

San Juan River Recovery Implementation Program



Coordination Committee Meeting May 13, 2010 Durango Community Recreation Center 2700 Main Ave, Durango, CO

Meeting Summary

Coordination Committee Members:

Jim Brooks, Chair
Catherine Condon
Dan Israel
Herb Becker
Michael Howe (Alternate)
Al Pfister
Tom Pitts
John Leeper (Alternate)
Ted Kowalski
Brent Uilenberg
John Whipple
Adrian Oglesby
Absent

Representing:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
Jicarilla Apache Nation
Bureau of Indian Affairs
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 6
Water Development Interests
Navajo Nation
State of Colorado
Bureau of Reclamation
State of New Mexico
The Nature Conservancy
Bureau of Land Management

Program Management:

David Campbell, Program Coordinator
Sharon Whitmore, Asst. Program Coordinator
Scott Durst, Program Biologist

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2

Other Interested Parties:

Michelle Shaughnessy (CC Alternate)
Bill Miller, BC Chair
Homer Gonzales
Ron Juleon
Wally Murphy
Mike Oetker
Paul Harms
Katrina Grantz
Mark McKinstry
Amy Kraft
Dale Ryden
Dave Propst

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 6
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Jicarilla Apache Nation
Jicarilla Apache Nation
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2
NM Interstate Stream Commission
Bureau of Reclamation
Bureau of Reclamation
Southwestern Water Conservation District
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 6
New Mexico Dept. of Game and Fish

Jim Brooks welcomed the group. He announced that Nancy Gloman, CC Alternate for the Fish and Wildlife Service, Region 2, has retired from the Service and Brian Millsap, the new Region 2 Assistant Regional Director for Ecological Services, will replace her as the CC Alternate.

Approval of March 2, 2010 Meeting Summary – One comment was received from Becker to delineate. Darryl Vigil as his CC alternate instead of Warren Vigil. Pfister moved to approve the summary with the

one change; Oglesby seconded; summary approved.

Program Document Revisions – Comments were received from Whipple and Condon. Whipple said his comments were mostly editorial. The following edits were discussed by the group.

- *Ch.6; pg. 5, Reclamation Responsibility #8 – Delete “during extreme hydrologic conditions.”* The group agreed to this change.
- *Ch.6; pg. 6 – Add, “including regarding the assessment of monitoring data, progress toward recovery, and management recommendations” to Responsibility #6 and pg. 7- Delete Responsibility #14.* The group decided to retain Responsibility #14 which includes the suggested verbiage to #6 and not add it to #6.
- *Ch.6; pg. 14 – Administration of Program and Recovery Funds; last paragraph – reword verbiage regarding State funds contributed to capital projects placed in the NFWF account.* Whipple said his modified verbiage describes that funds in the NFWF Account and interest accrued are NM’s until Reclamation takes it out for capital projects. Campbell said his understanding is that the interest accrued stays in the account to be used for account administration. Uilenberg said the account, with funds withdrawn and deposited, is current and if any money is left on the table, the States get it back. Whipple suggested striking the sentence about interest accruing in his modified verbiage. The group agreed that the verbiage can be modified but needs to be consistent with the provisions of the contract.

Condon said her comments were primarily to change all references from Program Office to Program Coordinator and to add verbiage related to hydrology modeling. She believes using Program Coordinator better reflects who is ultimately responsible and the primary point of contact for the Program. She also remains concerned that the sections related to the hydrology model do not adequately address how the Program will deal with hydrology and modeling issues in the future. The group went through Condon’s comments:

- *San Juan River Basin Hydrology Model section; first paragraph – Add, “Consistent with the provisions of Chapter 6, Bureau of Reclamation” section,” to the beginning of last sentence.* The group agreed to this change.
- *Ch. 6 – Change “Program Office” to “Program Coordinator” throughout.* The group agreed to this change.
- *Ch.6; pg.2 – Add sentence,” The Program Coordinator can delegate certain tasks to his office staff, but the Program Coordinator will be ultimately responsible to ensure each task is accomplished.”* The group determined this was not needed.
- *Ch. 6; pg. 5 - Responsibility #6 – Add “beginning in September, 2010,” to front of bullet.* The group did not agree to this change but decided to delete “technical” in front of “hydrology meeting.”
- *Ch. 6; pg. 5 – Add paragraph about the hydrology model scope of work (SOW) development process.* Uilenberg did not support the addition because it would be too restrictive and flexibility is needed. Whipple asked if the level of detail in the SOW in the AWP provides adequate detail. Pfister asked if the annual report Katrina Grantz gave at the Annual Meeting was adequate. Pitts said he understands the need for transparency and suggested striking the last three sentences of the paragraph and say it will go through the annual review process. Oglesby said a model update could be included as a standing CC agenda item. Uilenberg reminded the group why the HC was disbanded and said a statement could be included that says an annual SOW will be submitted that includes “enough detail for a technical review.” Campbell reminded the group that the CC recently made it clear that the model is a Service/Reclamation model and formed the SJRB Hydrologic Baseline Workgroup to allow the CC to make policy decisions regarding the model. Miller suggested adding an objective to the SOW that the model will be reviewed before each new phase.

The group agreed to add a paragraph but modified from the original version. The following paragraph will be added, “*Reclamation will submit an annual scope of work for tasks associated with maintenance, improvements and changes for the hydrology model during the annual work plan process. The scope of work will include enough detail for a technical evaluation of the proposed work. ~~The Coordination Committee members or their technical experts will have 30 days to review and comment on the scope of work. The comments are submitted to the Program Coordinator for inclusion in the annual work plan review process. The Coordination Committee will vote on whether to approve the scope of work as submitted or with recommended changes as part of the vote on the annual work plan.~~ The scope of work will be evaluated through the Annual Work Plan process.*” Also, an objective will be added to the hydrology model SOW that states the model will be reviewed before each new phase.

✓ Pitts moved to approved with the above changes to Chapter 6; Becker seconded; the motion carried.

2010 Long-Range Plan – Whitmore reported LRP tables A1 and A2 were provided to the committees in February for review and comment. Specific comments were received from Tom Wesche and they were incorporated. The full LRP was sent to the committees on April 21, 2010 and specific comments were received from Whipple but they have not yet been incorporated. Miller said the BC made a change to Table 2 during their meeting. A *Status/Action(s) Required* column will be added and updated annually.

Condon said Miller has had to spend a lot of time recently on the monitoring plan revision. She said longer-term, more time consuming tasks such as this should be included in the LRP so an RFP can be developed, if necessary. Campbell asked about tasks being done in-kind as a committee member’s responsibility versus committee members being paid to do committee tasks through either their SOW or an RFP. Miller envisions tasks will be on a case-by-case basis, i.e., if it is a committee responsibility then no SOW would be required but if it is a big burden on an individual member then a SOW or RFP with a budget would be needed. The CC determined this would be the Program Coordinator’s call.

Pitts said the second sentence of the first paragraph under *Demographic and Recovery Factor Criteria* that says five-year status reviews are being conducted and revised recovery goals are expected in 2010, needs to be modified to reflect Service plans to modify the recovery goals into recovery plans.

Uilenberg provided the following edits:

- Pg. 13, *Element 1 description* – add sentence about Horse Thief Canyon ponds
- *Appendix A tables* - flag “compliance” items as priority
- *Task 2.15.3* - separate into two tasks; no X
- *Task 2.2.3.2* – in Navajo-Gallup BO so Reclamation is responsible; ongoing; no X
- *Task 2.3.1.5 and Task 2.3.1.6*– pending; Xs out to 2015
- *Task 2.3.3.3-2.3.3.7* – pending no Xs
- *Task 3.1.3.4* - list problem reservoirs, e.g., Lake Nighthorse did not originally anticipate warm water fish stocking so the BO assumes no escapement; thought the bassomatic would prevent escapement but may not be 100% effective (Rob Waldman contact).

Whipple said his comments were mostly editorial in nature and did not think the group needed to go through them individually. Whitmore was tasked with incorporating the comments discussed and Whipple’s comments. She will flag any comments that require further CC discussion.

Sufficient Progress Report – Campbell reported a draft has been done and has undergone an internal review by Region 6. After those comments are incorporated, a draft will go out to the CC for review. After

the Program Office revises the draft based on CC comments, it will go to Region 2 for review and RD signature.

2011 Annual Work Plan and Budget – Campbell went through the draft AWP. He explained that the Program Office asked that SOWs be kept at 2010 levels until the CPI is known. Notable changes include:

- *SOW #7 Distribution of razorback sucker and Colorado pikeminnow from Dexter and Uvalde* – Distribution of hatchery fish was separated from the hatchery SOWs which is a better way to account for this activity. Some adjustments are still needed to the SOWs but the expectation is that the hatchery budgets will decrease commensurate to the costs in the distribution SOW. Uvalde has already submitted a new SOW that is about \$16,000 less than the one in this draft. They are trying to figure out how to deal with costs associated with transporting the larger razorback sucker held over at Uvalde which will require more trips than usual.
- *SOW #12 NAPI Ponds* – The increase in budget is due to lack of carry-over. The Navajo Nation (NN) was unable to hire a fisheries biologist for the past two years so \$20,000 was carried-over. They have now filled that position so need the funds. Brooks expects that Service involvement and costs associated with the project will go down with a full-time NN fisheries biologist on-board.
- *SOW #15 PNM Fish Passage* – Increased from last year for the same reason as NAPI ponds. The NN biologist position is funded ½ from this SOW and ½ from the NAPI pond SOW
- *TNC Conservation/Habitat Planning* – no additional Program funds will be needed in 2011. The Service will handle environmental compliance for RERI projects via cost-share.
- *PNM O&M* – No additional costs will be needed in 2011 as they still have money to do the work. This activity remains on the list because it is an ongoing Program obligation that will incur costs in future years. CC said to remove it from the list in years where there are no costs but footnote it.
- *SOW #27 Pit Tags* – This budget is higher because Reclamation will be cutting a new contract in 2011 which will require a lot of additional administrative work. It is a combined contract for both the San Juan and Upper Colorado River Programs and costs will be proportional.
- *Data Integration* – No money was included for this activity because the Program Office does not plan to fill the Recovery Science Biologist position until after the funding authorization issues are resolved. In the interim, Scott Durst is handling some data integration projects as part of his job.
- *Administrative Overhead Charges* – The administrative overhead charges for work done by the Grand Junction Fisheries Office will be decreased from 22% to 11% to adhere to the agreement reached between Region 6 for the Upper Colorado Recovery Program.
- *Estimated Balance* - The estimated \$122,283 surplus will be higher after adjustments are made.

Israel asked if we were seeing results from the non-native fish (NNF) removal work and if any NNF are being stocked that could be a threat. Campbell said we have seen results as carp are one of the rarest fish caught and it appears the effort has altered the age structure of catfish. He said the upcoming workshop will evaluate the NNF effort to see if any changes are needed. Brooks said there are differing viewpoints about NNF removal and questions such as how much removal should be done, what the targets should be, and can we realistically control NNF. These issues will be addressed at the workshop.

Pitts asked about habitat mapping. Campbell explained habitat monitoring methods were modified to get general habitat information over time. It is important to implement this new method in 2011 to get baseline information before the RERI projects are started. Pitts asked if videography is needed every year. It is the basis for habitat mapping so is needed.

Israel asked what the difference is between the Workshops SOW and the Peer Review SOW. Campbell explained that the Peer Review SOW funds the Program's annual peer review program which includes the

Program's regular peer reviewers. The Workshops SOW funds costs associated with holding specific subject matter workshops that are held on a case-by-case basis. It includes costs associated with bringing in outside expertise and other workshop arrangements. Workshop costs could potentially be removed for FY2011 as none are planned at this time. Pitts asked how the peer review process is working. Campbell said it is working well now that the reviewers' responsibilities have been better defined. He wants to insure they realize their role as Program peer reviewers are not just to review BC activities and products but to be available for the CC as well. Miller said they were not involved in developing the new monitoring plan but were asked to review the product. Brooks said the BC discussed the possibility of having the peer reviewers attend the CC meeting so they can interact directly with the CC. Kowalski asked if they are required to provide an annual report. Campbell said their primary role is to review specific work products so they provide written reviews when requested.

Pitts said more positive press is needed about the SJRRIP. Campbell said there is limited Service staff to work on this activity. Israel said the Service should not be solely responsibility for doing this. Pitts mentioned the upcoming Colorado Foundation for Water Education tour of the San Juan and Dolores rivers that includes no mention of the SJRRIP. He thinks the Program should spend more money on I&E to increase awareness. The possibility of adding additional money to the agreement with the Upper Colorado Program to do SJRRIP press releases was discussed. Debbie Felker is only one person who has a full workload doing this for the Upper Colorado Program and simply providing more money will not change this. Campbell said he will talk to Felker and will look at options for increasing I&E, if not in FY2011 then in FY2012.

Condon asked about the \$33,930 from FY2010 for data integration. Campbell explained Durst has been doing some data integration in 2010 and will continue to do so. No funds are requested in 2011 for data integration but Durst will continue to do this as time allows using those funds.

Campbell said there are two proposed projects on the table, radio-tracking in the river to locate Colorado pikeminnow spawning sites and a razorback sucker survey of the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell. The BC ranked radio-tracking in the river a low priority and the survey of Lake Powell a high priority. He explained there is a reproducing population of razorback sucker in Lake Mead and there is a lot of interest in seeing what is in Lake Powell. Ryden, the primary author of the SOW, said the project would involve one-year of intensive surveying for razorback sucker but all other species caught would also be recorded including Colorado pikeminnow. He said the SOW includes three sampling options depending on level of effort and cost. The target area was lake but is now a mixture of lake and river, which includes 35 miles of critical habitat. Depending on what is found, the information would be considered in the recovery plan updates and could count toward recovery goals especially if they are reproducing. Miller said there are varying opinions on whether or not the Program should do monitoring in Lake Powell but all agree that if it is done, it needs to be a comprehensive effort to answer numerous questions that came out of the monitoring workshops. There was general agreement that the 10-week option is needed. Ryden said the final cost for this SOW should be between \$230,000 and \$240,000 once the administrative overhead charge is decreased from 22% to 11%. Brooks said this is a one-year project but will probably lead to additional work/questions depending on what is found.

Campbell said there may be other sources of funds to cost share work in Lake Powell. He said Colorado River staff in Region 2 and 6 will be meeting next week and Lake Powell will be discussed. Mike Oetker, Assistant Regional Director for Fisheries, said the intent of this meeting is to get all staff who work on the Colorado River together to coordinate and communicate. Ryden said NPS has also indicated interest in contributing but they are waiting to see what the SJRRIP decides to do before committing. McKinstry said LCRMSCP could also potentially contribute.

✓ Israel moved that the CC pursue a robust survey of Lake Powell in FY2011; Pitts seconded. Condon asked what happens if outside funding cannot be procured. Campbell said because it is a high priority, he will look at expenses and build a budget accordingly. The motion was approved.

Kowalski said the presentations from the day before indicated the Program may need to stock more fish and asked if the number of razorback suckers stocked should be increased. Miller said the current stocking targets first need to be met consistently. After that occurs, it can be determined if increases are needed. He said this is an ongoing BC discussion and it will continue to be discussed. Campbell added it may be that larger fish are needed not necessarily more fish and the larger fish being stocked from Uvalde will help answer that question.

Pitts asked about passive pit tag detectors. McKinstry said a raft-mounted detector designed by Biomark was tested last year and it did not work well. Keeping permanently-mounted detectors in place in the river just above the waterfall could also be a problem. Biomark suggested installing a test frame without the antennae first before spending money on the detection equipment. McKinstry said he obtained outside funding to investigate floating readers and will report on his efforts this winter. He said he will put together a concept paper of what is needed for various set-ups. Israel emphasized the need to identify the purpose of passive pit tag detectors, e.g., to detect loss of fish over the waterfall or detect fish movement. He also questioned if pit tags affect reproduction.

Pitts said the Program Office SOW needs to be revised to remove outdated language about the HC.

BC Report – Miller said he did not have much to report beyond what was reported at the annual meeting. He said the presentations were good and they showed the Program is moving toward recovery and data is being integrated across projects. He expects to have a final comprehensive monitoring plan done in mid-August.

RERI Project Update – Oglesby said getting the RERI project underway has been a group effort. He thanked Mark McKinstry and John Leeper who have been instrumental in making it happen. He said the NMED funds were unfrozen and the project is moving forward. A habitat improvement subcommittee was formed to help identify restoration sites. He produced a new SOW that was negotiated and agreed upon by NMED. Six secondary channels will be restored totaling about three miles of river. To further develop the plan, July/August videography will be used and a field trip will occur in August. Final project design will be done by December after which it will go to the Service to do environmental compliance. He expects this will be done in early spring and work can start after that. He said NM has voiced concerns about offsetting depletions that could occur if new open water areas are created that would increase evapotranspiration. He said there is no final design yet but he will work with NM on this as needed.

Capital Projects Update – Uilenberg provided an updated five-year plan for capital projects for both recovery programs (attached). He said they had planned to use FY2010 capital funds for the Horsethief Canyon ponds but will not be able to do this because of some project complications. The original design has to be changed because test pits that indicated 100-150 gallons per minute would be possible from the aquifer is actually closer to 60 gallons per minute. Once the design for the infiltration gallery is done, the rest can be done internally during this fiscal year; however, Reclamation does not want to cut a contract until the wells are in place. He submitted a request to his agency to carry-over the FY2010 funds but he is not sure whether it will be approved. If not, the money will have to come out of FY2011 funds set aside for OMID Canal Automation project which would be put on hold. Pitts asked when Uilenberg will know if Reclamation will carry-over the FY2010 funds. Uilenberg said he should know in late July/early August. Pitts asked what the CC can do to help make it happen. Uilenberg said to contact Larry Walkoviak.

Pfister asked about production space for the Upper Colorado River Program since Horsethief Canyon ponds will be delayed. Uilenberg estimates next spring/early summer for project completion unless there is a bad winter that delays construction. Shaughnessy said it will impact the production program and they are looking for alternate sites for growing-out 15,000 razorback sucker but they have been operating on a limited basis in 2010 so the impact is not as great as it could be.

Uilenberg said the O&M contract for Hogback Fish Weir was executed by Navajo Nation and Cindy Murray took it back to PNM for execution yesterday. After that, it will go to Service and then Reclamation. Because pre-construction planning and environmental compliance work will not get done in time to cut a construction contract in FY2010, he expects this will occur in mid-FY2011 and construction can begin late in 2011 after irrigation season.

Uilenberg reported the cost for fixing the slide at Farmers Mutual Ditch has increased from the authorized ceiling of \$7 million to \$9 million. This increase will affect the budget in FY2013 when the projected expenditure total is \$12,230,000. He thinks it is doubtful Reclamation will get that much money allocated for one year and also does not think getting Farmers Mutual Ditch done in that amount of time is realistic. There was some sentiment expressed that this should not be funded by SJRRIP capital funds and that only the original \$7 million should be allowed.

Annual Funding Legislation Update – Pitts reported that he believes a bill will be passed. He expects a House bill to go forward within the next couple weeks and it will require appropriations after FY2011 to fund Program activities outside of O&M of facilities and monitoring. In the Senate, Bingaman is still intent on keeping the recovery programs on power revenues but offsets will need to be found. The bill may be packaged with others into an omnibus bill. He said even if appropriations are required, he is confident they will be provided. Reclamation has indicated it is a high priority for them. Campbell pointed out there may be a lag period; however, because Reclamation's FY2012 budget is already in place. Uilenberg confirmed that funding for the recovery programs is being considered in Reclamation's FY2013 budget.

Pitts gave the group a heads-up about Ruedi Reservoir, a component of the Fryingpan-Arkansas Project that delivers west slope water to southeastern Colorado. Part of the project is to provide 5,412.5 acre-feet of water stored in Ruedi for the benefit of endangered fish in the 15-mile reach of the Colorado River. Legislation has been drafted to address the issue of how the water will be paid for. He said this is a Colorado issue and does not affect the San Juan River.

Report to Congress – Uilenberg reported the Report to Congress was submitted to Congress the last week in April. He said Anne Castle, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, was instrumental in getting OMB's issues addressed in a reasonable manner with emphasis on Recommendation #3 about exploring cost savings and other cost-share financing mechanisms for the recovery programs.

Desert Rock Update – Campbell reported he expects to receive a Biological Assessment (BA) in mid July after which consultation can commence again. He said he did not anticipate the BA will be much different than the original version. The first time around, the CC requested a copy of the draft BA but the BIA refused. Campbell indicated the Service would work with BIA to circulate the BA.

Next Meeting – scheduled for August 23; 11:00 a.m. to 5 p.m. in Durango. Tentative agenda items include:

- 2011 Work Plan
- Sufficient Progress
- Nighthorse Reservoir Bassomatic
- Annual Funding Report – McKinstry
- TNC Conservation Action Plan Update - Oglesby

Approved September 23, 2010

Approved September 23, 2010

SAN JUAN AND UPPER COLORADO RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS 5-YEAR PLAN as of March 30, 2010

| | SJRIP | UCRIP | TOTAL | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------|--|
| Remaining Cost Ceiling End of FY 2008 1/ | \$15,400,000 | \$28,332,000 | \$43,732,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P.L. 111-11 Cost Ceiling Increase | \$12,000,000 | \$15,000,000 | \$27,000,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FY 2009 Expenditures | \$285,000 | \$5,999,000 | \$6,284,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Remaining Cost Ceiling End of FY 2009 | \$27,115,000 | \$37,333,000 | \$64,448,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 | 2023 | Total | |
| Projected Expenditures FY 2010 - 2023 2/ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Farmers Mutual Ditch Repair | | | | 4,500,000 | 4,500,000 | | | | | | | | | | 9,000,000 | |
| APS Fish Passage | | | | | 200,000 | 1,300,000 | | | | | | | | | 1,500,000 | |
| Fruitland Fish Passage | | | | | | 200,000 | 1,300,000 | | | | | | | | 1,500,000 | |
| Hogback Fish Barrier | 100,000 | 2,400,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2,500,000 | |
| San Juan Capital Projects Management | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 700,000 | |
| Projected San Juan Program Subtotal | 150,000 | 2,450,000 | 50,000 | 4,550,000 | 4,750,000 | 1,550,000 | 1,350,000 | 50,000 | 15,200,000 | |
| Butch Craig Levee Repair | 500,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 500,000 | |
| Horsethief Canyon Fish Rearing Ponds | 2,016,000 | 3,384,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5,400,000 | |
| GVIC Fish Screen Retrofit | | | | | 400,000 | | | | | | | | | | 400,000 | |
| OMID Canal Automation | | 2,020,000 | 7,000,000 | 7,480,000 | | | | | | | | | | | 16,500,000 | |
| Price-Stubb Fish Passage Pit Tag Reader | 120,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 120,000 | |
| Tusher Wash Fish Screen/Barrier | 100,000 | | | 100,000 | 7,800,000 | | | | | | | | | | 8,000,000 | |
| Upper Colorado Capital Projects Management | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 1,400,000 | |
| Projected Upper Colorado Program Subtotal | 2,836,000 | 5,504,000 | 7,100,000 | 7,680,000 | 8,300,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 32,320,000 | |
| Projected Expenditure Total | 2,986,000 | 7,954,000 | 7,150,000 | 12,230,000 | 13,050,000 | 1,650,000 | 1,450,000 | 150,000 | 47,520,000 4/ | |
| Current Budget Amount 3/ | 2,986,000 | 7,954,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10,940,000 | |
| Unallocated Remaining Ceiling FY 2010 - 2023 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Notes:

1/ Cost ceiling authorized by P.L. 106-392 as amended by P.L. 109-183 indexed to 2008 price level.

2/ Expenditure schedule based on current understanding of factors influencing ability to construct facilities and is subject to change. The schedule for individual line items and budget amounts do not agree with BRC budget documents or PF2B. Projected costs are based on estimates of varying detail. Near term expenditures (2010 through 2013) are based on more refined estimates. Out year costs (2014 through 2023) should be used as approximations only.

3/ Does not include Activities to Avoid Jeopardy which is not accounted for as part of the authorized cost ceiling.

4/ Difference between remaining authorized cost ceiling and projected expenditures (\$64,448,000-\$47,520,000=\$16,928,000) may be used to address future Program needs for additional capital projects and replacement of existing capital facilities as needed.