampa River have rapidly increased in abundance and pose a significant predatory and competitive threat to the endangered fish. The Recovery Program began removing nonnative sportfish from certain reaches of the Yampa River to more acceptable waters in 1999.

Initial flow recommendations for the Little Snake River will be developed in 2004. Beginning 5 years after the Management Plan and a PBO are completed for the Yampa River, the Recovery Program and CWCB will review CDOW's new flow recommendations and the performance progress of the PBO. During the fourth year of the first 5-year period, the Recovery Program and CWCB will develop a process for assessing the need for further instream-flow protection for the endangered fishes. On completion of this review, a determination will be made regarding the need for additional instream-flow protection for the endangered fishes.

The Program's integrated stocking plan (Nesler et al. 2003) outlines plans for stocking bonytail in the middle Green and Yampa rivers. Stocking bonytail in the Yampa River was initiated in 2000.

3.3 DUCHESNE RIVER

3.3.1 Importance

Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker regularly utilize the mouth of the Duchesne River especially during spring runoff. Fishery surveys conducted in 1993 documented the use of the lower 15 miles of the Duchesne River by Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker. More recently, fish surveys have been conducted in the lower 33 miles of the Duchesne River and have documented seasonal use by Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker.

3.3.2 Recovery Actions

Initial flow recommendations were developed for the Duchesne River in 1995 to address immediate concerns of several proposed water projects being considered in the Duchesne River basin. A follow-up study to evaluate and refine these flow recommendations began in 1997 and was completed in 2003 (Modde and Keleher 2003). A water-availability study was completed that identified sources of water to meet the flow recommendations. A coordinated reservoir operations study is nearing completion. The Duchesne Biological Opinion issued in 1998 will be updated in 2004. Agreements will be developed to provide flows in the Duchesne River for the endangered fishes.

Active control of nonnative fishes will begin in 2004. A study to determine escape of nonnative fishes from Starvation Reservoir was begun in 2002.

3.4 WHITE RIVER

3.4.1 Importance

Adult Colorado pikeminnow occupy the White River downstream of Taylor Draw Dam near Rangely, Colorado, in relatively high numbers. Adult Colorado pikeminnow resident to the White River spawn in the Green and Yampa rivers. Juvenile and subadult Colorado pikeminnow also utilize the White River on a year-round basis. Incidental captures of razorback sucker have been recorded in the lower White River. Construction of Taylor Draw Dam in 1984 blocked Colorado pikeminnow migration to upper portions of the White River.

3.4.2 Recovery Actions

A work plan for the White River was developed to synthesize current information about the endangered fish and provide recommendations for specific recovery actions, including the merits of providing fish passage at Taylor Draw Dam. Interim flow recommendations for the White River were completed in 2004 (Irving et al. 2004). Due to shortcomings in the study design, however, additional research may be necessary in the future to develop meaningful flow recommendations. Instream-flow filings are on hold pending reevaluation of how flows will be legally protected in Colorado.

3.5 COLORADO RIVER

3.5.1 Importance

The mainstem Colorado River from Rifle, Colorado, to Lake Powell, Utah, supports populations of humpback chub and Colorado pikeminnow, and is recognized as important to the recovery of all four endangered fishes (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1990a, 1990b, 1991, 1998, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d). Relatively large and healthy humpback chub populations occur at Black Rocks and Westwater Canyon near the Utah-Colorado state line. A smaller humpback chub population occurs in Cataract

Canyon, and some of the last wild bonytail were collected in this river reach. All life stages of Colorado pikeminnow occur in the section of river from Palisade, Colorado, downstream to Lake Powell. Colorado pikeminnow are being translocated and stocked into the upper reach of the Colorado River between Palisade and Rifle, Colorado; natural access to this historic-habitat reach has been blocked since the early 1900's by three diversion dams near Palisade. Razorback sucker populations in the mainstem Colorado River have declined precipitously in the past 20 years. In 1993, 67 adult razorback sucker were collected from isolated ponds adjacent to the Colorado River near Debeque, Colorado. Only a few wild adult razorback sucker have been captured from the river in the past 5 years, and there is no evidence of successful reproduction in the Colorado River. A few (less than 10) suspected wild bonytail have been captured from the Colorado River in the Black Rocks area, near Moab, Utah, and in Cataract Canyon over the past decade. However, this represents the highest catch rate of bonytail anywhere in the Upper Basin.

3.5.2 Recovery Actions

A variety of recovery actions are planned, ongoing, or completed for the Colorado River. Numerous approaches are being taken to restore flows in the 15-mile reach immediately upstream of from the confluence of the Gunnison River to levels recommended by the Service. Reclamation has made available 5,000 acre-feet annually plus an additional 5,000 acre-feet 4 out of 5 years from Ruedi Reservoir to support flow augmentation in the 15-mile reach during July, August, and September. In addition, water made available by the leases for release of 10,825 acre-feet/year of water from Ruedi Reservoir and the permanent dedication of 10,825 acre-feet/year from Colorado Water Division Number 5 facilities will be delivered and protected to the 15-mile reach during the late summer period. Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) with the Colorado River Water District (CRWCD) and Denver Water were executed in 2000 for the delivery of 5,412 acre-feet of water from Wolford Mountain and Williams Fork reservoirs. These agreements will accommodate environmental commitments agreed to by Reclamation in the Environmental Impact Statement on Round II sales and any constraints of the reservoir's authorizing legislation. Additional water is being provided through an MOA with CRWCD for delivery of up to 6,000 acre-feet of water from Wolford Mountain Reservoir.

In 1992, Colorado filed an application in State water court for a 581 cubic feet per second (cfs) instream-flow right in the 15-mile reach for the months of July, August, and September. A final decree was issued in 1997. Colorado filed for a junior instream-flow right for the 15-Mile Reach in December 1995, which was opposed in State water court.

As a result of concerns expressed by the Service and other Recovery Program participants, CWCB withdrew the baseflow and recovery flow instream-flow filings on the Colorado and Yampa rivers. With the approval of the PBO for the upper Colorado River upstream of the Gunnison River confluence, CDOW staff has been instructed to develop new flow recommendations. The current methodology for instream-flow filings may not apply to warm-water rivers. Based upon these developments, the Recovery

Program's Management Committee has agreed that the need for further instream-flow filings will be evaluated every 5 years.

Beginning in 2005, the Recovery Program and CWCB will review CDOW's new flow recommendations and the performance progress of the PBO. On completion of this review, a determination will be made regarding the instream-flow protection needs for the endangered fishes. During the fourth year (2004) of the first 5-year period, the Recovery Program and CWCB will develop a process for assessing the need for further instream-flow protection for the endangered fishes.

Flow protection for the Colorado River downstream from the confluence of the Gunnison River will be addressed following completion of the Biological Opinion on reoperation of the Aspinall Unit.

Other sources of water for the 15-mile reach include construction of the Grand Valley Water Management Project and operation of Federal and private projects. A study of options for providing additional water primarily to augment spring peak flows was completed in 2003. Water users are exploring ways to increase participation in the expanded coordinated reservoir operations as recommended in the study report.

Reclamation has constructed a fish passage at the GVIC diversion dam, and has initiated construction for passage at the Grand Valley Project on the upper Colorado River. Construction of passage at the Price-Stubb diversion dam is scheduled for FY 2005-2006. Successfully providing fish passage at these diversion dams would benefit both Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker by providing access to approximately 50 miles of the river that was used historically by these fishes. To prevent entrainment of endangered fishes into diversion canals, a fish screen has been constructed at GVIC and another is under construction for the Grand Valley Project.

To restore floodplain habitats, levees have been breached to at two sites (20 acres) and ten properties acquired in perpetual easement or fee title to restore 394 acres.

Active control of smallmouth bass will begin in 2004. Operation of the fish barrier net at Highline Reservoir has been ongoing since 1999. CDOW began a study to determine the source of centrarchid fishes in 2003.

Razorback sucker, bonytail, and Colorado pikeminnow are being stocked in the Colorado River in accordance with the integrated stocking plan (Nesler et al. 2003).

3.6 GUNNISON RIVER

3.6.1 Importance

The Gunnison River is currently occupied by wild Colorado pikeminnow and is historic habitat for razorback sucker and bonytail. Several adult Colorado pikeminnow were captured in the Gunnison River in fishery surveys conducted in 1992 and 1993. Unrestricted migration of fish has been limited by the 10-foot high Redlands diversion dam located 2 miles upstream from the mouth of the Gunnison River. Several Colorado pikeminnow larvae have been collected in the Gunnison River immediately downstream from the Redlands diversion dam. Kidd (1977) reported that adult razorback sucker were collected frequently by commercial fishermen near Delta, Colorado, between 1930 and 1950. Wild razorback sucker have not been collected in the Gunnison River in recent times, although the reach near Delta is considered a priority razorback sucker restoration site.

3.6.2 Recovery Actions

Recovery activities on the Gunnison River are focused on operating and evaluating a fish ladder at the Redlands diversion dam, reoperating the Aspinall Unit to improve flow/habitat conditions in the Gunnison River, and restoring flooded bottomland habitats near Delta. Perpetual easements have been acquired on three properties (198 acres). Construction of a fish ladder at the Redlands diversion dam was completed in 1996 and has provided for passage of Colorado pikeminnow, razorback sucker, and other native fishes (as well as allowing exclusion of nonnative fishes). The need for fish passage at Hartland diversion is being reassessed. To prevent entrainment of adult and subadult endangered fish into diversion canals, fish screens will be installed at Redlands and perhaps Hartland.

A 5-year research plan to evaluate the effects of the Aspinall Unit on the endangered fishes and their habitat was completed in 1997. During this research period, Reclamation and Western Area Power Administration provided test flows. The research culminated with the Service's final flow recommendations in 2003. Reclamation has begun the NEPA process and the Service will issue a biological opinion in 2008. Legal protection of Aspinall releases and State protection of instream flows in the Gunnison River will be addressed as the biological opinion on the Aspinall Unit is developed.

Beginning in 1995, the Service experimentally stocked razorback sucker in the Gunnison River near Delta. Five razorback sucker used the Redlands fish ladder in summer 2001 (one of which was stocked in 1996), and one razorback sucker used the ladder in 2002. The State of Colorado stocking plan for razorback sucker was revised in 2001 to stock fewer but larger fish. Eight larval razorback sucker were discovered in the Gunnison River in 2002, indicating that stocked fish are reproducing. Stocking of razorback sucker and Colorado pikeminnow continues in the Gunnison River, in accordance with the integrated stocking plan.

3.7 DOLORES RIVER

3.7.1 Importance

The Dolores River is historic habitat for Colorado pikeminnow; both adult and young-of-the-year fish were captured in the 1950's and 1960's. Recent studies have only documented Colorado pikeminnow use in the lower 1 mile of the river (Valdez et al. 1991). Uranium processing facilities operated during the late 1940's through the 1960's severely impacted the river and may have contributed to the decline of Colorado pikeminnow in the Dolores River drainage.

3.7.2 Recovery Actions

Recovery actions for the Dolores River drainage have been limited to preventing escapement of nonnative sport fish (e.g., smallmouth bass, yellow perch, and kokanee salmon) from McPhee Reservoir. Environmental contaminant clean-up is being pursued by State and Federal agencies independent of the Recovery Program. Inflows from the Dolores River that are necessary to recover the endangered fishes on the mainstem of the Colorado River will need to be legally protected.

4.0 RECOVERY ACTION PLANS

The tasks in these Recovery Action Plans are prioritized by their schedules. Schedules are shown where they have been identified (if all the year columns for an activity are blank, then the activity has not yet been scheduled). If a completion date has been identified, it is shown under the appropriate fiscal year. Where specific dates have not been identified, but an action is ongoing, beginning, or ending in a year, an "X" appears in that year's column. The "who" column identifies the lead responsible agency (listed first) and any cooperating agencies. The status column is used where additional narrative is needed to explain the duration, status, etc. of an activity. Once again, the carat ">" identifies those recovery actions which are expected to result in a measurable population response, a measurable improvement in habitat for the fishes, legal protection of flows needed for recovery, or a reduction in the threat of immediate extinction. An asterisk (*) identifies those activities which will contribute to the RIPRAP serving as a reasonable and prudent alternative to the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

The Recovery Action Plans are formatted in stepdown-outline tables. This is reflected in the numbering system and indenting. Some actions which assess options or the feasibility of a recovery action are followed by a subsequent implementation step, and others are not, depending on how feasible the implementation step is considered to be at this time.

The following abbreviations are used to identify lead/cooperating agencies:

BR	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
CO	State of Colorado
CDA	Colorado Department of Agriculture
CDOPR	Colorado Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation
CDOW	Colorado Division of Wildlife
CRWCD	Colorado River Water Conservation District
CWCB	Colorado Water Conservation Board
FWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	-ES Ecological Services
	-FR Fishery Resources
	-RW Refuges and Wildlife
	-WR Water Resources
LFL	Larval Fish Laboratory
NWCD	Northern Water Conservancy District
PD	Recovery Program Director
TBD	To be determined
UT	State of Utah
UDWR	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
UTWR	Utah Division of Water Resources
WYGF	Wyoming Game and Fish Department

GENERAL RECOVERY PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTION PLAN

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT YEARS
I.	PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT)									
I.A.	Evaluate methods for defining habitat-flow needs and select methods most appropriate to specific stream reaches.									
I.A.1.	Review instream flow methodologies and assess the technical adequacy of current flow recommendations.	PD	Complete	"Guru II." Center for Public-Private Sector Cooperation, 1993.						
I.A.2.	Develop recommendations for integrating geomorphology and food web studies into Recovery Program.	PD	Complete	Andrews, et al, 1996.						
I.A.3.	Evaluate CDOW's instream flow methodologies and flow recommendations for warmwater native fishes (Anderson) as they relate to flows needed for endangered fish recovery.	FWS/PD		X	X					
I.A.4.	Develop strategic plan for geomorphic research and monitoring.	Program	Complete	LaGory et al., 2003.						
I.A.4.a.	Develop strategy and design for studies to address geomorphic research priorities.	Geo. Panel		X						
I.A.4.b.	Conduct needed geomorphic research and monitoring.	Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.B.	Develop and select methods for modifiable protection of instream flows in Colorado.									
I.B.1.	Develop, evaluate and select, as appropriate, options for interim protection of instream flows until uncertainty concerning habitat needs and water availability can be resolved.									
I.B.1.a.	Colorado Attorney General review.	CO	Complete	CWCB adopted the Statement of Policy and Procedure Regarding the Appropriation of Instream Flows for the Recovery of Endangered Fishes of the Upper Colorado River Basin on March 9, 1994 and S.B. 96- 064 concerning instream flow appropriations of the CWCB was passed in May '96.						
I.B.1.b.	CWCB approval/recommended action.	CWCB	Complete							
I.B.1.c.	Adopt legislation or regulation, if necessary.	CWCB	Complete							
I.B.2.	Evaluate options for allocating Colorado's compact entitlement among the five subbasins, the implications for water available to recover the endangered fishes, and implications of full protection of recovery flow recommendations on development of Colorado's compact entitlement.	CWCB	Complete	CWCB completed work on water availability study in 1995 after convening subbasin work groups. Scenarios for future development and estimates for future water use were outlined for each basin.						
I.B.3.	Assess need for retirement of senior conditional water rights.	CWCB/FWS	Dropped	Colorado law prohibits conversion of conditional water rights to instream flow water rights.						
I.C.	Develop an enforcement agreement between the Service and appropriate State agencies to protect instream flows acquired under the Recovery Program for the endangered fishes.									
>*	I.C.1. Colorado.	FWS/CWCB	Complete	Agreement with FWS concerning the enforcement and protection of fish recovery flow water rights adopted by CWCB on September 21,1993.						
I.D.	Develop tributary management plans (based in part on the tributary report, see V.F., pg. 23).									
I.D.1.	Assess need for tributary management plans on a site specific basis.	PD	Complete	2004: PD's office determined most tributaries covered by biological opinions (except White and San Rafael rivers), so this item was moved to Green River Action Plan.						
II.	RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE)									
II.A.	Restore flooded bottomland habitats.									
II.A.1.	Conduct inventory of flooded bottomland habitat for potential restoration.	FWS-FR	Complete	Inventory completed (see Irving & Burdick, 1995 as primary reference)						
II.A.2.	Screen high-priority sites for potential restoration/acquisition.	PD	On hold							
II.B.	Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts. [NOTE: Contaminants remediation (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program]									
II.B.1.	Evaluate effects of selenium.	FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X					
II.B.1.a.	If needed for recovery, identify actions to reduce deleterious levels of selenium contamination.	FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X					
II.B.2.	Identify locations of petroleum-product pipelines and assess need for emergency shut-off valves.	FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X					
>*	II.B.2.a. Ensure that all new petroleum product pipelines have emergency shutoff valves.					X	X	X	X	X
II.B.3.	Review and recommend modifications to State and Federal hazardous materials spills emergency response programs.	FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X					
II.C.	Develop an issue paper on the desirability and practicality of restoring and protecting certain portions of the floodplain for endangered fishes and evaluate the floodplain restoration program.									
II.C.1.	Identify what restoration and protection are needed by addressing: 1) biological merits of restoring the floodplain with emphasis on endangered fish recovery; 2) priority geographic areas; and 3) integration of a broader floodplain restoration initiative into the current Recovery Program floodplain restoration program.	PROGRAM	Complete	Phase 1 floodplain protection issue paper approved by Mgmt. Comm. 1/98 (Nelson 1998). Phase II (Tetra Tech 2000) and synthesis reports left in draft and highest priority work moved into Green and Colorado River floodplain management plans (Valdez and Nelson 2004a,b).						
II.C.2.	Identify how to conduct restoration and protection by addressing: 1) restoration and protection tools/approaches; 2) institutional options for floodplain restoration; 3) costs/funding strategy; and 4) implementation steps and schedule.	PD/CO/UT	Complete	Final draft floodplain issues report given to Mgmt. Comm. 2/00. Phase II (Tetra Tech 2000) and synthesis reports left in draft and highest priority work moved into Green and Colorado River floodplain management plans (Valdez and Nelson 2004a,b).						

GENERAL RECOVERY PROGRAM SUPPORT ACTION PLAN

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT YEARS
VII.A.5.a.	Convene Recovery Team.	FWS	Complete	1999						
VII.A.5.b.	Develop recommended recovery goals.	PD/Contract	Complete	2000						
VII.A.5.c.	Biology Committee review of recommended recovery goals.	Program	Complete	2000						
VII.A.5.d.	Finalize recovery goals.	FWS/PD	Complete	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 2002a, 2002b, 2002c, 2002d.						
VII.A.5.e.	Conduct species status review and update recovery goals at least every 5 years.	FWS/Program	Ongoing				X	X	X	X
VII.A.6.	Identify elements of state conservation plans to ensure long-term management and protection following delisting.	Program		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VII.A.7.	Monitor and assess Recovery Program accomplishments annually.	PD	Annual	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VII.A.8.	Develop biennial work plan to address priority needs.	PD	Annual	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VII.B.	Actively participate in Recovery Program committees and secure funding for annual work plan and larger projects (e.g., water acquisition, capital construction, and long term operation and maintenance) in accordance with the recovery actions and milestones (Utah, Colorado, Wyoming, Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, Western Area Power Administration, Water Users, Environmental Groups, Colorado River Energy Distributors Association) and the National Park Service.	PD	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VII.B.1.	As defined in PL 106-392, prepare joint report with San Juan River RIP on the utilization of power revenues for base funding, including recommendations regarding the need for continued base funding after 2011 that may be required to fulfill the goals of the Recovery Programs. Report is due to the committees of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives 9/30/08.	Program						X	X	
VII.C.	Manage, direct, and coordinate Recovery Program activities.	PD	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
VII.C.1.	Review Information and Education program (Management Committee).	PD	Complete	Management Committee, July 28, 1994.						

GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
I.	PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT)									
I.A.	Green River above Duchesne River (Utah only; flows not threatened in Colorado because river is entirely within a National Wildlife Refuge and National Monument.)									
I.A.1.	Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery while providing experimental flows.									
I.A.1.a.	Summer/fall.	FWS-ES	Complete	USFWS 1992.						
I.A.1.b.	Winter/spring.	FWS-ES	Complete	Muth, et al. 2000.						
I.A.1.c.	Review summer/fall flow recommendation.	FWS-ES	Complete							
I.A.2.	State acceptance of initial flow recommendations.									
I.A.2.a.	Summer/Fall.	UT	Complete	USFWS 1992 and revised in Muth et al. 2000.						
I.A.2.b.	Winter/Spring.									
I.A.2.b.(1)	Review scientific basis.	UT	Complete	Muth et al. 2000.						
I.A.2.b.(2)	Assess legal and physical availability of water.	UT		X						
I.A.3.	Deliver identified flows.									
>*	I.A.3.a. Operate Flaming Gorge pursuant to the 1992 Biological Opinion to provide summer and fall flows.	BR	Begin 93, ongoing	X						
>*	I.A.3.b. Operate Flaming Gorge to supply winter and spring test flows for research.	BR	Complete	Muth et al. 2000.						
I.A.3.c.	Complete NEPA on reoperation of Flaming Gorge pursuant to Biological Opinion.	BR		X						
>*	I.A.3.d. Operate Flaming Gorge Dam to provide winter and spring flows and revised summer/fall flows, pursuant to the new Biological Opinion.	BR	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.A.3.d.1.	Conduct real-time larval razorback and Colorado pikeminnow sampling to guide Flaming Gorge operations.	LFL/FWS	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.A.4.	Legally protect identified flows.									
I.A.4.a.	Protect Summer/Fall flows.									
I.A.4.a.(1)	Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy.	UT	Complete 10/94	Utah Division of Water Rights. 1994 (public meetings October 1994; policy November 1994).						
I.A.4.a.(2)	Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria).	UT	Complete 11/94							
>*	I.A.4.a.(3) Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights.	UT	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.A.4.a.(4)	Evaluate effectiveness of policy.	UT	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.A.4.b.	Protect Winter/Spring flows.									
I.A.4.b.(1)	Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy.	UT		X	X					
I.A.4.b.(2)	Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria).	UT		X	X					
>*	I.A.4.b.(3) Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights.	UT	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.B.	Green River below the Duchesne River									
I.B.1.	Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery while providing experimental flows.	FWS-ES	Complete	Muth et al. 2000.						
I.B.2.	State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations).									
I.B.2.a.	Review scientific basis.	UT	Complete	Muth et al. 2000.						
I.B.2.b.	Assess legal and physical availability of water from Green River and tributaries.	UT		X						
I.B.3.	Legally protect identified flows (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations).									
I.B.3.a.	Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy.	UT		X	X					
I.B.3.b.	Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria).	UT		X	12/04					
>*	I.B.3.c. Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights.	UT	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.C.	Price River									
I.C.1.	Determine endangered fish spring through autumn use of the Price River.	UT	Complete	Cavalli 1999.						
I.C.2.	Determine winter use and seasonal flow needs for Colorado pikeminnow in the Price River.	UT/FWS		X						
I.D.	Evaluate and revise as needed, flow regimes to benefit endangered fish populations.	FWS/Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.E.	Assess need for tributary management plan for San Rafael River.	PD			X					
I.E.1.	Estimate future water demands on San Rafael River.	TBD	TBD							
I.E.2.	Develop tributary management plan for San Rafael River.	PD	TBD							

GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
I.E.3.	Conduct appropriate Section 7 and NEPA compliance to implement tributary management plan.	PD/FWS	TBD							
II.	RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE)									
II.A.	Restore and manage flooded bottomland habitat.									
II.A.1.	Conduct site restoration.									
II.A.1.a.	Old Charlie Wash.									
>* II.A.1.a.(1)	Construct water control structure and fish kettle.	BR	Complete	Inlet and outlet water control structures repaired and a fish-harvest kettle installed in spring 1995. Inlet structure replaced March 1996. Leaks to outlet structure repaired in 1999.						
II.A.1.a.(2)	Update management plan.	PD	TBD	Need for operational plan TBD pending determination of role of OCW in recovery.						
II.A.1.a.(3)	Monitor and evaluate success.	FWS-FR/BR								
II.A.2.	Acquire interest in high-priority flooded bottomland habitats between Ouray NWR and Jensen to benefit endangered fish.									
II.A.2.a.	Identify and evaluate sites.	FWS-FR	Complete	Six sites acquired (1008.1 acres total). Floodplain acquisition completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Green River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004a) (IIA4).						
II.A.2.b.	Pre-acquisition planning and identification of acquisition options.	PD	Complete							
II.A.2.c.	Conduct appraisal/NEPA compliance.	PD	Complete							
>* II.A.2.d.	Negotiate acquisition and acquire.	PD	Complete							
II.A.2.e.	Evaluate effectiveness of land acquisition activities and provide recommendations.	PD	Complete							
II.A.3.	Implement levee removal strategy at high-priority sites.									
II.A.3.a.	Preconstruction (contaminants screening, floodability assessments, environmental compliance, design, and engineering).	PD/BR	Complete	Levees breached at 8 sites (accessing 274 acres). Levee removal completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Green River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004a) (IIA4). See also Birchell et al. 2002.						
>* II.A.3.b.	Construction (levee breaching). [NOTE: Subject to review and approval for depression wetlands.]	BR	Complete							
>* II.A.3.c.	Operate and maintain.	BR/FWS	Complete							
II.A.3.d.	Evaluation.	FWS	Complete							
>* II.A.4.	Develop and implement Green River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004a).	Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
II.B.	Restore native fish passage at instream barriers.									
II.B.1.	Assess and make recommendations for fish passage at low flows at Tusher Wash.	FWS-FR/ - WR/BR	Complete	Cavalli 2000.						
II.B.2.	Screen Tusher Wash diversion to prevent endangered fish entrainment, if warranted.									
II.B.2.a.	Assess need.	UDWR	Complete	Cavalli 2000, Kitcheyan et al. 2001.						
II.B.2.b.	Design.	BR			X					
>* II.B.2.c.	Construct.	BR				X	X			
II.C.	Enhance water temperatures to benefit endangered fishes.									
II.C.1.	Identify options to release warmer water from Flaming Gorge Reservoir to restore native fish habitat in the Green River.	BR	Complete	USBR 2003.						
II.D.	Support actions to reduce or eliminate selenium impacts at Ashley Creek and Stewart Drain. [NOTE: selenium remediation (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program.]	FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
III.	REDUCE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT)									
III.A.	Reduce negative impacts to endangered fishes from sportfish management activities.									
III.A.1.	Determine relationship between Flaming Gorge test flows and relative abundance of young Colorado pikeminnow and nonnative fishes in nursery habitat.	UDWR	Complete	Bestgen 1997, Bestgen and Crist 2000.						
>* III.A.2.	Control escapement of nonnative fishes from Ouray National Wildlife Refuge originating from Pelican Lake.	FWS-RW	Complete	Construction completed prior to spring 1997 runoff?						
>* III.A.3.	Identify and control sources of catfish and centrarchids in the middle Green River.	UDWR	Complete	Jackson and Badame 2002.						
III.A.4.	Develop and implement control programs for nonnative fishes in river reaches occupied by the endangered fishes to identify required levels of control. Each control activity will be evaluated for effectiveness, and then continued as needed.									
>* III.A.4.a.	Northern pike in the middle Green River.	UDWR		X	X	X				
III.A.4.b.	Nonnative cyprinids and centrarchids in nursery habitats.									
>* III.A.4.b.(1)	Small nonnative cyprinids from backwaters and other low-velocity habitats in the lower Green River.	UDWR	Late report	X						
>* III.A.4.b.(2)	Smallmouth bass in middle and lower Green River.	UDWR		X	X	X				

GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
>*	III.A.4.c. Channel catfish (e.g. Deso./Gray Canyons) to protect humpback chub populations, and in the middle Green River to protect razorback sucker and Colorado pikeminnow.	FWS/UDWR	On hold							
	IV. MANAGE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES)									
	IV.A. Augment or restore populations as needed, and as guided by the Genetics Management Plan.									
	IV.A.1. Develop state stocking plan for the four endangered fishes in the Green River.									
	IV.A.1.a. Prepare plan.	UDWR	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
	IV.A.1.b. Program acceptance.	UDWR	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
>	IV.A.1.c. Implement plan.	UDWR	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	IV.A.1.c.(1) Conduct high-priority lab/field studies identified in bonytail reintroduction plan.	UDWR	Draft not accepted; dropped.	Crowl and Rivera 2000.						
	IV.A.1.d. Evaluate stocking success as identified in monitoring plan for stocked fish.	LFL/FWS/ STATES	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	V. MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT)									
	V.A. Conduct research to acquire life history information and enhance scientific techniques required to complete recovery actions.									
	V.A.1. Verify additional Colorado pikeminnow spawning areas in lower Green.	UT	Complete	Chart et al. 1999.						
	V.A.2. Identify additional razorback sucker spawning areas in lower Green.	UT	Complete	Chart et al. 1999, Muth et al. 1998.						
	V.B. Conduct population estimate for humpback chub.									
	V.B.1. Desolation/Gray	UDWR		X			X	X	X	X
	V.C. Conduct population estimate for Colorado pikeminnow.									
	V.C.1. Middle Green River (including Yampa and White rivers).	LFL/UDWR/ FWS				X	X	X	X	X
	V.C.3. Lower Green River	LFL/UDWR/ FWS				X	X	X	X	X
	V.D. Conduct population estimate for razorback sucker.							X	X	X

GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: YAMPA AND LITTLE SNAKE RIVERS

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
I.C.1.	Evaluate importance of Little Snake to endangered fishes and develop management action plan. (Determine if habitat exists to protect under Colorado's instream flow program.)	BR/LFL	Complete	Hawkins et al. 2001; Hawkins and O'Brien 2001.						
I.C.2.	Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery (needed).									
I.C.2.a.	Develop work plan.	BR/LFL	Complete	Hawkins et al. 2001; Hawkins and O'Brien 2001.						
I.C.2.b.	Identify flows.	FWS-WR		6/04						
I.C.3.	Evaluate need for instream flow water rights.									
I.C.3.a.	Review scientific basis.	CWCB/CDOW	Complete							
I.C.3.b.	Assess legal and physical availability of water.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
I.C.3.c.	Assess compact considerations.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
I.C.3.d.	Five-year periodic review of progress under the PBO to determine if instream flow filings are necessary.	CWCB/FWS Wyoming							X	X
I.C.3.d.(1)	If necessary, evaluate how identified flows will be legally protected.	CWCB/ Wyoming							X	X
I.C.4.	Assess Wyoming's current and future water needs.	Wyoming	Complete	Assessment of Wyoming's future water needs is completed (see 2001 RIPRAP assessment)						
I.D.	<u>Yampa River below Little Snake River</u>									
I.D.1.	Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery.	FWS-FR	Complete	Modde and Smith 1995.						
I.D.1.a.	Modify based on revisions to environmental baseline.	FWS-WR	Complete	Modde and Smith 1995.						
I.D.1.b.	Update flow recommendations to include flows from the Little Snake River.	FWS		9/04						
I.D.2.	Evaluate need for instream flow water rights.									
I.D.2.a.	Review scientific basis.	CWCB/CDOW	Complete							
I.D.2.b.	Assess legal and physical availability of water.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
I.D.2.c.	Assess compact considerations.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
I.D.2.d.	Five-year periodic review of progress under the PBO to determine if instream flow filings are necessary.	CWCB/FWS						X	X	X
I.D.2.d.(1)	If necessary, evaluate how identified flows will be legally protected.	CWCB						X	X	X
II.	RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE)									
II.A.	<u>Yampa River from Dinosaur National Monument to Craig, Colorado</u>									
II.A.1.	Restore native fish passage at instream barriers and reduce impacts of maintaining diversion structures.									
II.A.1.a.	Inventory potential barriers.	CRWCD	Complete	Hydrosphere 1995.						
II.A.1.b.	Determine threshold (passage) flows between Craig and Dinosaur National Monument (low- flow dependent).	CDOW/FWS	Complete	Modde et al. 1999.						
II.A.1.c.	Develop guidelines to facilitate fish passage at new diversion structures.	PD/FWS-ES	Complete	Roehm 2003.						
II.A.2.	Reduce/eliminate entrainment of Colorado pikeminnow at diversion structures.									
II.A.2.a.	Identify and evaluate existing diversion structures for entrainment of Colorado pikeminnow	PD/FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
>* II.A.2.b.	Develop and implement remedial measures, as necessary, to reduce or eliminate entrainment.	PD/CDOW/ FWS	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
II.A.2.c.	Develop guidelines to reduce or eliminate entrainment at new diversion structures, if necessary.	PD/CDOW/ FWS	Complete	Roehm 2003.						
II.A.3.	Review NPS/USGS report to assess potential for negative impacts of elevated pH to endangered fish.	Program	Complete	PD's office reviewed Chafin 2002 and agreed elevated pH is a sampling artifact.						
II.B.	<u>Green River from Ouray to Jensen, Utah</u> (see Green River Action Plan)									
II.B.1	Acquire interest in high-priority flooded bottomland habitats between Ouray NWR and Jensen to benefit endangered fish (see Green River Action Plan : Mainstem II.A.2.)									
II.B.2.	Implement levee removal strategy at high-priority sites (see Green River Action Plan : Mainstem II.A.3.).									
III.	REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT)									
III.A.	Develop aquatic management plan (Colorado) to reduce nonnative fish impacts while providing sportfishing opportunities (also relates to nonnative fish management/control -- Recovery Element III). CDOW 1998.	CDOW	Complete; due for revision	X	X					
>* III.A.1.	Implement Yampa Basin aquatic wildlife management plan to develop nonnative fish control programs in reaches of the Yampa River occupied by the endangered fishes. Each control activity will be evaluated for effectiveness and then continued as needed.	CDOW	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: YAMPA AND LITTLE SNAKE RIVERS

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
III.A.1.a.	Identify potential conflicts between present fisheries management in existing Elkhead Reservoir and endangered fishes and formulate alternative management plan.	CDOW	Complete	CDOW 2003.						
III.A.1.a.(1)	Evaluate nonnative fish escapement and control options at Elkhead Reservoir (during and after Elkhead expansion construction).	FWS-FR/ CDOW		X						
>* III.A.1.a.(2)	Implement control measures as needed to control escapement (during and after Elkhead expansion construction).				X	X	X	X	X	X
III.A.1.b.	Control northern pike									
>* III.A.1.b.(1)	Remove and translocate northern pike from Yampa River.	CDOW/FWS	Ongoing	X	X	X				
III.A.1.b.(2)	Reduce northern pike reproduction in the Yampa River.									
III.A.1.b.(2)(a)	Identify and evaluate natural and artificial spawning/nursery habitats for northern pike in the Yampa River for exclusion devices.	CDOW		X						
>* III.A.1.b.(2)(b)	Implement remedial measures to reduce pike reproduction in Yampa River.	CDOW		X						
III.A.1.b.(2)(c)	Develop guidelines for new structures to minimize creation of habitat suitable for pike spawning/nursery.	CDOW		X						
III.A.1.c.	Control channel catfish									
>* III.A.1.c.(1)	Remove channel catfish in Yampa Canyon.	FWS	Ongoing	X	X	X				
>* III.A.1.c.(2)	Remove and translocate channel catfish above Yampa Canyon.	CDOW	On hold							
>* III.A.1.d.	Remove and translocate smallmouth bass.	CDOW	Ongoing	X	X	X				
III.A.1.e.	Remove bag and possession limits on warmwater nonnative sportfishes within critical habitat in Colorado.	CDOW	Complete	In Colorado fishing regulations.						
IV.	MANAGE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES)									
IV.A.	<u>Yampa River in Dinosaur National Monument</u>									
IV.A.1.	Augment or restore populations as needed, and as guided by the Genetics Mgmt. Plan.									
IV.A.1.a.	Develop State stocking plan for bonytail in the Yampa River.	CDOW	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003						
> IV.A.1.a.(1)	Implement stocking plan.	FWS/CDOW	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV.A.1.b.	Evaluate stocking success as identified in monitoring plan for stocked fish.	LFL/FWS/ States/PD	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
V.	MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT)									
V.A.	Conduct population estimate for humpback chub.	FWS		X			X	X	X	X

GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: DUCHESNE RIVER

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
I.	PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT)									
I.A.	Identify initial year-round flows needed for recovery.	FWS-ES	Complete	Initial year-round flow needs for recovery were identified & summarized in a letter to Program Director on 03/09/95 and included in 1998 biological opinion.						
I.A.1.	Conduct hydrology/water availability study.	UT	Complete	CH2MHill 1997.						
I.A.2.	Conduct follow-up study to evaluate and refine flow recommendations.	FWS/UT	Complete	Modde and Keleher 2003.						
I.B.	State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations).									
I.B.1.	Review scientific basis.	UT	Complete	Acceptance of Modde and Keleher 2003.						
I.B.2.	Assess legal and physical availability of water.	UT			12/04					
I.C.	Legally protect and deliver identified flows.									
I.C.1.	Strawberry Valley Project.									
I.C.1.a.	Determine amount of water available from the Strawberry Valley Project for fish use. (This is part of the coordinated reservoir operation in I.D.)	USBR/DOI/PD/ Strawberry Water Users	Late	BR/CUWCD completed coordinated reservoir operations model in 2003. Task completion part of I.D.1.						
I.C.2.	Management of Daniels Transbasin Diversion.									
I.C.2.a.	Determine the amount of water available from the Daniels Diversion for endangered fish use and pattern and location for delivery.	DOI/IBAT/FWS/ Mitig. Comm./ CUWCD/ UteTribe	Late	BR/CUWCD completed model in 2003. Task completion part of I.D.1.						
>* I.C.2.b.	Develop agreements if feasible to deliver and protect water available from the Daniels Diversion.	UT/IBAT /FWS/DOI/ Mitig.Comm./ CUWCD		X	X	12/05				
I.D.	Coordinate reservoir operation.									
I.D.1.	Determine feasibility and benefits of coordinated reservoir operation.	BR/CUWCD/ DOI	Late	X						
>* I.D.2.	Develop agreements if feasible to coordinate reservoir operations and protect flows to the Green River.	BR/CUWCD/ UT/Ute Tribe		X	X	12/05				
I.E.	Examine the feasibility of other options for obtaining water.	BR/DOI/PD/ UteTribe		X	X	X				
I.F.	Determine need and feasibility of additional gaging.	BR/FWS/UT		X	12/04					
I.F.1.	Construct additional gages, as needed.	TBD			X	X				
I.G.	Evaluate and revise as needed, flow regimes to benefit endangered fish populations	FWS/Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
III.	REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT)									
III.A.	Reduce negative interactions between nonnative and endangered fishes.									
III.A.1.	Identify most damaging nonnative fishes.	UDWR	Complete	Hawkins and Nesler 1991, Lentsch et al. 1996b, Tyus and Saunders 1996.						
III.A.2.	Assess options to control negative interactions from nonnative fishes from the Duchesne River to benefit Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker young-of-the-year.	UDWR	Complete	Tyus and Saunders 1996.						
III.A.3.	Implement and evaluate the effects of viable measures to control negative interactions from nonnative fishes. (See III.A.3. under Green River Mainstem Action Plan.)									
III.A.3.a.	Evaluate feasibility of screen on Bottle Hollow Reservoir to control nonnative fish escapement and explore alternative funding sources.	FWS-FAO/Ute Tribe/BOR	Complete	USFWS 2001.						
>* III.A.3.a.(1)	If feasible and necessary, screen Bottle Hollow Reservoir	Ute Tribe	Complete	Elder's Pond screen (downstream of Bottle Hollow) completed in 2002 (Irving and Montoya 2002).						
III.A.3.b.	Evaluate escapement of nonnative fishes from Starvation Reservoir and the feasibility of screening.	UDWR		X	X					
>* III.A.3.b.(1)	If feasible and necessary, screen Starvation Reservoir	TBD								
>* III.A.3.c.	Remove nonnative fish (smallmouth bass, channel catfish and northern pike).	FWS-FR		X	X	X				

GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: WHITE RIVER

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
I.	PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT)									
I.A.	Assess need for tributary management plan for the White River.	PD			X					
I.A.1.	Estimate future water demands on the White River.	TBD	TBD							
I.A.2.	Develop tributary management plan.	PD	TBD							
I.A.3.	Conduct appropriate Section 7 and NEPA compliance to implement tributary management plan.	PD/FWS	TBD							
I.B.	Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery.									
I.B.1.	Develop work plan.	FWS-FR	Complete	Lentsch et al. 2000.						
I.B.2.	Identify flows.	FWS-FR	TBD	Initial report complete (Irving et al. 2004), but may need further refinement after demand study completed.						
I.C.	Evaluate how identified flows will be legally protected.	CWCB	Pending							
I.D.	State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations).									
I.D.1.	Review scientific basis, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS.	UT/CO	Pending							
I.D.2.	Assess legal and physical availability of water.	UT/CO	Complete	No work has been done in Utah on water availability. CO completed work on a water availability study for the White River in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of Compact waters to the White River.						
I.D.3.	Assess compact considerations (in Colorado).	CWCB	Complete	CO completed work on a water availability study for the White River in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of Compact waters to the White River.						
I.D.4.	CWCB notice of intent to appropriate (in Colorado).	CWCB	On hold							
I.E.	Legally protect identified flows (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations).									
I.E.1.	Protect flows in Colorado.									
I.E.1.a	Appropriate.									
I.E.1.a.(1)	CWCB approval to appropriate.	CWCB	On hold							
>* I.E.1.a.(2)	Colorado Attorney Generals Office file date.	CWCB	On hold							
>* I.E.1.a.(3)	Water court adjudication (litigation dependent).	CWCB	On hold							
I.E.2.	Protect flows in Utah.									
I.E.2.a.	Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy.	UT	TBD							
I.E.2.b.	Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria).	UT	TBD							
>* I.E.2.c.	Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights.	UT	TBD, as required							
I.F.	Evaluate and revise as needed flow regimes to benefit endangered fish populations.	FWS/Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
II.	RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE)									
II.A.	Restore native fish passage at instream barriers.									
II.A.1.	Assess and make recommendations for fish passage at Taylor Draw.	PD	Complete	Taylor Draw fish passage recommendations completed in 1997 when Program determined costs exceeded benefits. Irving 1997.						
III.	REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT)									
III.A.	Reduce negative interactions between nonnative and endangered fishes.									
III.A.1.	Monitor escapement of nonnative fishes from Kenney Reservoir (especially black crappie and channel catfish).	CDOW	TBD	Initial assessment completed. If fish stocked in the future, escapement will need to be monitored. Elmblad 1998.						
III.B.	Reduce negative impacts to endangered fishes from sportfish management activities.									
III.B.1.	Assess adequacy of current regulations and options (including harvest) to reduce negative impacts on native fishes from nonnative sportfish and options to reduce angling mortality on native fishes below Kenney Reservoir.	CDOW	Complete	CDOW completed sportfish regulation/angling regulation changes in 1997 (See Colorado fishing regulations).						
III.B.1.a.	If necessary, assess management options to reduce escapement of black crappie from Kenney Reservoir.	CDOW	Complete	Colorado evaluation of January 2002 determined that black crappie escapement is not a problem.						
V.	MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT)									
V.A.	Conduct research to acquire life history information and enhance scientific techniques required to complete recovery actions.									
V.A.1.	Determine relative abundance and fate of Colorado pikeminnow congregation below Kenney Reservoir.	FWS-FR	Complete	Elmblad 1997.						
V.A.2.	Monitor the White River fish community downstream of Kenney Reservoir to determine long-term effects of mainstream impoundment on the White River.	FWS-FR	Complete	Elmblad 1997.						

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
I.	PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT)									
I.A.	<u>Colorado River above Gunnison River</u>									
>*	I.A.1. Develop, issue and implement PBO.	FWS	Complete	USFWS 1999b.						
	I.A.2. Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery.									
	I.A.2.a. Rifle to Roller Dam.	FWS-FR	Complete	Osmundson 2001.						
	I.A.2.b. Roller Dam to 15-Mile Reach.	FWS-FR	Complete	Osmundson 2001.						
	I.A.2.c. 15-Mile Reach.	FWS-FR	Complete	Osmundson and Kaeding 1991.						
	I.A.3. Provide a depletion accounting report as outlined in the 15-Mile Reach PBO.									
	I.A.3.a. Collect data.	CWCB/FWS-ES/BR		X	X					X
	I.A.3.b. Develop consumptive use and losses report with CRDSS model to verify level of depletions.	CWCB				12/05				
	I.A.3.c. Calculate new depletions every 5 years (2011, 2016, etc).	CWCB								X
	I.A.4. Evaluate need for instream flow water rights.									
	I.A.4.a. Rifle to Roller Dam (Dependent on initial flow recommendations).									
	I.A.4.a.(1) Assess legal and physical availability of water.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
	I.A.4.a.(2) Assess compact considerations.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
	I.A.4.a.(3) Five-year periodic review of progress under the PBO to determine if instream flow filings are necessary.	CWCB/FWS		X						X
	I.A.4.a.(3)(a) If necessary, evaluate how identified flows will be legally protected.	CWCB		X						X
	I.A.4.b. Roller Dam to 15-Mile Reach (Dependent on initial flow recommendations).									
	I.A.4.b.(1) Assess legal and physical availability of water.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
	I.A.4.b.(2) Assess compact considerations.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
	I.A.4.b.(3) Five-year periodic review of progress under the PBO to determine if instream flow filings are necessary.	CWCB/FWS		X						X
	I.A.4.b.(4) If necessary, evaluate how identified flows will be legally protected.	CWCB		X						X
	I.A.4.c. 15-Mile Reach.									
	I.A.4.c.(1) Instream flow water right secured - 581 cfs (July - September).		Complete	On September 2, 1997, instream flow water rights were decreed for 581 and 300 cfs to benefit endangered fishes in the 15-Mile Reach. These water rights have a priority date of the date file which is December 1992 and December 194 respectively.						
	I.A.4.c.(2) Irrigation season return flows legally protected - 300 cfs.		Complete							
	I.A.5. Provide and legally protect instream flows pursuant to Colorado River PBO.									
>*	I.A.5.a. Pursuant to Ruedi Biological Opinion, deliver 5,000af annually & an additional 5,000af 4 out of 5 years (ongoing and protect by short-term agreement).	BR/CWCB	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
>*	I.A.5.b. Execute long-term lease for 10,825 af from Ruedi Reservoir.	BR/FWS/CWCB	Complete	2012 lease signed June 23, 2003.						
>*	I.A.5.b.(1) Provide water annually pursuant to long-term lease.	BR/CWCB		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	I.A.5.c. Execute 10-year agreement for delivery of 5,412.5 af by West Slope water users.	CRWCD/FWS	Complete	Pursuant to the 1999 PBO, in 2000, the Service signed a 10-year agreement with the CRWCD for delivery of 5,412 acre-feet of West Slope water from Wolford Mountain Reservoir (in addition to the original commitment of 6,000 acre-feet).						
>*	I.A.5.c.(1) Provide and protect water deliveries by West Slope water users.	CRWCD/CWCB	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	I.A.5.d. Execute 10-year agreement for delivery of 5,412.5 af by East Slope water users.	DWD/FWS	Complete	Pursuant to the 1999 PBO, in 2000, the Service signed a 10-year agreement with Denver Water to deliver of 5,412 acre-feet of East Slope water from Williams Fork Reservoir.						
>*	I.A.5.d.(1) Provide and protect water deliveries by East Slope water users.	DWD/CWCB	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	I.A.5.e. Permanent delivery of 10,825 af of water in late summer/early fall to meet base flow needs.									
	I.A.5.e.(1) Identify options.	CRWCD/NWCD/Denver Water		X						

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
	I.B.4.b.(1) CWCB approval to appropriate.	CWCB	On hold							
>*	I.B.4.b.(2) Colorado Attorney Generals Office file date.	CWCB	On hold							
>*	I.B.4.b.(3) Water court adjudication (litigation dependent).	CWCB	On hold							
	I.B.4.c. Deliver and legally protect flows from Aspinall (see Colorado River above Gunnison and Gunnison River).									
>*	I.B.4.c.(1) Operate Aspinall to provide test flows.	BR	Complete	Test flows provided through 1997; synthesis report and flow recommendations report completed in 2003 (McAda 2003).						
>*	I.B.4.c.(2) Continue annual coordination (meeting 3 times/year) of Aspinall operation until biological opinion complete.	BR	Ongoing							
	I.B.4.c.(3) Operate Aspinall to provide flows pursuant to biological opinion.									
	I.B.4.c.(3)(a) Determine if change in water right and/or contract is needed.	BR	Pending							
	I.B.4.c.(3)(b) Enter into contract if needed.	BR	Pending							
>*	I.B.4.c.(3)(c) Deliver flows.	BR	Pending							
	I.C. Colorado River from Colorado-Utah State line to Green River (Flow recommendations needed.)									
	I.C.1. Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery.	FWS-FR	Complete	McAda 2003.						
	I.C.2. State acceptance of initial flow recommendations.									
	I.C.2.a. Review scientific basis.	UT	Pending							
	I.C.2.b. Assess legal and physical availability of water.	UT	Pending							
	I.C.3. Legally protect identified flows.									
	I.C.3.a. Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy.	UT	Pending							
	I.C.3.b. Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria).	UT	Pending							
>*	I.C.3.c. Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights.	UT	Pending							
	I.D. Colorado River below Green River									
	I.D.1. Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery.	FWS		X						
	I.D.2. Assess adequacy of combined flows from Colorado and Green rivers to provide fish habitat (and meet recovery goals) in the Cataract Canyon reach of the Colorado River.	FWS		X						
	I.E. Evaluate and revise as needed flow regimes to benefit endangered fish populations.	FWS/Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	II. RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE)									
	II.A. Restore and manage flooded bottomland habitat.									
	II.A.1. 29-5/8 Road Gravel Pit (became part of larger "Hot Spot Complex" in 2003.)									
	II.A.1.a. Develop and approve management plans.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick 1994.						
	II.A.1.b. Site design/complete environmental compliance.	BR	Complete	Levee initially breached in December 1995. To enhance post-runoff drainability, site topography was re-contoured in March 1998.						
>*	II.A.1.c. Construct.	BR	Complete							
>*	II.A.1.d. Operate and maintain.	BR	TBD, revisit as needed							
	II.A.1.e. Monitor and evaluate success; modify as needed.	FWS-FR	TBD, revisit as needed	Burdick 2002. Floodplain acquisition completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b) (IIA6).						
	II.A.2. Adobe Creek.									
	II.A.2.a. Develop and approve management plans.	FWS-FR	Complete	Earthen dikes and water control structures completed in spring 1995.						
	II.A.2.b. Site design/complete environmental compliance.	BR	Complete							
>*	II.A.2.c. Construct.	BR	Complete							
>*	II.A.2.d. Operate and maintain.	BR	TBD, revisit as needed	Hamilton et al. 1996, 1997, 2003. Floodplain acquisition completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b) (IIA6).						
	II.A.2.e. Monitor and evaluate success; modify as needed.	FWS-FR	TBD, revisit as needed							
	II.A.3. Walter Walker.									
	II.A.3.a. Develop and approve management plans.	FWS-FR	Complete	1994						
	II.A.3.b. Site design/complete environmental compliance.	BR	Complete	Initial construction was completed during FY 95.						

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04	FY 05	FY 06	FY 07	FY 08	FY 09	OUT-YEARS	
				10/03-9/04	10/04-9/05	10/05-9/06	10/06-9/07	10/07-9/08	10/08-9/09		
>*	II.A.3.c. Construct.	BR	Complete	75 cfs inlet control structure to flush selenium was completed December 1996 (Hamilton et al. 2003).							
>*	II.A.3.d. Operate and maintain.	BR/FWS/ CDOW	TBD, revisit as needed	Floodplain acquisition completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b) (IIA6).							
	II.A.3.e. Monitor and evaluate success; modify as needed.	FWS-FR	TBD, revisit as needed	Hamilton et al. 1996, 1997, 2003, Scheer 1998.							
	II.A.4. Develop and implement levee removal strategy at high-priority sites.										
	II.A.4.a. Preconstruction (contaminants screening, floodability assessments, environmental compliance, design & engineering.	BR/FWS	Complete	Burdick 2002. Levees breached at two sites (19.5 acres total). Levee removal completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b) (IIA6).							
>*	II.A.4.b. Construction (levee breaching) [NOTE: Subject to review and approval for depression wetlands.]	BR	Complete								
>*	II.A.4.c. Operate and maintain.	BR/FWS	Complete								
	II.A.4.d. Evaluation	FWS	Complete								
	II.A.5. Acquire interest in high-priority flooded bottomland habitats.										
	II.A.5.a. Identify and evaluate sites.	FWS	Complete	Acquired 10 sites (394 acres total). Floodplain acquisition completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b) (IIA6).							
	II.A.5.b. Pre-acquisition planning and identification of acquisition options.	PD	Complete								
	II.A.5.c. Conduct appraisal/NEPA compliance.	PD	Complete								
>*	II.A.5.d. Negotiate and acquire.	PD	Complete								
	II.A.5.e. Evaluate effectiveness of land acquisition activities and provide recommendations	PD	Complete								
>*	II.A.6. Develop and implement Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b).	Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	II.B. Restore native fish passage at instream barriers.										
	II.B.1. Restore passage at Grand Valley Irrigation Co. Diversion Dam (Palisade)										
	II.B.1.a. Evaluate and implement viable options to restore fish passage.	BR/FWS	Complete	1997							
	II.B.1.a.(1) Obtain landowner consent/agreement.	BR	Complete	Preconstruction activities complete 1997.							
	II.B.1.a.(2) Site design/environmental compliance.	BR	Complete	Preconstruction activities complete 1997.							
>*	II.B.1.a.(3) Construct.	BR	Complete	GVIC passage construction completed in 01/98.							
>*	II.B.1.a.(4) Operate and maintain.	FWS-FR/BR	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	II.B.1.a.(5) Monitor and evaluate success.	FWS-FR/BR	Complete	Burdick 1999.							
	II.B.1.b. Screen GVIC diversion to prevent endangered fish entrainment, if warranted.										
	II.B.1.b.(1) Design.	BR	Complete	1999							
>*	II.B.1.b.(2) Construct.	BR	Complete	GVIC diversion canal fish screen completed in 05/02, modifications to be completed March 2004.							
>*	II.B.1.b(3) Operate and maintain.	FWS-FR/BR	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	II.B.2. Restore fish passage at Price Stubb.										
	II.B.2.a. Evaluate and implement viable options.										
	II.B.2.a.(1) Obtain landowner consent/agreement.	BR		X							
	II.B.2.a.(2) Site design/environmental compliance.	BR		X							
>*	II.B.2.a.(3) Construct.	BR		X	X	4/06					
>*	II.B.2.a.(4) Operate and maintain.	TBD			X	X	X	X	X	X	
	II.B.2.a.(5) Monitor and evaluate success (if dam removed, no biological evaluation will be needed).	FWS-FR/BR			X						
	II.B.3. Restore fish passage at Government Highline (Roller Dam).										
	II.B.3.a. Evaluate and implement viable options.										
	II.B.3.a.(1) Site design/environmental compliance.	BR	Complete	2003							
>*	II.B.3.a.(2) Construct.	BR		8/04							
>*	II.B.3.a.(3) Operate and maintain.	BR			X	X	X	X	X	X	
	II.B.3.a.(4) Monitor and evaluate success.	FWS-FR/BR			X	X					
	II.B.3.b. Screen Government Highline diversion to prevent endangered fish entrainment										
	II.B.3.b.(1) Design.	BR	Complete	2002							
>*	II.B.3.b.(2) Construct.	BR		X	03/05						
	II.B.3.b.(3) Evaluate screening.	FWS-FR/BR			X	X					
	II.C. Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts. [NOTE: Contaminants remediation (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program.]										
	II.C.1. Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts of selenium in the Grand Valley.	FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	II.C.2. Support remediation of groundwater contamination at the Atlas Mill tailings site.	FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
II.C.3.	Identify measures to minimize risk of hazardous materials spills in Black Rocks and Westwater Canyon from transport along the adjacent railway to protect humpback chub populations.	FWS-ES	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
III.	REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT)									
III.A.	Develop and implement control programs in reaches of the Colorado River occupied by endangered fishes. Each control activity will be evaluated for effectiveness and then continued as needed.									
III.A.1.	Determine relationship between Aspinall test flows and nonnative fish abundance.	UDWR/ FWS-FR	Complete	McAda & Ryel 1999.						
>* III.A.2.	Reclaim ponds in critical habitat.	CDO	Complete	Martinez 2004.						
III.A.2.a.	Evaluate and make recommendations.	CDO	Complete							
III.A.3.	Nonnative cyprinids and centrarchids in nursery habitats.									
III.A.3.a.	Remove small nonnative cyprinids from backwaters and other low velocity habitats.	CDO/UDWR	Complete	Trammell et al. 2002.						
III.A.3.b.	Remove nonnative centrarchids from backwaters and other low velocity habitats.	FWS	Complete	Osmundson 2003.						
III.A.4.	Preclude escapement from ponds in critical habitat as needed and feasible.									
III.A.4.a.	Evaluate sources of nonnative fishes and make recommendations.	CDO/FWS		X	X					
>* III.A.5.	Develop and implement program to identify required level of channel catfish control.	FWS	On hold	Smallmouth bass considered higher priority (2004).						
>* III.A.6.	Develop and implement program to identify required level of smallmouth bass control.	FWS		X	X	X				
III.B.	Reduce negative impacts to endangered fishes from sportfish management activities.									
>* III.B.1.	Evaluate control options and implement measures to control nonnative fish escapement from Highline Reservoir.	CDO/ CRWCD	Complete	Fish barrier net installed in Highline Reservoir 8/99.						
III.B.1.a.	Operate and maintain Highline Reservoir net.	CDO	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
III.B.1.b.	Evaluate Highline Reservoir net.	CDO	Complete	Martinez 2002.						
III.B.2.	Remove bag and possession limits on warmwater nonnative sportfishes within critical habitat in Colorado.	CDO	Complete	See Colorado fishing regulations.						
III.B.4.	Develop basinwide aquatic management plan to reduce nonnative fish impacts while providing sportfishing opportunities. Draft: CDO 2002.	CDO		X						
>* III.B.4.a.	Implement CDO's Colorado River Aquatic Management Plan.	CDO	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV.	MANAGE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES)									
IV.A.	Augment or restore populations as needed, and as guided by the Genetics Management Plan.									
IV.A.1.	Razorback sucker.									
IV.A.1.a.	Develop experimental augmentation plan and seek Program acceptance.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick et al. 1995.						
IV.A.1.b.	Implement experimental augmentation plan.									
> IV.A.1.b.(1)	Stock fish.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick 2003.						
IV.A.1.b.(2)	Monitor and evaluate results; make recommendations regarding further augmentation.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick 2003.						
IV.A.2.	Monitor the fish community in the upper Colorado River (above Palisade) and develop management action plan, including recommendations for Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker augmentation.	CDO	Complete	Anderson 1997.						
IV.A.3.	Develop State stocking plan for razorbacks in the Colorado River in Colorado.	CDO/PD	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
IV.A.3.a.	Program acceptance.	CDO/PD	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
> IV.A.3.b.	Implement razorback sucker State stocking plan.	CDO/PD	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV.A.3.b.	Evaluate stocking success as identified in monitoring plan for stocked fish.	Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV.A.4.	Develop State stocking plan for Colorado pikeminnow in the Colorado River in Colorado.	CDO/PD	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
IV.A.4.a.	Program acceptance.	CDO/PD	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
> IV.A.4.b.	Implement Colorado pikeminnow State stocking plan.	CDO/PD	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV.A.4.c.	Evaluate stocking success as identified in monitoring plan for stocked fish.	Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV.A.5.	Develop State stocking plan for bonytail in the Colorado River from Palisade to Loma.	CDO	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
IV.A.5.a.	Program acceptance.	CDO/PD	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
> IV.A.5.b.	Implement bonytail State stocking plan.	FWS/CDO	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV.A.5.c.	Evaluate stocking success as identified in monitoring plan for stocked fish.	Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
IV.A.6.	Develop State stocking plan for the four endangered fish in the Colorado River in Utah.									
IV.A.6.a.	Prepare plan.	UDWR	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						
IV.A.6.b.	Program acceptance.	UDWR	Complete	Nesler et al. 2003.						

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
>	IV.A.6.c. Implement plan.	UDWR	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	IV.A.6.d. Evaluate stocking success as identified in monitoring plan for stocked fish.	UDWR		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	V. MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT)									
	V.A. Conduct research to acquire life history information and enhance scientific techniques required to complete recovery actions.									
	V.A.1. Determine Colorado pikeminnow larval drift into Lake Powell.	NPS	Complete	Muth and Wick 1996, 1997.						
	V.B. Monitor populations per requirements in the 15-Mile Reach PBO.									
	V.B.1. Determine initial baselines and indices for Colorado pikeminnow and humpback chub.	PD	Complete	Appendix to biological opinion (USFWS 1999a).						
	V.B.1.a. Evaluate population response, per 15-Mile Reach PBO (every 5 years beginning in FY 05).	FWS			X					X
	V.B.2. Determine initial baselines and indices for razorback sucker and bonytail.	PD			X					
	V.B.2.a. Evaluate population response, per 15-Mile Reach PBO (every 5 years beginning in FY 05).	FWS			X					X
	V.B.3. Revise population indices to conform to recovery goals.	FWS	Complete	2003 PBO evaluation (in concert with 2003 RIPRAP assessment).						
	V.B.4. Monitor incidental take.									
	V.B.4.a. Develop plan to monitor incidental take of endangered fishes in diversion structures.	FWS	Complete	"Plan" completed in that fish are being retrieved from canals until the canals are screened and screens are fully functional (anticipated in FY 05). Screens will prevent entrainment of adult, subadult, and juvenile fish (preventing entrainment of adult and subadult fish required is by recovery goals) because they are 3/32 mesh.						
	V.B.4.b. Implement plan to monitor incidental take of endangered fish in diversion structures.	FWS	Ongoing	X	X					
	V.C. Estimate humpback chub populations									
	V.C.1. Black Rocks	FWS		X			X	X	X	X
	V.C.2. Westwater	UDWR		X			X	X	X	X
	V.C.3. Cataract Canyon	UDWR/Valdez		X	X		X	X	X	X
	V.D. Estimate pikeminnow populations in the upper Colorado River (including Gunnison River).	FWS		X	X			X	X	X

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: GUNNISON RIVER

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
I.	PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT)									
I.A.	Identify fish habitat and flow needs.									
I.A.1.	Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery (Flow recommendations will be provided upon completion of Aspinall Unit studies.)									
I.A.1.a.	Complete draft technical synthesis report.	FWS	Complete	McAda 2000.						
I.A.1.b.	Complete draft biological assessment.	BR					X			
I.A.1.c.	Complete final technical synthesis report.	FWS	Complete	McAda 2003.						
I.A.1.d.	Complete final biological assessment.	BR					X			
I.A.1.e.	Complete draft biological opinion.	FWS						X		
I.A.1.f.	Complete draft NEPA document.	BR					X			
I.A.1.g.	Complete final biological opinion (FWS) and NEPA document (BR).	FWS/BR						X		
I.A.1.h.	Complete ESA Section 7 consultation resulting in a programmatic biological opinion (PBO) for the Gunnison Basin.	FWS/BR/WAPA							X	
I.B.	State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (Flow recommendations will be provided upon completion of Aspinall Unit studies.)									
I.B.1.	Review scientific basis, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS.	CWCB/CDOW	Complete	Complete with acceptance of McAda 2003.						
I.B.2.	Assess legal and physical availability of water.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
I.B.3.	Assess compact considerations.	CWCB	Complete	Colorado completed work on a water availability study in early 1995 & the work was used as the basis of the allocation of compact water between the five subbasins.						
I.B.4.	CWCB notice of intent to appropriate (in Colorado).	CWCB	On hold							
I.C.	Legally protect identified flows.									
I.C.1.	Acquire (flow recommendations will be provided upon completion of Aspinall Unit studies.)									
I.C.1.a.	Assess, acquire and convert water rights to instream flows.	CWCB	On hold							
I.C.2.	Appropriate (flow recommendations will be provided upon completion of Aspinall Unit studies.)									
I.C.2.a.	CWCB approval to appropriate.	CWCB	On hold							
>* I.C.2.b.	Colorado Attorney General's Office file date.	CWCB	On hold							
>* I.C.2.c.	Water court adjudication (litigation dependent).	CWCB	On hold							
I.C.3.	Deliver.									
>* I.C.3.a.	Aspinall Unit supplemental releases to maintain 2,000 cfs minimum flow at Colorado-Utah state line 9 out of 10 years. Provide annual report.	BR	Through 01							
I.C.3.b.	Flows from Aspinall Unit for research studies.									
>* I.C.3.b.(1)	Deliver flows.	BR	Complete							
>* I.C.3.b.(2)	Protect research flows.	FWS/BR/ CWCB	Complete	An interim contact is in place between Reclamation, Service & CWCB. Long term legal protection of Gunnison River flows will occur after completion of Aspinall biological opinion (BR 04/95-FY96).						
>* I.C.3.c.	Continue annual coordination (meeting 3 times/year) of Aspinall operation until biological opinion complete.	BR	Ongoing							
I.C.3.d.	Flows from Paonia Reservoir in accordance with FWS Horsethief Biological Opinion.									
>* I.C.3.d.(1)	Deliver flows.	BR	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.C.3.e.	Flows from Aspinall Unit pursuant to Aspinall Biological Opinion.									
I.C.3.e.(1)	Determine if change in water right and/or contract is needed.	BR	Pending							
I.C.3.e.(2)	Enter into contract if needed.	BR	Pending							
>* I.C.3.e.(3)	Deliver flows.	BR	Pending							
I.C.3.e.(3)(a)	Study Gunnison River return flows to determine consumptive use to be charged against flow deliveries.	USGS		X						
I.D.	Evaluate and revise as needed flow regimes to benefit endangered fish populations.	FWS/Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
I.E.	Initiate investigations of the feasibility of modifying releases from Aspinall Unit dams to increase water temperatures that would allow for upstream expansion of Colorado pikeminnow in the Gunnison River.	BR/Contract		X						
II.	RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE)									
II.A.	Restore and manage flooded bottomland habitat.									
II.A.1.	Develop management plan for Escalante State Wildlife Area.		Complete 5/94	Burdick 1994.						

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: GUNNISON RIVER

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
II.A.2.	Develop and implement levee removal strategy at high-priority sites.									
II.A.2.a.	Preconstruction (contaminants screening, floodability assessments, environmental compliance, design & engineering).	BR	Complete	Construction completed at Escalante State Wildlife Area (200 acres) in January 2001; Butch Craig's (Unaweep Charolais Ranch) (98.7) was completed October 2003. Levee removal completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b) (IIA4).						
>* II.A.2.b.	Construction (levee removal)	BR	Complete							
II.A.2.c.	Operate and maintain.	BR/FWS	Complete							
II.A.2.d.	Evaluation.	FWS	Complete							
II.A.3.	Acquire interest in high-priority flooded bottomland habitats.									
II.A.3.a.	Identify and evaluate sites.	FWS	Complete	Three sites acquired (198 acres total). Floodplain acquisition completed and operation, maintenance and evaluation of sites incorporated into Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b) (IIA4).						
II.A.3.b.	Pre-acquisition planning and identification of acquisition options.	PD	Complete							
II.A.3.c.	Conduct appraisal/NEPA compliance.	PD	Complete							
>* II.A.3.d.	Negotiate & acquire.	PD	Complete							
II.A.3.e.	Evaluate effectiveness of land acquisition activities and provide recommendations.	PD	Complete							
>* II.A.3.	Develop and implement Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan (Valdez and Nelson 2004b).	Program	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
II.B.	Restore native fish passage at instream barriers.									
II.B.1.	Restore passage at Redlands.									
II.B.1.a.	Assess and make recommendations for fish passage.	FWS	Complete	Burdick and Kaeding 1990.						
II.B.1.b.	Implement viable options to restore fish passage.									
II.B.1.b.(1)	Design passage, conduct NEPA compliance.	BR	Complete	1996 RR; Passage under construction as of 11/20/95, to be completed by 04/96, 96status.as						
>* II.B.1.b.(2)	Construct fish ladder.	BR	Complete	Construction completed in June 1996 (Burdick 2001).						
>* II.B.1.c.	Operate and maintain fish ladder.	FWS-FR/BR	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
II.B.1.d.	Monitor and evaluate success.	FWS-FR/BR	Complete	Burdick 2001.						
II.B.1.e.	Identify minimum flows below Redlands Diversion Dam.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick 1997.						
>* II.B.1.f.	Deliver flows below Redlands.	BR	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
II.B.1.g.	Screen Redlands diversion structure to prevent endangered fish entrainment									
II.B.1.g.(1)	Design.	BR	Complete	2003						
>* II.B.1.g.(2)	Construct.	BR		X	3/05					
II.B.2.	Restore passage at Hartland.									
II.B.2.a.	Assess and make recommendations for fish passage.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick and Pfeifer 1996.						
II.B.2.b.	Evaluate viable options to restore fish passage.	BR	Complete	Burdick and Pfeifer 1996. Tetra Tech 2000 (evaluated 3 design options for passage and 3 options for screens).						
II.B.2.c.	Design passage, conduct NEPA compliance.	BR	TBD							
>* II.B.2.d.	Construct fish passage, if needed.	BR	TBD							
>* II.B.2.e.	Operate and maintain.	TBD	TBD							
II.B.2.f.	Monitor and evaluate success.	FWS	TBD							
II.B.2.g.	Screen Hartland diversion to prevent endangered fish entrainment, if warranted.									
II.B.2.g.(1)	Assess need.	BR/FWS/PD	TBD							
II.B.2.g.(2)	Design.	BR	TBD							
>* II.B.2.g.(3)	Construct, if needed.	BR	TBD							
III.	REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT)									
III.A.	Reduce negative interactions between nonnative and endangered fishes.									
III.A.1.	Increase law enforcement activity to decrease angling mortality.	CDOW	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
>* III.A.2.	Remove small nonnative cyprinids from backwaters and other low velocity habitats.	CDOW	On hold							
>* III.A.3.	Reclaim ponds in critical habitat	CDOW	Complete	Martinez 2004.						
III.A.3.a.	Evaluate and make recommendations.	CDOW	Complete							
IV.	MANAGE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES)									
IV.A.	Augment or restore populations as needed and as guided by the Genetics Management Plan.									
IV.A.1.	Razorback sucker.									
IV.A.1.a.	Develop experimental augmentation plan and seek Program acceptance.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick et al 1995.						
IV.A.1.b.	Implement experimental augmentation plan. (Goal: 10 adults/river mile.)									
> IV.A.1.b.(1)	Stock fish.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick 2003.						
IV.A.1.b.(2)	Monitor and evaluate results; make recommendations regarding further augmentation.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick 2003.						
IV.A.2.	Develop State stocking plan for Colorado pikeminnow in the Gunnison River.									
IV.A.2.a.	Program acceptance.		Complete	Nesler et al 2003.						

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: GUNNISON RIVER

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
>	IV.A.2.b. Implement Colorado pikeminnow State stocking plan.	CDO/FWS	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	IV.A.2.c. Evaluate stocking success as identified in monitoring plan for stocked fish.	FWS/CDO		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	IV.A.3. Develop State stocking plan for razorback sucker in the Gunnison River.									
	IV.A.3.a. Program acceptance.		Complete	Nesler et al 2003.						
>	IV.A.3.b. Implement razorback sucker State stocking plan.	CDO/FWS	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	IV.A.3.c. Evaluate stocking success as identified in monitoring plan for stocked fish.	FWS/CDO	Ongoing	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
V.	MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT)									
V.A.	Conduct research to acquire life history information and enhance scientific techniques required to complete recovery actions.									
V.A.1.	Conduct Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker inventory in Gunnison River above Redlands.	FWS-FR	Complete	Burdick 1995.						
V.A.2.	Identify additional spawning sites of endangered fishes on the Gunnison River.	FWS-FR		X	8/05					

COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: DOLORES RIVER

	ACTIVITY	WHO	STATUS	FY 04 10/03-9/04	FY 05 10/04-9/05	FY 06 10/05-9/06	FY 07 10/06-9/07	FY 08 10/07-9/08	FY 09 10/08-9/09	OUT- YEARS
III.	REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT)									
III.A.	Reduce negative interactions between nonnative and endangered fishes.									
III.A.1.	Assess need and options to control nonnative fish escapement from McPhee Reservoir.	BR	Complete	McPhee Reservoir management plan was prepared by CDOW & accepted by the Service on 05/25/95.						
III.B.	Reduce negative impacts to endangered fishes from sportfish management activities.									
III.B.1.	Identify potential conflicts between present fish management practices in McPhee Reservoir and endangered fishes and formulate an alternative management plan.	CDOW	Complete	McPhee Reservoir management plan was prepared by CDOW & accepted by the Service on 05/25/95.						

5.0 RECOVERY ACTION PLAN PROJECTED FUNDING NEEDS (IN THOUSANDS)

ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS & FACILITY O&M:		Total									FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08
Estimated Annual Operating Costs and Facility Operation & Maintenance		11,569									5,713	5,856	6,002	6,152	6,306
CAPITAL FUNDING:		Total	FY99	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08			
Yampa River Management Plan	9,282	113	92		65		2,079	3,204	2,000	1729					
Grand Valley Water Management	6,937	97	3,427	1,275	266	281	1,270	151	170						
Coordinated Reservoir Operations	346	245	101												
Ruedi Water and Steamboat sales	235	126	109												
Acquire New Water to Enhance Flows	218	42	40	92	29	15									
Bottomlands Restoration	7,049	2,847	2,069	1,055	264	535	279								
Hartland Fish Passage	58	57		1											
GVIC Fish Passage	42	28			10	4									
Price/Stubb Fish Passage	4,738	175	200	240	74	49	340	1,750	1910						
Gov't Highline (Roller Dam) Passage	5,602	52	75	114	212	1,473	3,676								
Redlands Screening	4,590	6	7		63	464	356	3,694							
Hartland Fish Screening	0														
GVIC Fish Screening	3,214	2	198	410	2,108	121	375								
Gov't Highline (Roller Dam) Screening	8,240			22	284	434	3,600	3,900							
Tusher Wash Screening	4,475	31	5	44	37	3	5	350	1041	2959					
Endangered Fish Hatchery Facilities	4,627	2,077	898	704	191	145		612							
Nonnative Fish Control	1,050	172	192	272	414										
Highline Reservoir Screening	260	255	5												
Capital Program Management	3,257	405	400	310	216	376	400	400	250	250	250				
Public Involvement Plans	310	79	44	31	35	21	35	35	10	10	10				
Total	64,531	6,809	7,862	4,570	4,268	3,922	12,415	14,096	5,381	4,948	260				

6.0 LITERATURE CITED

Alder, L.H., and T.A. Crowl. 1995. The role of introduced fishes in the Green River: Exotic predators in nursery habitats of the endangered Colorado squawfish. Honors Thesis, Utah State University, Logan.

Anderson, R.M. 1997. An Evaluation of Fish Community Structure and Habitat Potential for Colorado Squawfish and Razorback Sucker in the Unoccupied Reach (Palisade to Rifle) of the Colorado River, 1993-1995. Final Report of Colorado Division of Wildlife, Fort Collins, Colorado to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Andrews, E. D., et al. (1996). Highlights of a Peer review and Roundtable Discussion on the Relationship of Streamflow, Geomorphology, and Food Web Studies in Recovery of the Endangered Fishes in the Upper Colorado River Basin, Grand Junction, Colorado, February 6-7, 1995. Final Report.

Ayres Associates. 1999. Yampa River research final synthesis report. Project No. 34-0683.00. Fort Collins, CO.

BBC Research & Consulting. 1998. Yampa Valley water demand study, final report. Prepared for Recovery Program for Endangered Fishes of the Upper Colorado River, Denver.

Bestgen, K.R. 1997. Interacting effects of physical and biological processes on recruitment of Colorado squawfish. Colorado State University Doctoral Dissertation to Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Bestgen, K.R., and L.W. Crist. 2000. Response of the Green River fish community to construction and re-regulation of Flaming Gorge Dam, 1962–1996. Final Report of Colorado State University Larval Fish Laboratory to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Birchell et al. 2002. The levee removal project: assessment of floodplain habitat restoration in the middle Green River. Final Report of Levee Removal Evaluation Group to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Bissonette, G., and T.A.Crowl. 1995. Habitat preference of juvenile bonytail (*Gila elegans*) and spatial competition with the exotic red shiner. Honors Thesis, Utah State University, Logan.

Brown and Caldwell. 2003. Phase 2 coordinated facilities water availability study for the endangered fishes of the Upper Colorado River. Final Report. Prepared for the Colorado Water Conservation Board. Denver.

Burdick, B.D. 1994. Conceptual management plan for habitat enhancement in flooded bottomlands: Escalante State Wildlife Area, Gunnison River downstream of Delta,

Colorado. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B.D. 1994. Conceptual management plan for habitat enhancement in flooded bottomlands: gravel pit at 29-5/8 Road near Grand Junction, Colorado. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B.D. 1995. Ichthyofaunal studies of the Gunnison River, Colorado, 1992–1994. Final Report of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, Colorado to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B.D. 1997. Minimum flow recommendation for passage of Colorado squawfish and razorback sucker in the 2.3-mile reach of the lower Gunnison River: Redlands Diversion Dam to the Colorado River confluence.

Burdick, B.D. 1999. Evaluation of fish passage at the Grand Valley Irrigation Company Diversion Dam on the Colorado River near Palisade, Colorado. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B. D. 2001. Five-year evaluation of fish passage at the Redlands Diversion Dam on the Gunnison River near Grand Junction, Colorado: 1996-2000. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service Project Number CAP-4b Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B.D. 2002. Evaluating the use of sloped gravel-pit ponds by listed and non-listed native fishes and removal of nonnative fishes from sloped gravel-pit ponds in the upper Colorado River near Grand Junction, Colorado. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Project Number C-6-GP Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B.D. 2003. Monitoring and evaluating various sizes of domestic-reared razorback sucker stocked in the Upper Colorado and Gunnison rivers: 1995–2001. Final Report of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, Colorado to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B.D., and L.R. Kaeding. 1990. Biological merits of fish passage as part of recovery of Colorado squawfish in the upper Colorado River basin. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B.D., and F.K. Pfeifer. 1996. Discussion of the merits for fish passage at Hartland Diversion Dam on the Gunnison River near Delta, Colorado. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Burdick, B.D., R.S. Wydoski, and C.W. McAda. 1995. Stocking plan for razorback sucker in the Upper Colorado and Gunnison rivers. Final Report of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, Colorado to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Cavalli, P. A. (1999). Fish community investigations in the lower Price River, 1996-1997. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources: 53. Salt Lake City.

Cavalli, P.A. 2000. An evaluation of the effects of Tusher Wash Diversion Dam on movement and survival of juvenile and subadult native fish. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

CDOW. 1998. Aquatic wildlife management plan: Yampa River basin, Colorado. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Denver, Colorado.

CDOW. 2002. Draft Upper Colorado River Basin aquatic wildlife management plan. Colorado Division of Wildlife Draft Report, Denver, Colorado.

CDOW. 2003. Elkhead Reservoir - draft lake management plan. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Grand Junction, Colorado.

CH2MHill. 1997. Duchesne River hydrology and water availability study. Report to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Denver.

Chafin, D.T. 2002. Evaluation of trends in pH in the Yampa River, northwestern Colorado, 1950–2000. U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigation Report 02–4038, Denver, Colorado.

Chart, T.E., D.P. Svendsen, and L. Lentsch. 1999. Investigation of Potential Razorback Sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*) and Colorado Pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*): Spawning in the Lower Green River, 1994 and 1995. Final Report of Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Crowl, T.A., and L. Lentsch. 1996. Estimating northern pike predation on Colorado squawfish in the middle Green River: A bioenergetics approach. Project Number F-47-R Final Report of Utah State University and Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Crowl, T.A., and S. Rivera. 2000. The importance of flow training for the successful stocking of bonytail. Chapter 4, Draft 1998 Annual Report, February 2000, Ecology Center, Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Utah State University, Logan, Utah.

Czapla, T.E. 1999. Genetics management plan. Upper Colorado River Endangered Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Douglas, M.E. 1995. Gila Taxonomy Project - Morphology. Draft Final Report of Arizona State University to Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Dowling, T.E. No Date. Genetic diversity of the Gila complex as determined by analysis of mitochondrial DNA. Draft Final Report of Arizona State University to Bureau of Reclamation, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Elmblad, W.R. 1997. The outcome of an experimental stocking of Colorado squawfish in Kenney Reservoir near Rangely, Colorado. Final Report of Colorado Division of Wildlife to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Elmblad, W. R. (1998). Evaluation of Stocking Channel Catfish in Kenney Reservoir, Colorado. Grand Junction, CO, Colorado Division of Wildlife: 29.

Haines, G.B., D.W. Beyers, and T. Modde. 1998. Estimation of winter survival, movement and dispersal of young Colorado squawfish in the Green River, Utah. Final Report of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Haines, G. B. and T. Modde (1996). "Evaluation of Marking Techniques to Estimate Population Size and First-Year Survival of Colorado Squawfish." North American Journal of Fisheries Management 16: 905-912.

Hamilton, S.J., K.M. Holley, K.J. Buhl, F.A. Bullard, L.K. Weston, and S.F. McDonald. 1996. The evaluation of contaminant impacts on razorback sucker held in flooded bottomland sites near Grand Junction, Colorado - 1996. Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Hamilton, S.J., K.M. Holley, K.J. Buhl, F.A. Bullard, L.K. Weston, and S.F. McDonald. 1997. The evaluation of contaminant impacts on razorback sucker held in flooded bottomland sites near Grand Junction, Colorado - 1997. Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Hamilton, S.J., K.M. Holley, K.J. Buhl, F.A. Bullard, L.K. Weston, and S.F. McDonald. 2003. Evaluation of flushing of a backwater channel: concentrations of selenium and other inorganic elements in water, sediment, invertebrates, forage fish, and Colorado pikeminnow. Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Hawkins, J., T. Modde, and J. Bundy. 2001. Ichthyofauna of the Little Snake River, Colorado, 1995 with notes on movements of humpback chub. Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver.

Hawkins, J.A., and T.P. Nesler. 1991. Nonnative fishes of the upper Colorado River basin: an issue paper. Final Report of Colorado State University Larval Fish Laboratory to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Hawkins, J. A., and J. O'Brien. 2001. Research plan for developing flow recommendations in the Little Snake River, Colorado and Wyoming, for endangered fishes of the Colorado River Basin. Colorado State University, Larval Fish Laboratory, final report to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. Denver.

Holden, P.B. 1980. The relationship between flows in the Yampa River and success of rare fish populations in the Green River system. Final Report of BIO/WEST, Inc., to U.S. National Park Service, Denver, Colorado.

Hydrosphere. 1995. Reconnaissance evaluation of Yampa River diversions structures: River mile 53 to river mile 179. Hydrosphere Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Hydrosphere Resource Consultants. 1995. Yampa River Basin recommended alternative detailed feasibility study. Final Report. Boulder, CO.

Irving, D.B. 1997. A discussion of providing fish passage for adult Colorado squawfish at Taylor Draw Dam on the White River, Colorado. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Project Number 32 Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Irving, D. 2003. Northern Ute Indian Tribe's nonnative stocking policy. Memo to Bob Muth, Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Irving, D., B. Haines, and T. Modde. 2004. White River base flow study, Colorado and Utah, 1995–1996. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Project Number 5D Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Jackson, J. A., and P. V. Badame. 2002. Centrarchid and channel catfish control in the middle and lower Green River; 1997 and 1998. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Project #59 to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Irving, D. B. and B. D. Burdick. 1995. Reconnaissance inventory and prioritization of existing and potential bottomlands in the upper Colorado River basin, 1993-1994. Final report of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Irving, D., and M. Montoya. 2002. Bottle Hollow Reservoir nonnative fish control structure. FY-02 Annual Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Kidd, G. T. 1977. An investigation of endangered and threatened fish species in the upper Colorado River as related to Bureau of Reclamation projects. Final Report to U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Northwest Fishery Research, Clifton, Colorado.

Kitcheyan, D. C., G.B. Haines, M.H. Fuller, and D.R. Beers. 2001. The presence of non-native and native fishes in the raceway and Green River canal below the Tusher Wash Diversion Dam. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Report Cavalli, P.A. 2000.

LaGory, K. E.; J. W. Hayse; and D. Tomasko. 2003. Recommended priorities for geomorphology research in endangered fish habitats of the Upper Colorado River Basin. Final Report. Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program Project 134. Argonne National Laboratory. Argonne, IL.

Lanigan, S.H., and H.M. Tyus. 1989. Population size and status of razorback sucker in the Green River basin, Utah and Colorado. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 9:68–73.

Lentsch, L.D., Y. Converse, P.D. Thompson, T.A. Crowl, and C.A. Toline. 1996a. Bonytail reintroduction plan for the upper Colorado River basin. Project Number 25 Final Report to Upper Colorado Endangered Fish Recovery Program.

Lentsch, L.D., L.M. Lubomudrov and B.G. Hoskins. 2000. The White River and endangered fish recovery: a hydrological, physical and biological synopsis. Final Report 1998, updated and edited 2000, to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. Project No. 21. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Publication No. 00-37. Salt Lake City.

Lentsch, L.D., R.T. Muth, P.D. Thompson, B.G. Hoskins, and T.A. Crowl. 1996b. Options for selective control of nonnative fishes in the upper Colorado River basin. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Lentsch, L.D., C.A. Toline, T.A. Crowl, and Y. Converse. 1998. Endangered fish interim management objectives for the Upper Colorado River Basin Recovery and Implementation Program. Final Report of Utah Division of Wildlife Resources to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Martinez, A.M. 2004. An evaluation of nonnative fish control treatments in ponds along the Colorado and Gunnison rivers. Project Number C-18/19 Final Draft Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Martinez, P.J. 2002. Westslope warmwater fisheries. Colorado Division of Wildlife Federal Aid Project F-325-R7, Job 1, Segment Objective 2, Grand Junction, Colorado.

McAda, C. W. 2000. Flow recommendations to benefit endangered fishes in the Colorado and Gunnison rivers. Draft Report to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. Colorado River Fishery Project: 54. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO.

McAda, C. W. 2003. Flow recommendations to benefit endangered fishes in the Colorado and Gunnison rivers. Final Report to the Upper Colorado River Endangered

Fish Recovery Program. Colorado River Fishery Project: 54. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO.

McAda, C.W., and R.J. Ryel. 1999. Distribution, relative abundance, and environmental correlates for age-0 Colorado pikeminnow and sympatric fishes in the Colorado River. Project Number 45 Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Modde, T. and C. Keleher. 2003. Flow recommendations for the Duchesne River with a synopsis of information regarding endangered fishes. Report to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Project No. 84-1. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal, Utah.

Modde, T., W. J. Miller, and R. Anderson. 1999. Determination of habitat availability, habitat use, and flow needs of endangered fishes in the Yampa River between August and October. Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. Denver.

Modde, T. and G. Smith. 1995. Flow recommendations for endangered fish in the Yampa River. Final report of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. Denver.

Moyle, P.B. 1976. Fish introductions in California: history and impact on native fishes. *Biological Conservation* 9:101–118.

Muth, R.T., L.W. Crist, K.E. LaGory, J.W. Hayse, K.R. Bestgen, T.P. Ryan, J.K. Lyons, R.A. Valdez. 2000. Flow and temperature recommendations for endangered fishes in the Green River downstream of Flaming Gorge Dam. Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Muth, R. T., G. B. Haines, S. M. Meismer, E. J. Wick, T. E. Chart, D. E. Snyder, and J. M. Bundy. 1998. Reproduction and early life history of razorback sucker in the Green River, Utah and Colorado, 1992–1996. Final Report of Colorado State University Larval Fish Laboratory to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Muth, R. T. and T. P. Nesler (1989). "Marking Colorado Squawfish Embryos and Newly Hatched Larvae With Tetracycline." *The Southwestern Naturalist* **34#3**: 431-436.

Muth, R.T., and E.J. Wick. 1996. Sampling for juvenile Colorado squawfish in the Colorado River inflow to Lake Powell, 1995 and 1996. Final Report of Colorado State University Larval Fish Laboratory to the U.S. National Parks Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Muth, R.T., and E.J. Wick. 1997. Sampling for larval razorback sucker in the lower Green and Colorado rivers (Canyonlands National Park) and Colorado inflow to Lake

Powell (Glen Canyon Dam Recreation Area), 1993–1995. Final Report of Colorado State University Larval Fish Laboratory to the U.S. National Parks Service, Fort Collins, Colorado.

Nelson, P. 1998. Floodplain protection issue paper - Phase 1. Colorado River Recovery Program Project No. 75. Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Nesler, T.P., K. Christopherson, J.M. Hudson, C.W. McAda, F. Pfeifer, and T.E. Czaplá. 2003. An integrated stocking plan for razorback sucker, bonytail, and Colorado pikeminnow for the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program (Addendum to State Stocking Plans). Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Osmundson, D. B. 2001. Flow regimes for restoration and maintenance of sufficient habitat to recover endangered razorback sucker and Colorado pikeminnow in the Upper Colorado River. Colorado River Fishery Project: 63. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO.

Osmundson, D.B. 2003. Removal of non-native centrarchids from upper Colorado River backwaters, 1999–2001: summary of results. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Project Number 89 Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Osmundson, D. B. and L. R. Kaeding. 1991. Recommendations for flows in the 15-mile reach during October-June for maintenance and enhancement of endangered fish populations in the Upper Colorado River. Colorado River Fishery Project: 82. U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Grand Junction, CO.

Roehm, G.W. 2003. Draft management plan for endangered fishes in the Yampa River Basin and draft environmental assessment. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region. Denver.

Scheer, B.K. 1998. Walter Walker State Wildlife Area ichthyofaunal survey, 1994–1998. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Final Report, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Schoenherr, A.A. 1981. The role of competition in the replacement of native species by introduced species. Pages 173–203 in R.J. Naiman and D.L. Soltz, eds. Fishes in North American deserts. John Wiley and Sons. New York.

Smith, G.R., and R.G. Green. 1991. Flaming Gorge consolidated hydrology report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Division of Water Resources, Denver, Colorado.

Snyder, D.E. 2003. Electrofishing and its harmful effects on fish. Informational and Technology Report USGS/BRD/ITR-2003-0002: U.S. Government Printing Office, Denver, Colorado.

Tetra Tech. 2000. Concept development report: Hartland Diversion Dam fish passage structure, Delta, Colorado. Draft Report prepared for U.S.B.R., Grand Junction.

Tetra Tech. 2000. Floodplain protection issue paper - Phase II. Colorado River Recovery Program Project No. 75. Final Draft Report of Tetra Tech ISG Engineering, Inc., to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Trammell, M., R. Valdez, H. Johnstone, and L. Jonas. 2002. Nonnative fish control in backwater habitats in the Colorado River. SWCA, Inc., Project Number 87b Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Tyus, H.M. 1984. Loss of stream passage as a factor in the decline of the endangered Colorado squawfish. Pages 138–144 *in* Issues and technology in the management of impacted western wildlife. Proceedings of a National Symposium. Thorne Ecological Institute Technical Publication Number 14, Boulder, Colorado.

Tyus, H.M., and C.A. Karp. 1989. Habitat use and streamflow needs of rare and endangered fishes, Yampa River, Colorado and Utah. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report 89:1–27.

Tyus, H. M., and I. James F. Saunders. 1996. Nonnative fishes in the upper Colorado River basin and a strategic plan for their control. Final Report of the University of Colorado Center for Limnology to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Tyus, H.M. and J.F. Saunders, III. 2001. An evaluation of the role of tributary streams for recovery of endangered fishes in the Upper Colorado River Basin, with recommendations for future actions. Draft report to the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. Center for Limnology, University of Colorado at Boulder.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2003. Operation of Flaming Gorge Dam Environmental Impact Statement. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Administrative Draft Number 13, Provo, Utah.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1990a. Humpback chub recovery plan. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado. 43 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1990b. Bonytail chub recovery plan. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1991. Colorado squawfish recovery plan. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1992. Final biological opinion on operation of Flaming Gorge Dam. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region. Denver.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1995. Final biological opinion – round II water sale from Ruedi Reservoir. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region. Denver.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1996. Procedures for stocking nonnative fish species in the Upper Colorado River Basin. Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado. Also Finding of no significant impact *in* 1996 Stocking Procedures.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998. Razorback sucker recovery plan. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999a. Final amendment to the biological opinion – round II water sale from Ruedi Reservoir. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region. Denver.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999b. Final programmatic biological opinion for Bureau of Reclamation's operations and depletions, other depletions, and funding and implementation of Recovery Program actions in the Upper Colorado River above the confluence with the Gunnison River, December 1999. Mountain-Prairie Region, Denver.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2001. Ute Tribal Elder fishing pond construction and Bottle Hollow Reservoir fish screen installation. Draft Environmental Assessment prepared for the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation Ute Tribe Fish and Wildlife Department, Fort Duchesne, Utah.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002a. Humpback chub (*Gila cypha*) recovery goals: amendment and supplement to the Humpback Chub Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region (6), Denver, Colorado.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002b. Bonytail (*Gila elegans*) recovery goals: amendment and supplement to the Bonytail Chub Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region (6), Denver, Colorado.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002c. Colorado pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*) recovery goals: amendment and supplement to the Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region (6), Denver, Colorado.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002d. Razorback sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*) recovery goals: amendment and supplement to the Razorback Sucker Recovery Plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region (6), Denver, Colorado.

Utah Division of Water Rights. 1994. Policy regarding applications to appropriate water and change applications which divert water from the Green River between Flaming Gorge Dam, downstream to the Duchesne River. Policy adopted on November 30, 1994, State Water Engineer, Robert L. Morgan.

Valdez, R.A., W.J. Masslich, and A. Wasowicz. 1991. Dolores River native fish habitat suitability study: Annual Summary Report, 1990. BIO/WEST Inc., Logan, Utah.

Valdez, R.A., and P. Nelson. 2004a. Green River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan. Final Report of R.A. Valdez and Associates, Inc., to Upper Colorado Endangered Fish Recovery Program.

Valdez, R.A., and P. Nelson. 2004b. Colorado River Subbasin Floodplain Management Plan. Draft Report of R.A. Valdez and Associates, Inc., to Upper Colorado Endangered Fish Recovery Program.

Vaske, J. J. (1995). Knowledge, Beliefs, and Attitudes Toward the Endangered Fish of the Upper Colorado River Basin. Ft. Collins, Colorado State University: 91.

Williamson, J.H., D.C. Morizot, and G.J. Carmichael. 1999. Biochemical genetics of endangered Colorado pikeminnow from the Green, Yampa, Colorado, and San Juan rivers. Final Report to Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Williamson, J.H., and R.S. Wydoski. 1994. Genetic Management Guidelines. Upper Colorado River Endangered Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

Wydoski, R. S. 1994. Coordinated Hatchery Facility Plan: Need for Captive-Reared Endangered Fish and Propagation Facilities. Denver, CO, US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Wydoski, R.S. 1995. Genetics management plan. Upper Colorado River Endangered Recovery Program, Denver, Colorado.

APPENDIX: CRITICAL HABITAT ANALYSIS

BACKGROUND

The final rule determining critical habitat for the four endangered fishes was published in the Federal Register on March 21, 1994, and the final designation became effective on April 20, 1994. As stated in the Section 7 Agreement and in the RIPRAP, the Recovery Program is intended to serve as the reasonable and prudent alternative to avoid the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat, as well as to avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to the continued existence of the endangered fishes resulting from depletion impacts of new projects and all existing or past impacts related to historic water projects with the exception of the discharge by historic projects of pollutants such as trace elements, heavy metals, and pesticides. Once critical habitat was designated, the Service reviewed the RIPRAP, and in coordination with the Recovery Program's Management Committee, developed modifications to fulfill this intent.

The Service's review concluded that many of the actions in the existing RIPRAP would not only contribute to allowing the Recovery Program to continue to serve as the reasonable and prudent alternative to avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to the continued existence of the endangered fishes, but also would avoid the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat for the endangered fishes. Specifically, the RIPRAP already included several of the following kinds of habitat-related actions for each subbasin (except the Dolores River): instream-flow acquisition, legal protection, and delivery from modified reservoir operations; fish passage restoration; and flooded bottomland restoration. Thus, the critical habitat modifications to the RIPRAP were not extensive. They were primarily intended to provide further definition to recovery actions already in the RIPRAP and to provide increased certainty that the Recovery Program can continue to serve as the reasonable and prudent alternative for projects subject to Section 7 consultations. Since many historic projects will be required to reinitiate Section 7 consultation with the Service due to the critical habitat designation, the Service encouraged Recovery Program participants to complete these RIPRAP actions as quickly as possible to facilitate fish recovery.

Destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat is defined at 50 CFR 402.02 as a direct or indirect alteration that appreciably diminishes the value of critical habitat for both the survival and recovery of a listed species. Section 7 consultation is initiated by a Federal agency when its action may affect critical habitat by impacting any of the primary constituent elements or reducing the potential of critical habitat to develop those elements. The primary constituent elements defined in the final rule as necessary for survival and recovery of the four Colorado River endangered fishes include, but are not limited to, 1) water (quantity and quality), 2) physical habitat (areas inhabited or potentially habitable, including river channel, bottom lands, side channels, secondary channels, oxbows, backwaters, and other areas); and 3) biological environment (food supply, predation, and competition). The Service reviewed the RIPRAP to determine if it addressed these constituent elements and to identify existing and new actions that will contribute to the RIPRAP serving as a reasonable and prudent alternative to the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. Then, in coordination with the Management Committee, the Service recommended additions

needed to address all of the constituent elements, to better define the expected result of the recovery action, and to increase the certainty that the constituent elements of critical habitat would be protected.

MODIFICATIONS

1. Instream Flow Protection: Modifications were made under this recovery element to protect the water quantity constituent element.
 - a. Adjudication of the instream-flow appropriations to be filed by the Colorado Water Conservation Board (on the Yampa, Little Snake, White, Colorado, and Gunnison rivers) was added since these instream-flow appropriation filings will not be legally protected until they are adjudicated in water court. Adjudication may take up to three years after filing, depending on the amount of litigation.
 - b. To provide more immediate habitat improvements in the Grand Valley area via instream flows, a modification was made under water acquisition for the 15-mile reach to enter into an interim agreement for uncommitted water remaining in Ruedi Reservoir after Round II water sales are completed or commitments to contracts are agreed to. If flow recommendations for the 15-mile reach are met from other sources during this interim agreement (thereby causing the additional water from Ruedi to exceed the flow recommendations), Ruedi would be relieved of this additional obligation. At the end of the interim agreement (whether the flow recommendations have been met or not), Reclamation may pursue additional water sales; however, these sales would be subject to review under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act.
2. Habitat Restoration: Modifications were made under this recovery element to protect the physical habitat constituent element.
 - a. Access to historically inundated floodplain habitats is believed to be very important to recovery of the razorback sucker and Colorado pikeminnow. Although the Recovery Program has begun a program to evaluate and restore flooded bottomland areas, the fish's riverine habitat has been and continues to be so channelized by levees, dikes, rip-rap, and tamarisk, that broader floodplain restoration and protection (e.g., through mechanisms such as landowner incentives, conservation easements, and perhaps zoning) is needed. Recovery Program participants were not sure exactly how such mechanisms might be implemented, so an issue paper on restoration and protection of the floodplain has been developed. The issue paper first addressed what restoration and protection measures are needed and then how they might be accomplished. After completion of the issue paper, viable options were identified and a restoration strategy developed for selected geographic areas (e.g. Grand Valley and Ashley Valley). Floodplain restoration activities may be implemented by the Recovery

Program or by Recovery Program participants individually. Responsibilities of other agencies were identified in the issue paper, and actions were implemented consistent with authorities outside the Recovery Program.

- b. The Recovery Program has been evaluating agricultural diversion structures in the Yampa River and has discovered that although not all of these structures impede Colorado pikeminnow passage, annual bulldozing in critical habitat in the river required to maintain many of these structures may destroy or adversely modify fish habitat. Upgrading these structures so that they are more secure would eliminate the need for annual bulldozing and consequent adverse modification of critical habitat.
 - c. Fish passage structures are planned for a number of diversion dams in the Upper Basin in the current RIPRAP. However, without screens or "entrainment preclusion structures," adult fish, especially razorback sucker, may go into the diversion canals. To keep fish in the more secure river habitat, a modification was made to include an entrainment preclusion structure on the proposed passage structure at the Grand Valley Project diversion (Roller Dam). Also, the need for an entrainment preclusion structure at Redlands diversion dam will be evaluated after construction of the fish ladder there.
3. Reduction of Negative Impacts of Nonnative Fishes and Sportfish Management Activities: Modifications were made under this recovery element to protect the constituent element of the fishes biological environment.
- a. Competition with and predation by introduced species is widely assumed to have played a role in the decline of the endangered fishes. The Recovery Program has been and continues to assess options to reduce negative impacts of problematic nonnative species, sportfish management, and angling mortality. Although we cannot yet fully predict the results of implementing some of these management options, we need to begin to implement the most viable ones. Therefore, actions have been added to implement (in cooperation with the States) viable measures which will decrease negative impacts of certain nonnative fishes, sportfish management, and angling mortality. Specific actions were added to selectively remove northern pike from the Yampa River and northern pike and centrarchids from the Gunnison River and possibly Paonia Reservoir.