



Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program

Dated: February 10, 2011

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING REVISED DRAFT AGENDA

[Country Inn and Suites](#), 4343 N Airport Way, Denver, Colorado, 303/375-1105

February 16, 2011

NOTE: Those who have the lead for the agenda items listed below are *expected* to post a synopsis of your report on the fws-coloriver list-server or to the Management Committee in advance of the meeting. Committee members are reminded that this makes for a more efficient conference call, so please comply with this request if possible.

CONVENE: 10:00 a.m.

1. Introductions, review/modify agenda and time allocations, and appoint a timekeeper (5 min.)
– *The Committee will consider the agenda, allotted time for each item, and make any necessary additions or revisions.*
2. Approve November 9 meeting summary and review previous meeting assignments (All, 10 min.) – *No revisions to the November summary have been submitted to date.*
3. Congressional & budget activities (45 min.)
 - a. February 24 conference call to brief Congressional staff (Shields, Pitts, Felker, 10 min)
 - b. March 15-22, 2011, briefing trip (Shields, 15 min)
 - c. FY 2012 use of power revenues (Pitts, Uilenberg, 10 min)
 - d. Annual funding legislation (Shields, Pitts, 5 min)
 - e. Ruedi legislation (Pitts, 5 min)
4. Nonnative Fish Management (Chart, Mitchell, 40 min.)
 - a. Discuss BC recommendations regarding translocation and tagging of nonnative fish captured in the Yampa River.
 - b. Review proposed changes to FY11 nonnative fish management Scopes of Work.
5. Section 7 Consultation
 - a. Aspinall [EIS](#) and Gunnison River Study Plan (Uilenberg, Chart, 30 min). *A draft Study Plan was transmitted to the BC and MC on November 30, 2010 along with comments received from Leslie James. Since that time the PDO has received comments from Tom Pitts, Bart Miller and Mike Roberts. (ATTACHED to transmittal e-mail). The PD's office requests that the MC discuss the draft Plan, comments received and the PD's proposal on how to proceed.*
 - b. Review sufficient progress action items (Attachment 2) (All, 10 min)

LUNCH: 12:30 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.

6. Implementation Committee March 9 conference call agenda (All, 10 min.)
7. Scheduling RIPRAP and Program Guidance review (late March, webinar?) and next meeting; review previous meeting assignments (Attachment 1) (All, 15 min).
8. Floodplain restoration (Chart, Pitts, 10 min) – *The Committee will discuss a process for incorporating the many good ideas (from the Ouray National Wildlife Refuge and others) that came forward as part of the fall floodplain site tour into the Program’s work plan.*
9. Updates
 - a. Capital projects (Uilenberg, 15 min) – *Brent will seek the Committee’s approval of an cost increase for the Horsethief Ponds construction (~\$600K increase to the ~\$5.4M project total).*
 - b. The Program's 2011 Green River Spring Flow Request letter – *the Program Director’s office and the Biology Committee have expressed general support for UDWR’s flushing flow request to cleanse substrates in the Flaming Gorge tailrace (with considerations for timing of the release to best assist in endangered fish recovery).*
 - c. [10,825 Alternatives](#) and agreements update (Pitts, 10 min.)
 - d. 5-year species status reviews (Czapla, 5 min)
 - e. Recovery goals/plan schedule and recovery timelines (Czapla, 15 min)
 - f. Southern Rockies LCC (Landscape Conservation Cooperative) (Chart, 5 min)

ADJOURN by 4:00 p.m.

Attachment 1

1. The **Fish and Wildlife Service** will meet to consider if it would be acceptable to screen the irrigation water and not the low-head hydropower water at Tusher Wash or if other methods (e.g., a weir wall) might achieve our objectives for screening Tusher Wash. *Discussions underway; but pending decisions on dam rehabilitation. 8/10/09: Robert King said no decision has been reached yet on dam rehabilitation. Brent said a fish preclusion weir such as the one that will be installed at the Hogback Diversion on the San Juan could be an option if fish mortality in the power turbines isn't a significant problem (would cost much less than the \$7-\$9 million to screen the entire canal flow). Brent Uilenberg will draft a recommendation for reviewing this. (Ask Biology Committee to review, first considering work done on similar turbines and potential for fish-friendly turbines, if needed. If this is unclear, field work may be needed to determine mortality at Tusher; this might be considered pre-design work under capital funds). Brent will prepare a decision tree outline. 2/25/10: Brent will send this out. The key decision point is to determine if fish entrainment mortality through the turbines acceptable (which may require a scope of work to do some monitoring and evaluation). Perhaps "fish-friendly" turbines would be a good alternative. Another question is whether the owners plan to raise the height of the dam. 3/24/10: Discussed by Biology Committee. The Program Director's office is preparing a list of issues to be resolved (e.g., what levels of mortality are acceptable for what size classes, potential O&M costs, etc.) to help move a decision on Tusher forward. 12/13/10: BC recommendation shown in sufficient progress table.*
2. **Program Director's office** will provide a more specific recommendation regarding establishing a basinwide recovery/conservation oversight team for the endangered fishes. *8/10/09: Tom Czapla said the Program Director's office believes that continuing coordination by Service staff in California/Nevada and Regions 2 and 6 is the best way to accomplish this. As with recovery goals, these Service offices would maintain communication with their stakeholders and then coordinate with one another. Tom will ask that Service group for their suggestions on how they would like to continue this coordination role as the recovery goals revision process wraps up. Pending. 2/25/09: Service Solicitor strongly recommended revising the full recovery plans (which will include the recovery goals). Tom Pitts asked if the recovery team would be reconvened; >the Service will look into this and also into Tom's question as to whether recent regulations have expanded potential recovery team membership. 4/7: The Service will maintain consistency with what has been done so far on recovery goal revisions, that is, relying on Service personnel to work with the partners in each program (e.g., Upper Colorado, San Juan, GCDAMP, etc.) throughout the Colorado River Basin. The Service does not plan to reconvene a recovery team at this time. Tom Pitts and others asked >the Service to provide a process and schedule for completing the recovery plans to the Recovery Program as soon as possible (request reiterated 11/9/10). 6/7/10: This schedule will be out shortly. Tom met recently with Lower Basin folks from the two Reclamation and two Service regions. The group recommended a meeting or conference call of the Program Directors with Reclamation and the Service in both regions twice a year to maintain coordination. Leslie James asked if the Glen Canyon program would be addressed in those meetings and Tom Czapla said that Sam Spiller participated in the meeting via phone. Tom Pitts asked for a short summary of the difference between recovery plans and recovery goals (provided by Tom Czapla 6/14/10).*

3. The **Program Director** will further discuss with the Service developing a programmatic biological opinion for the White River Basin when the Gunnison River PBO nears completion. *Pending. 8/10/09: We need to review the flow recommendations. Tom Pitts also suggests reviewing water demand data from the state (unclear if that's been updated to include projected needs for oil and gas development). Dan McAuliffe said a pending roundtable report should address oil and gas development and associated water demand estimates. (Dan Birch can provide status update). 4/7: **The Service** will begin discussing a White River PBO during their sufficient progress review next week. 2/3/11: Pending completion of the White River flow recommendations addendum (3/15/11).*
4. The **Program Director's Office (Tom Czapl)** will alert the committee when the 5-year status reviews are completed and provide a link to the documents. *Pending; no change in listing status anticipated. The Program Director's office confirmed these will be done before the end of the calendar year, as was reported on the Washington, D.C. trip. 11/9/10: In review by FWS Regional Office; **Julie Lyke to prioritize review to meet deadline.** 2/7/11: Julie Lyke secured a final round of Regional Office input on the HBC 5-year by mid-November, 2010. The HBC 5-year was subsequently revised and submitted back to the RO for surnaming (on Jan 31, 2011). The CPM 5-year was revised similarly and submitted for surnaming on Feb 7, 2011.*
5. The **Program Director's Office** will develop FY 2011 guidance for research to determine levels of selenium that affect eggs of endangered Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker (working with the San Juan Program). *2/22: Not yet developed; should be a component of the Gunnison River Study Plan (which also includes the affected area of the Colorado River from the Gunnison River confluence to Lake Powell). 4/1: Summary of FWS-Ecological Services contaminants activities sent to Biology and Management committees on 3/22/10. On March 30, Tom Czapl, Jana Mohrman, and Tom Chart met with Kevin Johnson (FWS-Region 6 Contaminants Coordinator) and David Campbell to discuss elevated levels of selenium (and mercury) detected in endangered Colorado River fishes throughout the Upper Basin (similar information has been reported from the Lower Basin as well). The group agreed the primary information need was to determine how these contaminants are affecting our ability to recover the fish, i.e., better understand what constitutes harmful levels. The SJRRIP is tasked with reducing all threats to the recovery of Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker, but the upper basin Program has not historically dealt with threats associated with degraded water quality. In any case, the primary information need likely is larger than the recovery programs' budgets could handle and perhaps beyond our expertise. Kevin agreed to start a dialogue with his colleagues in Region 6 as well as with FWS-Region 2, EPA and USGS to explore ways to answer this question. Meanwhile, during fish community monitoring in the lower Gunnison River, tissue samples will be collected from razorback suckers, as well as a chosen surrogate species, to determine selenium concentrations. 4/7: The water users and other Program participants want to have input into development of the work plan that is produced to address this primary information need. >**The Service** will provide the Committee an outline of the process for developing the work plan. John Shields suggested that the Service develop an e-mail list or listserv for these conversations so everyone interested can remain informed and involved. 2/3/11: Selenium toxicity experiments have been included in the Draft Aspinall Study plan and are a proposed revision to the RIPRAP. The PD's office doubts we will have*

Program funds available for this activity in 2012 and strongly urges Program partners to work with the PD's office to explore alternative funding strategies

6. **Tom Czapla** has been working with Krissy Wilson regarding UDWR's stocking regulations and Krissy said Utah can receive fish if the facility is certified (the concern was more about the potential for aquatic invasive species from leased and public ponds). Tom will confirm this with Krissy and Dave Campbell. *8/12: Tom Czapla said they're still working with New Mexico, but believes Utah's concerns have been resolved.*
7. **Becky Mitchell and Tom Chart** will arrange a meeting among Program staff, the Service, Colorado DNR, CDOW, and if interested, water users, to have a more thorough discussion of nonnative fish management issues and alternatives. *Done; update on agenda.* **Becky** will ask **CDOW** to let the Program know when they can begin to incorporate the 2009 Stocking Procedures into their fishing regulations.
8. Regarding fish condition below screen return pipes and potential injury to fish when the gates on the Grand Valley screen are narrowed to maintain the diversion, the **Program Director's office** will request a scope of work to seine below the Grand Valley Project screen return pipe and assess physical condition of fish (perhaps employing white suckers captured in the passage as surrogates). *Draft SOW reviewed by BC and under revision.*
9. By the end of November, **Management Committee members** will send **John Shields** and **Debbie Felker** and **Kara Lamb** (I&E Committee chair) a list of the highlights they'd like to see covered in the first Congressional briefing conference call and they'll get a combined list out to everyone for review by mid-December. *Done; update on agenda.*
10. The **Water Acquisition Committee** will work on a Green River flow protection timeline (from Utah's plan) to put into the RIPRAP. *Incorporated into draft RIPRAP revision.* **Utah** will provide periodic progress updates to the Management Committee (especially prior to each year's sufficient progress review) and the topic also will be discussed at each **Water Acquisition Committee** meeting.
11. **Melissa Trammell** will send the Program Director's office her examples of how the Park Service's formatting suggestions for the sufficient progress memo might be incorporated. *Done.*
12. **Angela Kantola** will post an updated consultation list to the website in the near future. *Update through September 2010 posted; December update pending review of revisions by Tom Pitts and Patty Gelatt.*
13. The **Management Committee** will consider naming one of the floodplain sites for Pat Nelson.

ATTACHMENT 2

Action Items from the [2010 Sufficient Progress Memo](#)

February 10, 2010

ACTION ITEM	LEAD	DUE DATE	STATUS
The Service will continue to closely follow the effectiveness of nonnative fish management actions and the responses of the endangered and other native fishes. Data should continue to be reported annually, and necessary changes to nonnative fish management actions should be made in a timely fashion.	FWS, CDOW, UDWR	Ongoing	Ongoing.
A research framework project (building on results and recommendations of previous population estimate reports and information developed as a result of previous population estimate workshops) was initiated in 2005 to conduct additional data analyses to further understand environmental variables and life-history traits influencing the dynamics of Colorado pikeminnow and humpback chub populations. The draft research framework report is significantly behind schedule (originally due in 2007), but the Program Director's office is working with the principal investigators to get the draft report to the Biology Committee for review in the summer of 2010. Results will be used to refine hypotheses and direct management actions.	PDO, Valdez, Bestgen		7/26/10: Draft sent to BC for review 7/16/10; comments due back to authors 8/31/10. Environmental groups, Service and Utah have submitted comments on the draft. PD's office will meet discuss with the environmental groups (and perhaps other commenters) prior to the December Biology Committee discussion/review of the framework so that the Committee can have a fairly focused discussion. 11/9: PDO met with environmental groups, still need to meet with Service and Utah and summarize all comments in advance December BC meeting. 12/13: BC agreed the document should be completed and to will consider next steps when they review the final draft. It will be helpful for folks to see the 5-Year Reviews and see what those offer (though they may not have the level of detail folks are looking for, in the future, they certainly could reference the more detailed documents). PD's office provided copies of comments to date; add'l BC comments were due by 1/15/11. Review/approval of final draft on BC March 1-2, 2011 agenda.
By September 30, 2010, the State of Utah will identify the legal and technical process and schedule to protect recommended year-round flows for the endangered fishes in the Utah.	Utah	9/30/10.	Utah submitted work plan and will provide regular updates to the WAC and MC. WAC to draft a timeline for RIPRAP (PD's office drafted for WAC and included in draft RIPRAP revisions).
The Program Director's office will complete the Price River position paper and submit it for Biology Committee review by September 1, 2010.	PDO	9/4/10 10/1/10 10/31/10	Draft sent for BC review; comments due 1/31/11. The Biology Committee will discuss comments & future direction on March 1.
The Biology Committee (assisted by an ad hoc technical group) will analyze existing data to understand impacts and what could be gained by various screening options at Tusher Wash and make a final recommendation to the Management Committee by December 31, 2010.	BC	12/31/10	Ad hoc work group reviewing options; conference calls 11/10/10; 11/24/10. Recommendations will be made based on current configuration/operations. 12/13: Ad hoc work group literature review for appropriate study design; doing a mortality study through the runners and determine what improvements could reduce mortality; and screening the 100 cfs for irrigation (option 3). Before committing to screening, BC recommended starting with literature review; outlining mortality study (including engineering considerations); and further investigating whether the owners would consider full or partial decommissioning.
CDOW will complete the Yampa River Aquatic Management Plan (with an Upper Yampa River northern pike strategy) by July 31, 2010. The Program will use this strategy and available information to evaluate the need for additional northern pike control upstream of Hayden to Steamboat Springs.	CDOW	Complete	Plan completed and CDOW also provided responses to comments.
Based on their analysis of smallmouth bass recapture information,	CDOW	2/1/11	End of Nov from CDOW. CSU synthesis also examining; CDOW waiting on

CDOW and the Recovery Program must decide, prior to the 2011 sampling season, if Elkhead Reservoir can continue to serve as a translocation site for smallmouth bass removed from the Yampa River.			their data. On January 31, 2011, CDOW approved the Biology Committee's recommendation that translocation of SMB to Elkhead Reservoir should cease due to documented levels of escapement. CDOW strongly supports the ongoing SMB programmatic synthesis and requests that the Program conduct a similar synthesis of northern pike data.
In cooperation with the Service, the CUWCD will draft a water management report (chronicling how flow recommendations have been met over the past 5 years, describing yearly efforts, available water and evolution of past operations [release triggers, etc.]) This report will replace the "water management plan" that the 2005 Biological Opinion called for by December 2009. A second or third draft will be presented at the fall 2010 DRWG meeting. The DRWG will continue to examine the feasibility of other options for obtaining water.	CUWCD / FWS / DRWG	Fall 2010	Duchesne work group met 11/10/10.
The Program Director's office will complete the addendum to the White River report and provide a status update and recommendation on the draft Schmidt and Orchard report on peak (channel maintenance) flows for Biology Committee review by December 31, 2010.	PDO	12/31/10 3/15/11	In progress; final draft anticipated March 15, 2011.
Implementation of CROS provided good peak flow augmentation in 2009; however, some constraints on operations due to flooding concerns may remain. The CROS working group will consider Cameo flood guidance to maximize benefits of CROS operations for endangered fish habitat.	CROS working group	4/1/10	Good operations in 2010; draft flood criteria were incorporated into decision-making.
Work on CFOPS has resumed and the Phase III CFOPS report will be completed by September 30, 2010.	CFOPS working group	12/30/10 1/30/11	When CWCB completes the report (pending), the group can then analyze how reservoir releases to augment the peak could be made. The concept is to the extent necessary, we would use a portion of the Service's pools of fish water to augment the spring peak, instead of later during base flows. Will require legal review. Concerns may remain regarding flows in the Fryngpan and reservoir levels for the Aspen Yacht Club. CWCB reviewing 2008 data. . 2009 report should be out soon. 2010 (very unusual year) draft information received; accounting pending.
Close coordination will be maintained by meeting twice a year with Grand Valley water users and conducting conference calls as needed to discuss river conditions prior to the weekly Historic User Pool calls. The focus should be on taking full advantage of water savings brought about by operation of the Grand Valley Water Management project for late summer flow augmentation.	PDO, water users	Meetings ongoing.	On track. Meeting held December 1.
The 15-Mile Reach PBO requires agreement(s) for permanent sources of the "10,825" water by June 30, 2010. Water users will extend existing interim agreements through 2013 (and another 2 years, if necessary) until the permanent water is in place. They also are preparing permanent agreements (were due June 30, 2010), which propose to provide water from Ruedi and Granby reservoirs (contingent upon the various steps that still need to occur). The water users will provide water from interim sources until that time. The permanent	Upper Basin water users, FWS	6/30/10 6/1/11	Interim 10825 agreements to provide water from Wolford and Williams Fork executed in July 2010. They extend the interim arrangements through July 1, 2013, with the possibility of a 2-year extension. Permanent agreements to be signed in January. River District and Reclamation have agreed to 40-yr water service contract for Ruedi releases. NEPA scheduled for completion mid-2011.

agreements currently are in draft and being reviewed by the Service. Work will continue on the National Environmental Policy Act process for the permanent water from Ruedi and Granby reservoirs to be completed in early 2011.			
--	--	--	--

