

**SECTION 7 CONSULTATION, SUFFICIENT PROGRESS,
AND HISTORIC PROJECTS AGREEMENT**

AND

RECOVERY ACTION PLAN

**RECOVERY IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM
FOR ENDANGERED FISH SPECIES
IN THE UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN**



**United States Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Region 6, Denver, Colorado**



**DRAFT REVISION
JUNE 20, 1994**

PREFACE

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. The Section 7 Consultation, Sufficient Progress, and Historic Projects Agreement (Section 7 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 information available and the recovery goals established for the four endangered fish species. It identifies specific actions and timeframes currently believed to be required to recover the endangered fishes in the most expeditious manner in the Upper Basin. The RIPRAP will serve as a measure of accomplishment so that the Recovery Program can continue to serve as the reasonable and prudent alternative to avoid the likelihood of jeopardy to the continued existence of the endangered fishes for projects undergoing Section 7 consultation as well as to avoid the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat.

NOTE: CHANGES MADE TO THIS DOCUMENT TO ACCOMODATE CRITICAL HABITAT DESIGNATION ARE INDICATED BY DOUBLE-UNDERLINE.

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

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.

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

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

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 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 | 3 |
| 1.6 | RECOVERY ACTION PLAN STRUCTURE | 3 |
| 2.0 | DISCUSSION OF RECOVERY ACTION PLAN ELEMENTS | 5 |
| 2.1 | I. PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT) | 5 |
| 2.2 | II. RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE) | 7 |
| 2.3 | III. REDUCE NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF NONNATIVE FISHES AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES (NONNATIVE AND SPORTFISH MANAGEMENT) | 9 |
| 2.4 | IV. CONSERVE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES) | 10 |
| 2.5 | V. MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT) | 11 |
| 2.6 | VI. INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT FOR THE ENDANGERED FISHES AND THE RECOVERY PROGRAM (INFORMATION AND EDUCATION) | 12 |
| 2.7 | VII. PROVIDE PROGRAM PLANNING AND SUPPORT (PROGRAM MANAGEMENT) | 12 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 3.0 DISCUSSION OF SUBBASIN RECOVERY PRIORITIES | 13 |
| 3.1 GREEN RIVER | 13 |
| 3.1.1 Importance | 13 |
| 3.1.2 Recovery Actions | 13 |
| 3.2 YAMPA AND LITTLE SNAKE RIVERS | 14 |
| 3.2.1 Importance | 14 |
| 3.2.2 Recovery Actions | 15 |
| 3.3 DUCHESNE RIVER | 16 |
| 3.3.1 Importance | 16 |
| 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 | 17 |
| 3.5.1 Importance | 17 |
| 3.5.2 Recovery Actions | 17 |
| 3.6 GUNNISON RIVER | 18 |
| 3.6.1 Importance | 18 |
| 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 | 30 |
| 4.3 GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: YAMPA AND LITTLE SNAKE RIVERS | 33 |
| 4.4 GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: DUCHESNE RIVER | 37 |
| 4.5 GREEN RIVER ACTION PLAN: WHITE RIVER | 39 |
| 4.6 COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: MAINSTEM | 41 |
| 4.7 COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: GUNNISON RIVER | 49 |
| 4.8 COLORADO RIVER ACTION PLAN: DOLORES RIVER | 52 |
| 5.0 RECOVERY ACTION PLAN BUDGET PROJECTIONS | 53 |
| 6.0 LITERATURE CITED | 54 |
| <u>APPENDIX: CRITICAL HABITAT ANALYSIS</u> | <u>A-1</u> |

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 endangered fishes while providing for existing and new water development to proceed in the Upper Basin (Cooperative Agreement, 1988). 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 endangered fishes is to achieve naturally self-sustaining populations and to protect the habitat on which they depend. Attainment of this goal will result in recovery and delisting of the of the four species: Colorado squawfish (Ptychocheilus lucius), razorback sucker (Xyrauchen texanus), humpback chub (Gila cypha), and bonytail chub (Gila elegans). The goal of the Recovery Program is recovery and delisting of the four endangered fishes in the upper basin.

The Service has developed recovery goals for each species, which are described in the Service's recovery plans for each species (the razorback sucker plan is still in development). These recovery plans, developed under Section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act, provide a biological and research-oriented approach to species recovery and include a recommendation for detailed management and site-specific implementation plans. Since the recovery plans refer to species recovery in both the upper and lower basins, their recovery goals apply to both basins. The Recovery Program provides for the coordinated implementation of these recovery plans for the upper basin.

As described in the recovery plans, the primary recovery goals for the Colorado squawfish and humpback chub are to establish and maintain natural self-sustaining populations and their habitat. Because of the critical population status of the bonytail chub in the upper basin, the immediate goal for this species is to prevent its extinction. The first recovery priority for the razorback sucker is to prevent their extinction in the wild, since there has been limited evidence of successful recruitment of young fish into the populations.

1.3 RECOVERY ACTION PLAN PURPOSE

This Recovery Implementation Program Recovery Action Plan (RIPRAP) has been developed using the best information available and the recovery goals established for the four endangered fish species. The RIPRAP is intended to provide an operational plan for implementing the Recovery Program, including development of the Program's annual work plan and future budget needs. Specifically, the RIPRAP identifies the feasible actions which are necessary to recover the endangered fishes, including schedules and budgets for implementing those actions. The RIPRAP also identifies the specific recovery actions which must be accomplished in order for the Recovery Program to serve as the reasonable and prudent alternative to 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. The RIPRAP was developed in support of that Agreement.

1.4 ESTIMATED COST OF RECOVERY ACTIONS

From FY 94 - FY 2000, the budget for the Recovery Program is expected to total approximately \$86 million¹. The funding is expected to come from the following sources:

- a. An annual operating budget of approximately \$3 million (adjusted annually for inflation, thus totalling approximately \$24 million through FY 2000) will be contributed by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (including 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, which could provide \$1-2 million over the next 10 years. 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 of \$12.34 (adjusted annually for inflation) per acre foot of the project's average annual depletion. The actual rate of water development has not been projected.

Annual operation and maintenance of refugia and hatchery facilities and fish passage facilities is expected to cost approximately \$3.9 million through FY 2000.

- b. Congressional appropriations of approximately \$59 million will be requested through FY 2000, of which approximately \$30 million will be

¹ See Section 5.0, page 53. This is a general estimate, subject to refinement.

used to acquire water and water rights to implement and maintain adequate in-stream flows for the fish, and approximately \$29 million will be used for capital construction projects such as building fishways, hatcheries, and/or restoring flooded bottomlands. These are approximate costs; uncertainties remain regarding the scope of several projects and the degree to which other project beneficiaries will be expected to share in the costs.

1.5 MEASURING PROGRESS TOWARD RECOVERY

Recovery 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 will 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 which 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 asterisked actions will generally be given highest priority.

The Recovery Program will need to continually evaluate the outcome of the actions identified in the RIPRAP to determine their effectiveness in achieving 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 against accomplishment of the actions identified in the RIPRAP.

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.

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 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. Protect instream flows;
- II. Restore 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 Section 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 (Section 4.0) 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 basinwide.

2.1 I. PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS

Recovery cannot be accomplished without protecting and managing sufficient habitat to support self-sustaining populations of the endangered fishes. Protecting instream flows is key to protecting the habitat of these fishes. The first step in instream flow protection is to identify the flow regimes needed by the fish. In the Recovery Program, determining flow needs is primarily the responsibility of the Fish and Wildlife 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. Below Federal dams (i.e. Flaming Gorge and the Aspinall Units), test flows are being provided while research is conducted to determine more precise flow recommendations.

Colorado

State acceptance of flow recommendations is the next step in instream flow protection. In Colorado, acceptance of flow recommendations by the Colorado Water Conservation Board is based on a review of their scientific basis, on legal and physical availability of water, and on an assessment of Compact considerations. Acceptance can be made on two levels in Colorado: one level is legal protection without any special qualifications; the other is for legal protection expressly subject to modification by the State. These levels of state acceptance will control the specific flow amounts to be legally protected by a variety of mechanisms.

Breaking state acceptance of flow recommendations into these two levels enables the flows to be legally protected despite uncertainties about the scientific basis for the Service's recommendations and about water availability or Compact allocations. These uncertainties will be periodically reviewed and the amount of legal protection that is explicitly modifiable can be continued, reduced, or

converted to less qualified protection. Also as a part of these periodic reviews, the Service can make additional recommendations for flow protection and the state can decide to protect additional flow amounts, with more or less qualifications about the subsequent modification of those amounts.

Flow protection mechanisms are organized in many Recovery Action Plans 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 can be dated back to the action of the Colorado Water Conservation Board to advance to final notice a recommendation for an appropriation, but the Conservation Board also must make a water court filing to confirm the appropriation and to avoid postponement of the appropriation's priority date. It may take two or more years from this filing to obtain a decree from the water court, depending on the nature of any litigation over the filing. In this case, the water right will have a relatively junior priority date, and only existing flow conditions can be protected.

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 Units, 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.

After examining the available flow protection approaches, it appears the most common strategy 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 would add a condition of approval to water right applications (within the area) filed after the policy is adopted. The condition would state that whenever the flow of the Green River (or other stream) drops below the predetermined streamflow level, then diversions associated with water rights approved after such condition was imposed would be prohibited. Based on past legal challenges to the State's authority to impose conditions associated with new approvals, it would appear that this is within the authority of the State Engineer. This approach will not specifically recognize an instream flow right; however, it will protect the flows from being diverted and used by subsequently approved water rights. This strategy of conditioning the approval of presently filed and new applications also could be combined with the others listed above and with appropriately contracted reservoir reoperations.

Implementing this approach will require that the State Engineer conduct public hearings to present the proposed streamflow levels to the public and water users. At the hearing, comments would be taken about the proposal and time would be allowed to submit written comments. After reviewing the information presented and any additional investigation deemed necessary, the State Engineer then would determine if such flow protection is in the public interest. If so, a policy would be developed requiring presently filed and new applications to be approved subject to accepted flow recommendations (currently summer and fall flows in the Green River). As additional flow recommendations are finalized and accepted (e.g. winter and spring flows in the Green River), the policy would be applied to address these flows.

2.2 II. RESTORE 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, 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. When these habitats are available, razorback suckers use them extensively for feeding prior to and after spawning, and may also

have spawned in such sites. Colorado squawfish also use these areas for feeding prior to migrating to spawning areas.

The Recovery Action Plans contain tasks to identify and restore important bottomland habitat. The Recovery Program is conducting an inventory of all bottomlands adjacent to mainstem upper basin rivers and will classify them according to their perceived value to endangered fish recovery.

Five candidate bottomland sites in the upper basin already have been selected for evaluation of their restoration potential (two on the Green River, two on the Colorado River, and one on the Gunnison River). Baseline data have been collected and conceptual management plans for restoring these sites have been developed. Where land and/or water rights are needed, the Recovery Program is working to acquire them (via lease, purchase, etc.). Conceptual management plans will be developed for additional sites identified through the bottomland inventory. Once management plans are finalized and access secured, restoration and construction activities will begin, and these will be followed by monitoring and evaluation to determine their success in contributing to recovery.

In addition, the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan contains tasks to develop and implement a broad floodplain restoration and protection strategy to increase inundated floodplain habitats and to ameliorate the effects of levees, diking, and rip-rap, grave mining, and other forms of floodplain development.

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 squawfish 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, USFWS 1991). Restoring access to historically-occupied habitats via fish passage ways has been identified in the Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan as one of several means to aid in Colorado squawfish recovery (USFWS 1991).

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 some sites and activities are under way to restore passage at agricultural diversions in the Yampa River and at the Redlands Diversion Dam on the Gunnison River, and several diversions on the mainstem Colorado River near Palisade, Colorado.

The Green River directly downstream of Flaming Gorge Dam formerly provided habitat for all four of the endangered fishes. However, after the dam was closed, these warmwater species disappeared in the reach between the dam and the confluence with the Yampa River. Cold water temperatures (resulting from release of cold reservoir water) are presumed to be unsuitable and may be the primary reason for the absence of the endangered fishes there. Modifying water

temperature by releasing warm surface water or otherwise manipulating flows from Flaming Gorge Reservoir has been suggested as a strategy to restore this habitat. As such, the Mainstem Green River Action Plan contains a task to identify options to release warmer water and restore native fish habitat in this reach.

A number of potentially harmful contaminants (including selenium, petroleum derivatives, heavy metals, 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 from nonnative species (not including salmonids) is widely assumed to have played a role in the decline of the endangered fishes (Bestgen 1990). However, evidence of direct impacts of introduced species on native fishes is difficult to obtain (Schoenherr 1981) and often is masked by man-caused habitat alterations (Moyle 1976).

Recovery Program activities related to nonnative fishes to date have focused primarily on identifying impacts/interactions and developing nonnative fish stocking procedures. The Recovery Action Plans include a variety of tasks to assess impacts of nonnative fishes where those impacts are still relatively unknown, to identify potential conflicts between reservoir fisheries management and develop and implement alternative management plans, to assess and implement viable options to selectively remove nonnative fish from certain areas and to prevent nonnative fish escapement from reservoirs, and to assess sportfishing regulations and angling mortality on native fishes and implement viable options to reduce negative impacts.

The states and the Service also have developed interim procedures for stocking of nonnative fishes in the upper basin. The procedures are designed to reduce the impact of stocking of nonnative fishes on native fishes in the upper basin and clarify the role of the states, the Service, and others, in the review of stocking proposals. The interim procedures will be evaluated, revised, finalized, and then incorporated into state processes for regulating stocking by private aquaculture. It is intended that all participants in the Recovery Program will abide by and support these 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 very 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 since 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. Conducting studies to confirm presumed genetic stocks is vital to genetics management of the endangered fishes. Once identified, stocks may be protected in refugia to guard against catastrophe or to develop broodstocks. Representatives of stocks thought to be in immediate danger of extinction are brought into refugia immediately, rather than waiting until they have been confirmed as unique stocks through genetic studies. Refugia populations of genetic stocks are developed using paired breeding matrices to maximize genetic variability and integrity.

Most of this work is included under the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan, because it applies basinwide. Only subbasin-specific activities of augmenting or restoring genetic stocks are placed under the subbasin Action Plans, these are identified only when the Recovery Program already has firmly concluded that such action is required in a specific subbasin. As additional needs for augmentation or restoration are clearly identified, plans will be developed, fish produced, river reaches restored and augmented with those fish, and the results monitored and evaluated.

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

The Genetics Management Guidelines document is the conceptual document. It 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 are 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 must be planned, built, and operated in a coordinated fashion. For this reason, the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan contains tasks to produce an annual Propagation Operational Plan. Based on the Genetics Management Plan, this annual Propagation 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.

Additional facilities are required to meet short-term (within five years; experimental stocking) propagation needs, and plans are being formulated to meet long-term (five years or more; augmentation and restoration stocking) needs. The plan for these facilities is the Coordinated Hatchery Facility Plan. This Plan, in accordance with the Genetics Management Plan, defines facilities required to meet propagation needs, identifies fish needs that can be met by existing facilities, discusses the need for additional facilities, recommends expansion or modification of existing facilities or new constructions, and estimates costs for construction and operation of these facilities.

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

This category consists primarily of research and monitoring activities which 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; determining gaps in existing life history information (such as determining how the endangered fishes may imprint to their natal areas via chemoreception) and recommending and conducting research to fill those gaps; and improving scientific research and sampling techniques. In the subbasin Recovery Action Plans, this element includes activities to identify additional spawning sites and the importance of tributaries which have been investigated only very little. 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 success of the Recovery Program. A multi-faceted information and education program is being implemented to: educate the public about the endangered fishes; increase public understanding and support regarding recovery of the fishes (including support at the local, state, and national levels); involve the public in implementation of Recovery Program activities; and promote communication and cooperation among members of the Recovery Program. All of the activities in this program are included under the General Recovery Program Support Action Plan.

Numerous site-specific activities such as news releases, public meetings, presentations, and publication distribution are being undertaken to promote understanding and support of Recovery Program actions and to involve the public in decisions which may impact specific locations in the Upper Basin.

The information and education program has developed or continues to develop a number of products, including a newsletter twice a year, news releases, information brochure, angler information card, signs in popular angler areas, educational video, educational slide show, a summary of historic information about the fishes, educational displays, river guide education programs, and a technical library.

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 importance of the Green River to the endangered fishes has been established by the Recovery Program and recognized by many biologists. The Green River was listed as the highest priority area for recovery of Colorado squawfish in the Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan (USFWS 1991). The Green River in Desolation and Gray canyons and in Dinosaur National Monument (Dinosaur) is considered important to the recovery of humpback chub in the Humpback Chub Recovery Plan (USFWS 1990a). The Bonytail Chub Recovery Plan (USFWS 1990b) indicates that one of the last known riverine concentrations of bonytail chub was in the Green River within Dinosaur and identifies the Green River in Desolation/Grays Canyon and within Dinosaur as high priority recovery and/or restoration sites. In addition, the Green River supports the largest known population of razorback sucker in their natural riverine habitat (Lanigan and Tyus 1989).

3.1.2 Recovery Actions

Recovery actions in the Green River will focus 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 1991. This opinion contained flow recommendations for the Green River at Jensen, Utah for the months of July-October, and specified a range of experimental test flows for the remainder of the year. The effects of the test flows on the endangered fishes and their habitat are being evaluated through a variety of studies through 1996, at which time the biological opinion (including flow recommendations) will be reviewed and revised as appropriate.

An element of the Flaming Gorge biological opinion identified the need to protect releases from Flaming Gorge from possible diversion in the occupied habitat of the endangered fishes. The initial focus of this effort will be to legally protect (by November 1994) 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 following issuance of the revised biological opinion in 1997.

Other Green River activities will involve restoration of bottomlands adjacent to the Green River which flood in the spring and provide important habitat for razorback suckers and Colorado squawfish. A pilot restoration effort is being initiated at Old Charlie Wash on the Ouray National Wildlife Refuge near Ouray, Utah.

Refuge (captive) populations of razorback suckers collected from the Green River will be developed and maintained at the Endangered Fish Hatchery at Ouray, Utah. A plan for augmenting razorback suckers into the Green River using hatchery propagated fish will be developed in 1994.

Contamination of water in Stewart Lake and Ashley Creek near Jensen, Utah with the heavy metal, selenium, has been identified as a source of impact to the razorback sucker. The Fish and Wildlife Service, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Bureau of 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, a tributary to the Green River, is essential for the maintenance and recovery of the endangered fishes in the Green River basin. The relatively unaltered flows of the Yampa River are responsible for providing a natural shape to the hydrograph of the Green River. Catch rates of adult and sub-adult Colorado squawfish which occupy the river year-round are high when compared with other areas of occupied habitat in the basin. The Yampa River contains one of two confirmed Colorado squawfish spawning areas in the Upper Basin and is a major producer of fish for the entire Green River basin (Tyus and Karp 1989). The Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan (USFWS 1991) has identified the Yampa River as one of the essential habitat areas that must be protected before the Colorado squawfish can be considered eligible for delisting. A small but apparently self-sustaining population of humpback chub exists in the Yampa River in Dinosaur National Monument (Tyus and Karp 1989). The Humpback Chub Recovery Plan (USFWS 1990a) identified the Yampa River in Dinosaur as one of the primary recovery areas for the humpback chub. Adult and larval razorback suckers have been captured in the mouth of the Yampa River. Adult razorback suckers 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 the bonytail chub and is associated with some of the most recent captures of this very rare fish. The Bonytail Chub Recovery Plan (USFWS 1990b) identifies the Yampa River within Dinosaur as high priority recovery and/or restoration site for the bonytail chub.

The Little Snake River provides approximately 28 percent of the Yampa River's flow and 60 percent of the river's sediment supply. The sediment supply of the Little Snake is believed to be important to the maintenance of backwater nursery

areas utilized by young Colorado squawfish in the Green River (Smith and Green 1991). Adult Colorado squawfish have recently been captured up the Little Snake River to near Baggs, Wyoming. Humpback chub have been captured in the lower 10 miles of the Little Snake River.

3.2.2 Recovery Actions

Recovery actions in the Yampa River are focused on maintaining and legally protecting the natural flow regime required to recover the endangered fishes. To achieve this objective, the Recovery Program is attempting to purchase the Juniper dam water rights from the Colorado River Water Conservation District. The Juniper rights are conditional (undeveloped) water rights which could control approximately 75 percent of the flow of the river. The River District has expressed a willingness to consider sale of a portion of these and other Yampa basin rights it holds for conversion to instream flows if a plan to meet the long-term water needs in the Yampa River basin can be developed. If acquired, the Juniper water rights would be converted to instream flows rights to benefit the endangered fishes. A decision to acquire the Juniper rights and/or enlarge Elkhead Reservoir is scheduled for September 1995.

The Colorado Water Conservation Board will also file for junior instream flow water right for the Yampa River by December 1995, following completion of the administrative process set out in the Memorandum of Understanding for the Phase II study on the enlargement of Elkhead Reservoir. If this process is delayed, the Conservation Board will still proceed with this filing for a junior instream flow right. The amount of the filing will depend upon the Board's review and acceptance of the Service's flow recommendation for the Yampa River and the completion of a study to identify the physical and legal availability of water in the Yampa River.

Plans also are under way to rehabilitate several low-level agriculture water diversion dams on the Yampa River to provide for Colorado squawfish passage and to reduce the impacts of annually maintaining these structures on squawfish habitat. Several of the current diversions are believed to be barriers to fish passage during low-flow periods (August-October). Feasibility studies will be conducted in 1994 and 1995; construction is scheduled to occur between 1995 and 1998.

Impacts of northern pike on native fishes will be assessed in 1994 and pike will be removed from certain reaches of the Yampa River to more acceptable waters beginning in 1995.

Studies also are planned to evaluate the importance of the Little Snake River. A detailed work plan will be developed for the Little Snake River by October 1995. Initial flow recommendations will be developed and opportunities for improving late summer-early fall base flows will be evaluated in 1996-98. Inflows from the Little

Snake River in Colorado and Wyoming that are necessary to recovery endangered fishes on the lower Little Snake and Yampa rivers will need to be legally protected.

3.3 DUCHESNE RIVER

3.3.1 Importance

Colorado squawfish and razorback suckers 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 squawfish and razorback suckers.

3.3.2 Recovery Actions

Several studies will be funded by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District as part of its biological assessment of several proposed water projects being considered in the Duchesne River basin. These studies will involve evaluating the importance of the Duchesne River to the endangered fish, determining instream flow requirements in the Duchesne River, and assessing the importance of the Duchesne River in meeting endangered fish flow needs in the Green River. These studies should be completed in 1995.

Studies also will be done to identify negative impacts of nonnative fishes in and from the Duchesne River and to determine and implement viable options to reduce these impacts.

3.4 WHITE RIVER

3.4.1 Importance

Adult Colorado squawfish occupy the White River below Taylor Draw dam near Rangely, Colorado in relatively high numbers. Adult Colorado squawfish which reside in the White River spawn on the Green and Yampa Rivers. Juvenile and subadult Colorado squawfish also utilize the White River on a year-round basis. Incidental captures of razorback suckers have been recorded on the lower White River. Construction of Taylor Draw dam in 1984 blocked Colorado squawfish migration to the upper portions of the White River.

3.4.2 Recovery Actions

A work plan for the White River is to be developed in 1994-95 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 are scheduled to be developed for the White River by March 1997, and protection of those recommended flows by 1998.

Studies also will be done to identify negative impacts of nonnative fishes in the White River and to determine and implement viable options to reduce these impacts.

3.5 COLORADO RIVER

3.5.1 Importance

The mainstem Colorado River from Rifle, Colorado to Lake Powell, Utah supports several very important populations of the endangered fishes. The recovery plans for the Colorado squawfish, humpback chub, and bonytail chub all recognize the Colorado River (or portions thereof) as being high priority recovery areas. A relatively large and healthy population of humpback chubs occurs at Black Rocks and Westwater Canyon near the Utah-Colorado state line. A smaller population of humpback chubs occurs in Cataract Canyon. All life stages of Colorado squawfish occur in the section of river from Palisade, Colorado downstream to Lake Powell. The upper reach of the Colorado River between Palisade and Rifle, Colorado is currently unoccupied Colorado squawfish habitat, presumably the result of three diversion dams near Palisade which have blocked upstream migrations since the early 1900's. Razorback sucker populations in the mainstem Colorado River have declined precipitously in the past 20 years and only a few adult razorbacks have been captured from the river in the past 5 years. In 1993, 67 adult razorbacks were collected from isolated ponds adjacent to the Colorado River near Debeque, Colorado. There is no evidence of successful razorback reproduction in the Colorado River. A few (less than 10) suspected bonytail chub 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 bonytails anywhere in the Upper Basin.

The 15-mile reach of the Colorado River immediately upstream of the confluence of the Gunnison River has been a focal point of recovery efforts to date. Catch rates of adult Colorado squawfish in the 15-mile reach are approximately double that of other areas in the Colorado River. In addition, concentrations of adult razorback suckers in spawning condition were found in the 15-mile reach prior to their precipitous decline over the past decade. Instream flows in the 15-mile reach have been heavily impacted as a result of several major agricultural water diversions during the late summer and early fall.

3.5.2 Recovery Actions

A variety of recovery actions are planned for the Colorado River. Restoration of late summer-early fall flows in the 15-mile reach to levels recommended by the Fish and Wildlife Service is under way. The Bureau of Reclamation has been providing 20,000 acre feet of water from Ruedi Reservoir since 1990. After Round II water sales from Ruedi Reservoir are completed, or commitments to contracts agreed to, an agreement will be entered into for the remaining

uncommitted water from Ruedi. This agreement will take into account the environmental commitments agreed to by the Bureau of Reclamation in the Environmental Impact Statement on Round II sales and any constraints associated with the authorizing legislation for the reservoir.

The Colorado Water Conservation Board currently has an application before State water court for a 581 cfs instream flow right in the 15-mile reach for the months of July, August, and September. The Bureau of Reclamation is currently evaluating several other promising sources of water for the 15-mile reach, including (a) utilizing water saved by more efficiently managing water in the government-operated Grand Valley irrigation system and (b) changing the operation of the Collbran and Silt projects. In addition, Reclamation is evaluating opportunities to coordinate the operation of Federal and private projects (Colorado-Big Thompson Projects, Green Mountain, Ruedi, Williams Fork, etc.) in the head water areas of the Colorado River to help meet the flow needs of the fish.

The Colorado Water Conservation Board will also file for junior instream flow water right for the 15-mile reach for the winter-spring period by December 1995. The amount of the filing will depend upon the Board's review and acceptance of the Service's flow recommendation for the Colorado River and the completion of a study to identify the physical and legal availability of water in the 15-mile reach. Flow protection for the Colorado River below the confluence of the Gunnison River will be addressed following completion of the Biological Opinion on the Aspinall Project in 1997.

The Bureau of Reclamation has initiated plans to provide for fish passage at the Price-Stubb dam and the Government Highline dam near Palisade, Colorado. Successfully providing fish passage at these diversion dams would benefit both Colorado squawfish and razorback suckers by providing access to approximately 50 miles of the river that was used historically by these fish. The Colorado Division of Wildlife is also preparing a management plan for the Colorado River between the Government Highline dam and Rifle, Colorado. This plan will address instream flow needs, control of nonnative fishes, and stocking of the reach with Colorado squawfish and razorback sucker.

Beginning in 1994, the Service will experimentally stock razorback suckers in the Colorado River near Rifle and Grand Junction, Colorado. Broodstock/refuge populations of Colorado squawfish, humpback chub, and razorback sucker have been developed from Colorado River stocks.

3.6 GUNNISON RIVER

3.6.1 Importance

The Gunnison River is currently occupied Colorado squawfish habitat and historical habitat for the razorback sucker and bonytail chub. Several adult Colorado

squawfish were captured in the Gunnison River in fishery surveys conducted in 1992 and 1993. Unrestricted migration of fish is currently limited by the 10-foot high Redlands diversion located two miles above the mouth of the Gunnison River. Several larval Colorado squawfish have been collected in the Gunnison River immediately downstream of the Redlands diversion. Kidd (1977) reported that razorback suckers were collected frequently by commercial fishermen near Delta between 1930 and 1950. No razorbacks have been collected in the Gunnison River in recent times, although the reach near Delta, Colorado is considered a priority razorback restoration site.


3.6.2 Recovery Actions

Recovery activities on the Gunnison River are focused on constructing a fish ladder at the Redlands diversion dam, reoperating the Aspinall Unit to improve flow/habitat conditions in the Gunnison, and restoring flooded bottomland habitats near Delta, Colorado. The fish ladder for the Redlands diversion dam will be designed in 1994 and constructed in 1995 and 1996. The ladder will provide for passage of both razorbacks and squawfish and allow exclusion of nonnative fishes. A 5-year research plan to evaluate the effects of the Aspinall Unit on the endangered fishes and their habitat will be conducted from 1992 through 1996. During this research period, the Bureau of Reclamation and Western Area Power Administration will provide test flows. The research will culminate with a biological opinion on the operation of the Aspinall Unit in 1997. Legal protection of Aspinall releases and state protection of instream flows in the Gunnison River will be addressed following completion of the biological opinion on the Aspinall Unit.

In addition to the studies relating to the Aspinall biological opinion, two other activities are under way which will affect the operation of the Aspinall Unit. These are the pursuit by the National Park Service of a Federal reserve water right in the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Monument and the development of a contract with several Federal agencies and the State of Colorado to deliver water through the Monument and in the Gunnison River Gorge. These activities are not expected to conflict with the Aspinall biological opinion or delay the opinion or flow protection in the Gunnison River.

To reduce negative impacts to native fishes, northern pike and centrarchid fishes (bass, bluegill, etc.) will be removed from the Gunnison River and Paonia Reservoir to more acceptable waters beginning in 1995.

Beginning in 1994 the Service will experimentally stock razorback suckers in the Gunnison River near Delta, Colorado.



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 this 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 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 a 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.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----------|--|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 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. | Complete | 3/94 | | | | | |
| I.A.2. | Develop recommendations for integrating geomorphology and food web studies into Recovery Program. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| 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. | Complete | 11/93 | | | | | |
| I.B.1.b. | CWCB approval/recommended action. | Complete | 3/94 | | | | | |
| I.B.1.c. | Adopt legislation or regulation, if necessary. (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.) | Complete | 9/94 | | | | | |
| 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. | Ongoing | | 1/95 | | | | |
| I.B.3. | Assess need for retirement of senior conditional water rights. | | | | 1/96 | | | |
| 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. | Complete | | | | | | |
| II. | RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE) | | | | | | | |
| II.A. | Conduct inventory of flooded bottomland habitat for potential restoration. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| II.B. | Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts. ¹ | | | | | | | |

¹ Contaminants work (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|-------------|--|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| II.B.1. | Evaluate effects of petroleum derivatives, heavy metals, uranium, agriculture, and municipal, industrial, and carrier sources of potential contaminants throughout the Upper Basin. | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | |
| II.B.2. | Evaluate and correct pipelines that threaten endangered fishes throughout the Upper Basin. | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | |
| II.C. | <u>Develop an issue paper concerning restoration and protection of the floodplain in the Upper Colorado River Basin. The issue paper will address: 1) biological merits of restoring the floodplain with emphasis on endangered fish recovery; 2) restoration and protection tools/approaches; 3) institutional options for floodplain restoration; 4) integration of a broader floodplain restoration initiative into the current Recovery Program floodplain restoration program; 5) priority geographic areas; 6) costs/funding strategy; and 7) implementation steps and schedule.</u> | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| II.C.1. | <u>Implement a restoration strategy in selected geographic areas (e.g., Grand Valley, Ashley Valley)</u> | | | | 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. | Where not already generally known, identify negative impacts (e.g., predation, competition) of problem species. | | | | | | | |
| III.A.1.a. | Determine role of nonnative fishes as potential competitors with bonytails and determine size-specific vulnerability of bonytails to nonnative fish predators. | | | 12/94 | | | | |
| III.A.1.b. | Assess impact of northern pike predation on Colorado squawfish in the Green River. | | 6/94 | | | | | |
| III.A.1.c. | Determine relationship between Flaming Gorge test flows and relative abundance of young Colorado squawfish and nonnative fishes in nursery habitat. | | X | X | 9/96 | | | |
| III.A.1.d. | Determine relationship between Aspinall test flows and relative abundance of young Colorado squawfish and nonnative fishes in nursery habitat. | | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| III.A.2. | Assess options (including selective removal) to reduce negative impacts of problem species and assess regulations and options (including harvest) to reduce negative impacts on native fishes from nonnative sportfish. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| III.A.32.a. | Implement viable options <u>active control measures.</u> | | X | X | X | X | X | X |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|------------|--|------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| III.B. | Reduce negative impacts to endangered fishes from sportfish management activities. | | | | | | | |
| III.B.1. | Implementation Committee approval of Interim Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures. | | 4/94 | | | | | |
| III.B.2. | Implement Interim Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures | | | | | | | |
| III.B.2.a. | Develop scope of work for evaluation of Interim Procedures. | | 5/94 | | | | | |
| III.B.2.b. | Evaluate and revise Interim Procedures and identify any reasonable and prudent alternatives or measures. | | | 12/94 | | | | |
| III.B.3. | Implementation Committee review of revised Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures. | | | 1/95 | | | | |
| III.B.4. | Finalize revised Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures. | | | | | | | |
| III.B.4.a. | Complete Biological Opinion/NEPA compliance. | | X | 2/95 ¹ | | | | |
| III.B.4.b. | State wildlife commissions approval, as necessary. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| III.B.4.c. | Execute memoranda of agreement between Service and States. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| III.B.4.d. | Implementation Committee approval of revised Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures. | | | | | | | |
| III.B.5. | Incorporate final Procedures into State aquaculture permitting process. | | | | | | | |
| III.B.5.a. | Colorado. | Start 3/95 | | X | 3/96 | | | |
| III.B.5.b. | Utah. | | | 4/95 | | | | |
| III.B.5.c. | Wyoming | | | 4/95 | | | | |
| III.B.6. | Explore options for tribal acceptance of Nonnative Fish Stocking Procedures. | | | 12/94 | | | | |
| IV. | MANAGE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES) | | | | | | | |
| IV.A. | Genetics Management. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1. | Develop and approve Genetics Management Guidelines. | | 4/94 | | | | | |
| IV.A.2. | Develop and implement Genetics Management Plan for all species and genetic stocks and update by December of each year. | ongoing | 6/94 | X | X | X | X | X |

¹ Subject to change based on the outcome NEPA and Section 7 consultation processes.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|--------------|---|-------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| IV.A.3. | Conduct genetic stock identification studies (includes Gila taxonomy studies) and confirm presumptive genetic stocks based on all available information. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.3.a. | Razorback sucker. | | 6/94 | | | | | |
| IV.A.3.b. | Bonytail and humpback chubs. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.3.b.(1) | Morphological and allozyme analyses. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| IV.A.3.b.(2) | Mitochondrial DNA analysis. | | X | X | X | X | | |
| IV.A.3.c. | Colorado squawfish. | | 6/94 | | | | | |
| > IV.A.4. | Secure and manage the following presumptive genetic stocks in refugia (according to the Genetics Management Plan) (subject to change based on results of genetic stock identification studies). | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.4.a. | Razorback sucker. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.4.a.(1) | Upper Green (including Island Park, Echo Park ¹ , etc.). | | X | X | | | | |
| IV.A.4.a.(2) | Colorado River arm of Lake Powell. | | X | X | | | | |
| IV.A.4.a.(3) | Upper Colorado River above Westwater. | | X | X | | | | |
| IV.A.4.b. | Bonytail chub. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.4.b.(1) | Lake Mojave. | | X | X | | | | |
| IV.A.4.c. | Humpback chub. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.4.c.(1) | Black Rocks Canyon. | | | X | | | | |
| IV.A.4.c.(2) | Westwater Canyon. | | | X | | | | |
| IV.A.4.d. | Colorado squawfish. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.4.d.(1) | Upper Colorado River above Westwater Canyon. | | | X | | | | |
| IV.A.5. | Develop basinwide bonytail chub restoration plan and seek Program acceptance. | Draft 12/94 | X | X | | | | |
| IV.B. | Conduct annual fish propagation activities. | | | | | | | |
| IV.B.1. | Identify fish needs for genetic stock refugia, research, augmentation, and information and education. | annual | 12/93 | 12/94 | 12/95 | 12/96 | 12/97 | X |
| IV.B.2. | Produce Annual Propagation Operational Plan. | annual | 12/93 | 12/94 | 12/95 | 12/96 | 12/97 | X |
| IV.C. | Operate and maintain facilities. | ongoing | | | | | | |

¹ It has not yet been determined if razorback suckers in the Yampa and Green rivers should be considered separate genetic stocks.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|-----------|---|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| IV.C.1. | Ouray. | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| IV.C.2. | Horsethief. | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| IV.C.3. | Bellvue. | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| IV.C.4. | Wahweap. | | | | X | X | X | X |
| IV.C.5. | Craig. | | | | X | X | X | X |
| IV.D. | Conduct independent review of Program endangered fish facilities and operations. | | X | | | | | |
| IV.E. | Plan, design, and construct needed facilities. | | | | | | | |
| IV.E.1. | Develop Coordinated Hatchery Facility Plan to meet long- and short-term fish needs. | | 2/94 | | | | | |
| IV.E.2. | Design and construct appropriate facilities. | | | | | | | |
| IV.E.2.a. | Ouray expansion. | | X | X | | | | |
| IV.E.2.b. | Wahweap. | | X | X | | | | |
| IV.E.2.c. | Craig. | | X | X | | | | |
| V. | MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT) | | | | | | | |
| V.A. | Measure and document population and habitat parameters to determine status and biological response to recovery actions. | | | | | | | |
| V.A.1. | Conduct standardized monitoring program. | annual | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| V.A.1.a. | Evaluate and refine procedures periodically, as appropriate. (Biology Committee.) | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| V.A.1.b. | Identify and evaluate new methodologies for monitoring population parameters such as population size, survival, natality (births) and mortality (deaths) that identify population recovery and maintenance of natural reproduction. | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| V.A.2. | Conduct interagency data management program to compile, manage, and maintain all research and monitoring data collected by the Recovery Program. | annual | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| V.B. | Conduct research to acquire needed life history information. | | | | | | | |
| V.B.1. | Identify significant deficiencies in life history information and needed research (will come partially from Interim Management Objectives). | | X | X | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----------|---|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| V.B.2. | Conduct appropriate studies to provide needed life history information. | | | | | | | |
| V.B.2.a. | Conduct chemoreception-imprinting studies. | through 00 | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| V.C. | Develop and enhance scientific techniques required to complete recovery actions. | | | | | | | |
| V.C.1. | Conduct marking study of young-of-the-year Colorado squawfish. | complete | | | | | | |
| V.D. | Establish sampling procedures to minimize adverse impacts to endangered fishes. | | | | | | | |
| V.D.1. | Assess electrofishing injury impacts to endangered fishes. (BR) | | X | X | | | | |
| V.D.2. | Implement scientific sampling protocols to minimize mortality for all endangered fishes. | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI. | INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS AND SUPPORT FOR THE ENDANGERED FISHES AND THE RECOVERY PROGRAM. | | | | | | | |
| VI.A. | Conduct survey to measure public awareness of and attitudes toward endangered Colorado River fishes and the Recovery Program. | periodic | X | | | X | | |
| VI.B. | Train Recovery Program managers and researchers in media relations. | | X | | | | | |
| VI.C. | Plan and implement information and education activities in specific locations where significant Recovery Program actions are being taken (e.g site-specific news releases, presentations, and public meetings). | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.D. | Promote technical publication of study results. | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E. | Produce, distribute, and evaluate information and education products. | | | | | | | |
| VI.E.1. | Produce and distribute newsletter. | Twice each year | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.2. | Write and disseminate news releases. | ~5-10/year | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.3. | Produce and distribute brochure. | Reprinted in 93, distribution ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.4. | Produce and distribute information card for field officers to use with anglers. | Production complete, distribution ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.5. | Identify endangered fishes in fishing regulations (and on fishing licenses, where feasible). | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.6. | Design and oversee production of signs to alert and inform anglers about endangered fishes. | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.7. | Produce and promote video for televised airing. | Revise and distribute in 93 | 12/93 | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----------|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| VI.E.8. | Produce and distribute slide program. | Revise and distribute in 93 | 9/93 | | | | | |
| VI.E.9. | Compile data for, write, and disseminate historical research about the endangered fishes. | | 12/93 | | | | | |
| VI.E.10. | Produce and distribute poster on endangered fishes. | Production complete in 90, distribution ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.11. | Create and distribute portable display(s). | Production to be completed in 93, distribution ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.12. | Produce permanent display(s). | Proposed beginning in 94 | X | | | | | |
| VI.E.13. | Organize and conduct education for river guides. | | X | | | | | |
| VI.E.14. | Conduct public presentations and meetings. | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VI.E.15. | Establish Recovery Program technical library and announce availability of research information clearinghouse. | | X | | | | | |
| VI.E.16. | Develop distribution plans for appropriate I&E products. | Due on completion of each product | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VII. | PROVIDE PROGRAM PLANNING AND SUPPORT (PROGRAM MANAGEMENT) | | | | | | | |
| VII.A. | Determine actions required for recovery. | | | | | | | |
| VII.A.1. | Update, refine, and prioritize recovery actions (RIPRAP) annually. | annual | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| VII.A.2. | Develop Interim Management Objective (IMOs) periodically for each species and presumptive stock and an index to population status. | Update every 5 years | X | X | | | | |
| VII.A.3. | Monitor and assess Recovery Program accomplishments annually. (The Biology Committee will use IMOs to gauge biological response to recovery actions Biological response of target populations or stocks of endangered fishes to specific recovery actions will be used to gauge progress within the Recovery Implementation Program.) | annual | | X | X | X | X | X |
| VII.A.4. | Develop annual work plan to address priority needs. | annual | 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). | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | |
| VII.C. | Manage, direct, and coordinate Recovery Program activities. | ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |

| | | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|--|----------|--|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | VII.C.1. | Review Information and Education program (Management Committee). | | 3/94 | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|-------------|--|---|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| I. | PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT) | | | | | | | |
| I.A. | <u>Green River above Duchesne River</u> (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. | Complete | | | | | | |
| I.A.1.b. | Winter/spring. | | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| I.A.1.c. | Review summer/fall flow recommendation. | | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| I.A.2. | State acceptance of initial flow recommendations. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.a. | Summer/Fall. | Complete, but may be revised based on new information | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.b. | Winter/Spring. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.b.(1) | Review scientific basis. | | | | | X | 12/97 | |
| I.A.2.b.(2) | Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | | | X | 12/97 | |
| I.A.3. | Deliver identified flows. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.3.a. | Operate Flaming Gorge pursuant to the Biological Opinion to provide summer and fall flows. | Begin 93, ongoing | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| I.A.3.b. | Operate Flaming Gorge to supply winter and spring test flows for research. | ongoing through 9/97 | X | X | X | X | | |
| I.A.3.c. | Operate Flaming Gorge Dam to provide winter and spring flows and revised summer/fall flows, if necessary. | begin 10/97, ongoing | | | | 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. | | X | | | | | |
| I.A.4.a.(2) | Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria). | | X | | | | | |
| I.A.4.a.(3) | Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights. | | | 11/94 | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----|--|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| > | I.A.4.b. Protect Winter/Spring flows. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.4.b.(1) Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy. | | | | X | X | | |
| | I.A.4.b.(2) Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria). | | | | 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. | | | | | | X | |
| I. | I.B. <u>Green River below the Duchesne River</u> | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.1. Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery while providing experimental flows. | | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| | I.B.2. State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.2.a. Review scientific basis. | | | | | X | 12/97 | |
| | I.B.2.b. Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | | | X | 12/97 | |
| | 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. | | | | X | X | | |
| | I.B.3.b. Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria). | | | | X | X | | |
| > | I.B.3.c. Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights. | | | | | | X | |
| | II. RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE) | | | | | | | |
| | II.A. Restore and manage flooded bottomland habitat. | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1. Conduct restoration at 2 sites. | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1.a. Old Charlie Wash. | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1.a.(1) Construct water control structure and fish access. | Complete | X | | | | | |
| | II.A.1.a.(2) Develop management plan. | Complete | 5/94 | | | | | |
| | II.A.1.a.(3) Monitor and evaluate success. | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| | II.A.1.b. Escalante. | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1.b.(1) Evaluate feasibility to lease, purchase, etc. | | X | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|--------------|---|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| II.A.1.b.(2) | Develop management plan. | Complete | 5/94 | | | | | |
| 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. | | | | 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. | | X | X | X | | | |
| II.D. | Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts at Ashley Creek and Stewart Drain. ¹ | | 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. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1. | Razorback sucker. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.a. | Develop augmentation plan and seek Program acceptance. | | 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 squawfish spawning areas in lower Green. | | X | X | X | | | |
| V.A.2. | Identify additional razorback sucker spawning areas in lower Green. | | X | X | | | | |
| V.A.3. | Investigate Gila spp. distributions and abundance throughout Whirlpool and Lower Lodore canyons. | NPS | X | X | | | | |

¹ Contaminants work (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----------------|---|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| I. | PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS HABITAT MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | |
| I.A. | <u>Yampa River above the Little Snake River</u> | | | | | | | |
| I.A.1. | Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery. | complete | | | | | | |
| I.A.2. | State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendation). | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.a. | Review scientific basis. | | | 4/95 | | | | |
| I.A.2.b. | Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| I.A.2.c. | Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| I.A.2.d. | Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance | | | 5/95 | | | | |
| I.A.3. | Legally protect identified flows. | | | | | | | |
| > I.A.3.a. | Acquire. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.3.a.(1) | Steamboat Lake. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.3.a.(1)(a) | Change decree. | | X | | | | | |
| I.A.3.a.(1)(b) | Lease 2,000 af. to augment late summer flows. | Ongoing | 6/94 | X | X | X | X | |
| I.A.3.a.(2) | Juniper conditional decree(s). | | | | | | | |
| I.A.3.a.(2)(a) | Complete Phase II Feasibility Study. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| I.A.3.a.(2)(b) | Complete administrative process. | | | 9/95 | | | | |
| I.A.3.b. | Appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.3.b.(1) | CWCB action to advance preliminary to final notice. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| > I.A.3.b.(2) | CWCB filing. | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| > I.A.3.b.(3) | <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | <u>12/98</u> |
| I.A.4. | Review initial recommendations and legal protection. | Ongoing | | | | | | X |
| I.B. | <u>Yampa River below Little Snake River</u> | | | | | | | |
| I.B.1. | Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery. | Complete | | | | | | |
| I.B.1.a. | Modify based on revisions to environmental baseline. | | 2/94 | | | | | |
| I.B.2. | State acceptance of initial flow recommendations. | | | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|---|---|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | I.B.2.a. Review scientific basis. | | | 4/95 | | | | |
| | I.B.2.b. Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| | I.B.2.c. Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| | I.B.2.d. Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance. | | | 5/95 | | | | |
| | I.B.3. Legally protect identified flows. | | | | | | | |
| ▶ | I.B.3.a. Acquire. | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.3.a.(1) Assess, acquire and convert water rights to instream flows. | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.3.a.(2) (See upstream reaches.) | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.3.b. Appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.3.b.(1) CWCB action to advance preliminary to final notice. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| ▶ | I.B.3.c.(2) CWCB filing. | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| ▶ | I.B.3.c.(3) <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | <u>12/98</u> |
| | I.B.4. Review initial recommendations and legal protection. | Ongoing | | | | | | |
| | I.C. <u>Little Snake River</u> (Colorado and Wyoming) | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.1 Evaluate importance of Little Snake River to endangered fishes and develop management action plan. (Determine if habitat exists to protect under Colorado's instream flow program.) | | | 6/95 | | | | |
| | I.C.2. Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery (needed). | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.2.a. Develop work plan. | | | | 10/95 | | | |
| | I.C.2.b. Identify flows. | | | | X | X | 3/97 | |
| | I.C.3. State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.3.a. Review scientific basis, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | 6/97 | | |
| | I.C.3.b. Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| | I.C.3.c. Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| | I.C.3.d. Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance (in Colorado), dependent on development of flow recommendations. | | | | | 9/97 | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|-----|--|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| | I.C.4. Legally protect identified flows (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.4.a. Appropriate in Colorado | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.4.b.(1) CWCB action to advance preliminary to final notice. | | | | | | 11/97 | |
| > | I.C.4.b.(2) CWCB filing, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | | 12/97 | |
| I.V | <u>I.C.4.b.(3)</u> <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | <u>12/00</u> |
| | I.C.5. Review initial recommendations and legal protection. | Ongoing | | | | | | |
| | II. RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE) | | | | | | | |
| | II.A. Restore native fish passage at instream barriers <u>and reduce impacts of maintaining diversion structures.</u> | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1. Assess and make recommendations for fish passage at low flows at agricultural diversions <u>and for reducing impacts of diversion maintenance.</u> | | X | X | | | | |
| > | II.A.2. Implement viable options to restore fish passage <u>and for reducing impacts of diversion maintenance.</u> | | | X | X | X | X | |
| | II.A.3. Monitor and evaluate success. | | | | | | | 99-00 |
| | 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 impacts of northern pike on native fishes in the Yampa River (as part of V.A.1). | NPS | X | | | | | |
| I | <u>III.A.2.</u> <u>Physically remove northern pike to other acceptable waters.</u> | | | X | X | X | | |
| | III.B. Reduce negative impacts to endangered fishes from sportfish management activities. | | | | | | | |
| | III.B.1. Identify potential conflicts between present fisheries management in Elkhead Reservoir and endangered fishes and formulate alternative management plan. | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| | V. MONITOR POPULATIONS AND HABITAT AND CONDUCT RESEARCH TO SUPPORT RECOVERY ACTIONS (RESEARCH, MONITORING, AND DATA MANAGEMENT) | | | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|--------|---|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| V.A. | Conduct research to acquire life history information and enhance scientific techniques required to complete recovery actions. | | | | | | | |
| V.A.1. | Evaluate fish community changes in the Yampa River. | NPS | X | X | | | X | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----------|--|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| I. | PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS HABITAT MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | |
| I.A. | Identify initial year-round flows needed for recovery. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.1. | Monitor flows and endangered fish habitat, dependent on tribal cooperation). | | X | X | | | | |
| I.A.2. | Evaluate options to provide flows in lower Duchesne River, dependent on tribal cooperation. | | X | X | | | | |
| I.A.3. | Request/receive test flows to verify fish habitat requirements (e.g. from Starvation Reservoir), dependent on tribal cooperation. | | X | X | | | | |
| I.B. | State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| I.B.1. | Review scientific basis. | | | | | X | | |
| I.B.2. | Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | | | X | | |
| I.C. | Legally protect identified flows. | | | | | | | |
| I.C.1. | Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy. | | | | | X | | |
| I.C.2. | Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria). | | | | | X | | |
| I.C.3. | Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights. | | | | | | X | |
| II. | RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE) | | | | | | | |
| II.A. | Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts on the lower Duchesne. ¹ | | 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 (especially smallmouth bass and black crappie). | | X | X | | | | |

¹ Contaminants work (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|-------|--|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | III.A.2. Assess options to control negative interactions from nonnative fishes from the Duchesne River to benefit Colorado squawfish and razorback sucker young-of-the-year. | | X | X | | | | |
| I * V | <u>III.A.3. Implement viable measures to control negative interactions from nonnative fishes.</u> | | | X | X | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|---------------|--|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| I. | PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS (HABITAT MANAGEMENT) | | | | | | | |
| I.A. | Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.1. | Develop work plan. | | X | | | | | |
| I.A.2. | Identify flows. | | | X | X | 3/97 | | |
| I.B. | State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| I.B.1. | Review scientific basis, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | 6/97 | | |
| I.B.2. | Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| I.B.3. | Assess compact considerations (in Colorado). | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| I.B.4. | Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance (in Colorado), dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | | 3/98 | |
| I.C. | Legally protect identified flows (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| I.C.1. | Protect flows in Colorado. | | | | | | | |
| I.C.1.a | Appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| I.C.1.a.(1) | CWCB action to advance preliminary to final notice, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | | 7/98 | |
| ▷ I.C.1.a.(2) | CWCB filing, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | | | 12/98 |
| ▷ I.C.1.a.(3) | <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | <u>12/01</u> |
| I.C.1.d. | Evaluate other options to protect flows. | | | | | X | | |
| ▷ I.C.1.e. | Implement other options. | | | | | | X | |
| I.C.2. | Protect flows in Utah. | | | | | | | |
| I.C.2.a. | Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy. | | | | | X | | |
| I.C.2.b. | Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria). | | | | | X | X | |
| ▷ I.C.2.c. | Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights. | | | | | | X | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|-----------------|--|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| I.D. | Review initial recommendations and legal protection in Colorado | Ongoing | | | | | | 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. | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| II.B. | Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts of petroleum derivatives. ¹ | | 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. | Monitor escapement of nonnative fishes from Kenney Reservoir (especially black crappie and channel catfish). | | 12/93 | | | | | |
| 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. | | X | 9/95 | | | | |
| I-V III.B.2. | <u>Implement viable measures to reduce negative impacts and angling mortality.</u> | | | | 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 relative abundance and fate of Colorado squawfish congregation below Kenney Reservoir. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| 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. | | 9/94 | | | | | |

¹ Contaminants work (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|--------------------|---|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| I. | PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS HABITAT MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | |
| I.A. | <u>Colorado River above Gunnison River</u> | | | | | | | |
| I.A.1. | Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.1.a. | Rifle to Roller Dam. | | X | X | 9/96 | | | |
| I.A.1.b. | Roller Dam to 15-Mile Reach. | | X | X | 9/96 | | | |
| I.A.1.c. | 15-Mile Reach. | Complete | | | | | | |
| I.A.2. | State acceptance of initial flow recommendations. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.a. | Rifle to Roller Dam (Dependent on initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.a.(1) | Review scientific basis, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | X | | |
| I.A.2.a.(2) | Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| I.A.2.a.(3) | Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| I.A.2.a.(4) | Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | | 9/97 | |
| I.A.2.b. | Roller Dam to 15-Mile Reach (Dependent on initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.b.(1) | Review scientific basis, dependent of development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | X | | |
| I.A.2.b.(2) | Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| I.A.2.b.(3) | Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| I.A.2.b.(4) | Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance. | | | | | | 9/97 | |
| I.A.2.c. | 15-Mile Reach. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.c.(1) | July - September. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.c.(1)(a) | 581 cfs. | complete | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.c.(1)(a)i) | Review scientific basis. | complete | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.c.(1)(a)ii) | Assess legal and physical availability of water. | complete | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.c.(1)(a)iii) | Assess compact considerations. | complete | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.c.(1)(a)iv) | Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance. | complete | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.c.(1)(b) | For flows up to flow recommendation. | | | | | | | |
| I.A.2.c.(1)(b)i) | Review scientific basis. | | | 12/94 | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|---|---|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | I.A.2.c.(1)(b)ii) Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(1)(b)iii) Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(1)(b)iv) Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance. | | | 5/95 | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(2) Irrigation season return flows. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(2)(a) Review scientific basis. | complete | | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(2)(b) Assess physical and legal availability. | | 4/94 | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(2)(c) Assess compact considerations. | | 6/94 | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(2)(d) Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(3) October - March | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(3)(a) Review scientific basis. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(3)(b) Assess physical and legal availability. | | | 11/94 | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(3)(c) Assess compact considerations. | | 3/95 | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(3)(d) Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance. | | 5/95 | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(4) April - June. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(4)(a) Review scientific basis. | | | 12/94 | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(4)(b) Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(4)(c) Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| | I.A.2.c.(4)(d) Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance. | | | 5/95 | | | | |
| | I.A.3. Legally protect identified instream flows. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.a. Rifle to Roller Dam. | | | | | | | |
| ▷ | I.A.3.a.(1) Acquire (see 15-Mile Reach). | | | | | | | |
| ▷ | I.A.3.a.(2) Appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.a.(2)(a) CWCB action to advance preliminary to final notice. | | | | | | 11/97 | |
| ▷ | I.A.3.a.(2)(b) CWCB filing | | | | | | 12/97 | |
| ▷ | I.A.3.a.(2)(c) <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | 12/00 |
| ▷ | I.A.3.a.(3) Deliver (see 15-Mile Reach). | | | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----|---|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | I.A.3.b. Roller Dam to 15 Mile Reach (concurrent with Rifle to Roller Dam activities, also dependent on flow recommendation). | | | | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.b.(1) Acquire (see 15-Mile Reach). | | | | | | | |
| I. | I.A.3.b.(2) Appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.b.(2)(a) CWCB action to advance preliminary notice to final | | | | | | 11/97 | |
| > | I.A.3.b.(2)(b) CWCB filing. | | | | | | 12/97 | |
| > | I.A.3.b.(2)(c) <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | 12/00 |
| I. | > I.A.3.b.(3) Deliver (see 15-Mile Reach). | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c. 15-Mile Reach. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(1) Acquire. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(1)(a) Assess, acquire and convert water rights to instream flows (process may be repeated). | Ongoing until flow rec. achieved | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(1)(b) Ruedi. | | | | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(1)(b)i) Continue year-to-year lease of 10,000 af from Ruedi Resv. | ongoing until 12/95 agreement | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(1)(b)ii) Evaluate options for use of uncommitted Ruedi Reservoir water following Round II sales. | | | 12/94 | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(1)(b)iii) <u>After Ruedi Round II water sales are completed, or commitments to contracts agreed to, enter into agreement for remaining uncommitted water from Ruedi Reservoir.</u> | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| I. | I.A.3.c.(2) Initially Appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(a) July - September. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(a)i) 581 cfs. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(a)i)a) CWCB action to advance preliminary notice to final. | | | | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(2)(a)i)b) CWCB filing. | complete | | | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(2)(a)i)c) <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | 6/97 | |
| I. | I.A.3.c.(2)(a)ii) For flows up to flow recommendation. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(a)ii)a) CWCB action to advance preliminary notice to final. | | | 7/95 | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----|--|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| > | I.A.3.c.(2)(a)ii)b) CWCB filing. | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| I. | I.A.3.c.(2)(a)ii)c) <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | 12/98 |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(b) Irrigation season return flows. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(b)i) CWCB action to advance preliminary notice to final. | | | 11/94 | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(2)(b)ii) CWCB filing. | | | 12/94 | | | | |
| I. | I.A.3.c.(2)(b)iii) <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | 12/97 | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(c) October - March | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(c)i) CWCB action to advance preliminary notice to final. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(2)(c)ii) CWCB filing. | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| I. | I.A.3.c.(2)(c)iii) <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | 12/98 |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(d) April - June. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(2)(d)i) CWCB action to advance preliminary notice to final. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(2)(d)ii) CWCB filing. | | | | 12/95 | | | |
| I. | I.A.3.c.(2)(d)iii) <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | 12/98 |
| | I.A.3.c.(3) Deliver. | | | | | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(3)(a) Pursuant to Ruedi Biological Opinion, deliver 5,000af annually & an additional 5,000af 4 out of 5 years (ongoing and protect by agreement). | ongoing | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(b) Pursuant to Wolford Mountain (Muddy Creek) Biological Opinion, deliver water (dependent on reservoir construction and Program success in obtaining water from other sources). | | | | | | X | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(c) Coordinated reservoir operations. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(c)i) Evaluate. | | X | X | 6/96 | | | |
| > | I.A.3.c.(3)(c)ii) Implement & protect. | | | | X | X | X | X |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(d) Collbran Project. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(d)i) Evaluate. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(d)ii) Implement & protect. | | | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|-----|---|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(d)ii)a) File for change in use to include instream flows. | | 12/93 | | | | | |
| ▷ | I.A.3.c.(3)(d)ii)b) Enter contract. | litigation dependent | | 9/95 | | | | |
| I.▷ | I.A.3.c.(3)(e) Silt Project. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(e)i) Evaluate. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(e)ii) Implement & protect. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(e)ii)a) File for change in use to include instream flows. | | | 12/94 | | | | |
| ▷ | I.A.3.c.(3)(e)ii)b) Enter contract. | litigation dependent | | 9/95 | | | | |
| I.▷ | I.A.3.c.(3)(f) Grand Valley Water Management Project. | | | | | | | |
| | I.A.3.c.(3)(f)i) Evaluate. | | X | X | 9/96 | | | |
| ▷ | I.A.3.c.(3)(f)ii) Protect. | | | | X | 9/97 | | |
| I.▷ | I.A.3.c.(3)(f)iii) Construct and implement. | Begin 4/98 using check structures, complete 9/98 | | | | | 9/98 | |
| | I.A.4. Review initial flow recommendations and legal protection. | Ongoing | | | | | | |
| | I.A.4.a. Rifle to Roller Dam. | | | | | | | X |
| | I.A.4.b. Roller Dam to 15-Mile Reach (see Rifle to Roller Dam). | | | | | | | X |
| | I.A.4.c. 15-Mile Reach. | | | | | | | X |
| | I.B. <u>Colorado River from the Gunnison to the Colorado-Utah State line</u> (Includes the 18-Mile Reach (Flow recommendation needed; expected with completion of Aspinall Unit biological opinion.) | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.1. Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery. | | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| | I.B.2. State acceptance of initial flow recommendations. | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.2.a. Review scientific basis, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | | 12/97 | |
| | I.B.2.b. Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| | I.B.2.c. Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| | I.B.2.d. Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | | 3/98 | |
| | I.B.3. Legally protect identified flows. | | | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|------|---|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| I. > | I.B.3.a. Acquire (see Colorado River above Gunnison and Gunnison River). | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.3.b. Appropriate. | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.3.b.(1) CWCB action to advance preliminary to final notice. | | | | | | 7/98 | |
| > | I.B.3.b.(2) CWCB filing. | | | | | | | 12/98 |
| I. > | <u>I.B.3.b.(3) Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | <u>12/01</u> |
| | I.B.3.c. Deliver and legally protect flows from Aspinall (see Colorado River above Gunnison and Gunnison River). | | | | | 9/97 | | |
| I. > | I.B.3.c.(1) Operate Aspinall to provide test flows. | | | | | | | |
| I. > | I.B.3.c.(2) Operate Aspinall to provide flows pursuant to biological opinion. | | | | | | | |
| | I.B.4. Review initial recommendations and legal protection. | Ongoing | | | | | | |
| | I.C. <u>Colorado River from Colorado-Utah State line to Green River</u> (Flow recommendations needed.) | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.1. Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery. | | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| | I.C.2. State acceptance of initial flow recommendations. | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.2.a. Review scientific basis. | | | | | X | 12/97 | |
| | I.C.2.b. Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | | | | 12/97 | |
| | I.C.3. Legally protect identified flows. | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.3.a. Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy. | | | | | | | X |
| | I.C.3.b. Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria). | | | | | | | X |
| I. > | I.C.3.c. Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights. | | | | | | | X |
| | I.D. <u>Colorado River below Green River</u> | | | | | | | |
| | I.D.1. Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery. | | | | | | | X |
| | I.D.2. State acceptance of initial flow recommendations (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| | I.D.2.a. Review scientific basis. | | | | | | | X |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|-----|---|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| | I.D.2.b. Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | | | | | X |
| | I.D.3. Legally protect identified flows (dependent on development of initial flow recommendations). | | | | | | | |
| | I.D.3.a. Hold public meeting to establish future appropriation policy. | | | | | | | X |
| | I.D.3.b. Adopt and implement new policy (new appropriations subject to flow criteria). | | | | | | | X |
| I-V | I.D.3.c. Prepare and execute contracts with water users as required to subordinate diversions associated with approved and/or perfected rights. | | | | | | | X |
| | II. RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE) | | | | | | | |
| | II.A. Restore and manage flooded bottomland habitat. | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1. Conduct restoration at 2 sites (30 Road and Scott Matheson Wildlife Refuge [Moab Slough]). | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1.a. Develop management plans. | Complete | 5/94 | | | | | |
| I-V | II.A.1.b. Implement restoration/construction actions. | | | X | X | X | 4/98 | |
| | II.A.1.c. Monitor and evaluate success. | | | | X | X | X | X |
| | II.B. Restore native fish passage at instream barriers. | | | | | | | |
| | II.B.1. Restore passage at Price Stubb. | | | | | | | |
| | II.B.1.a. Assess and make recommendations for fish passage. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| I-V | II.B.1.b. Complete construction. | | X | X | 9/96 | | | |
| | II.B.2. Restore Passage at Government Highline (Roller Dam). | | | | | | | |
| | II.B.2.a. Assess and make recommendations for fish passage <u>and adult fish entrainment preclusion structure.</u> | | | | | 9/97 | | |
| I-V | II.B.2.b. Complete construction. | | | | | | | 9/99 |
| | II.B.3. Restore Passage at Grand Valley Diversion (Palisade). | | | | | | | |
| | II.B.3.a. Assess and make recommendations for fish passage. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| | II.B.3.b. Complete construction. | | | | 9/96 | | | |
| | II.C. Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts of heavy metals and selenium in the Grand Valley. ¹ | | X | X | X | X | X | |

¹ Contaminants work (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|--------------|---|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| III. | REDUCE NEGATIVE 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. | Evaluate angling mortality in the Grand Valley, at Black Rocks and Westwater. | | | X | X | | | |
| IV. | MANAGE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES) | | | | | | | |
| IV.A. | Augment or restore populations as needed. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1. | Razorback sucker. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.a. | Develop experimental augmentation plan and seek Program acceptance. | complete | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.b. | Implement experimental augmentation plan. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.b.(1) | Acquire fish. | Complete | X | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.b.(2) | Stock fish. | Complete | X | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.b.(3) | Monitor and evaluate results; make recommendations regarding further augmentation. | | X | X | 12/95 | | | |
| IV.A.2. | Monitor the fish community in the upper Colorado River (above Palisade and develop management action plan, including recommendations for Colorado squawfish and razorback sucker augmentation). | | X | X | 12/95 | | | |
| IV.A.2.a. | Establish Program position on recommended augmentation plan. | | | | 1/96 | | | |
| 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 squawfish larval drift into Lake Powell. | NPS | X | X | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|---------------|---|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| I. | PROVIDE AND PROTECT INSTREAM FLOWS HABITAT MANAGEMENT | | | | | | | |
| I.A. | Initially identify year-round flows needed for recovery (Flow recommendations will be provided upon completion of Aspinall Unit studies.) | | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| 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. | | | | | | 12/97 | |
| I.B.2. | Assess legal and physical availability of water. | | | 3/95 | | | | |
| I.B.3. | Assess compact considerations. | | | 7/95 | | | | |
| I.B.4. | Preliminary notice of bi-level acceptance, dependent on development of flow recommendations by FWS. | | | | | | 3/98 | |
| I.C. | Legally protect identified flows. | | | | | | | |
| > I.C.1. | Acquire (flow recommendations will be provided upon completion of Aspinall Unit studies.) | | | | X | X | X | |
| I.C.1.a. | Assess, acquire and convert water rights to instream flows. | | | | | | | |
| > I.C.2. | Appropriate (flow recommendations will be provided upon completion of Aspinall Unit studies.) | | | | 9/96 | | | |
| I.C.2.a. | CWCB action advance preliminary to final notice. | | | | | | 7/98 | |
| > I.C.2.b. | CWCB filing. | | | | | | | 12/98 |
| > I.C.2.c. | <u>Water court adjudication (litigation dependent)</u> | | | | | | | <u>12/01</u> |
| 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. | ongoing through 6/97 | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| I.C.3.b. | Flows from Aspinall Unit for research studies. | | X | X | X | X | | |
| > I.C.3.b.(1) | Deliver flows. | | X | X | X | 9/97 | | |
| > I.C.3.b.(2) | Protect research flows. | | | 4/95 | X | | | |
| I.C.3.c. | Flows from Paonia Reservoir in accordance with Biological Opinion. | | | | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|------|--|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| I. > | I.C.3.c.(1) Deliver flows. | ongoing | | | | | | |
| | I.C.3.d. Flows from Aspinall Unit pursuant to Aspinall Biological Opinion. | | | | | | | |
| | I.C.3.d.(1) Determine if change in water right and/or contract is needed. | | 9/94 | | | | | |
| | I.C.3.d.(2) File to change water right to include instream flow use. | | | 12/94 | | | | |
| | I.C.3.d.(3) Enter into contract if needed. | | | | | | 12/97 | |
| I. > | I.C.3.d.(4) Deliver flows. | Begin 10/97, ongoing | | | | | 10/97 | X |
| | I.D. Review initial recommendations and legal protection. | Ongoing | | | | | | |
| | II. RESTORE HABITAT (HABITAT DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE) | | | | | | | |
| | II.A. Restore and manage flooded bottomland habitat. | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1. Conduct restoration at Escalante State Wildlife Area. | | | | | | | |
| | II.A.1.a. Gain access (lease, purchase, etc.). | | | 9/95 | | | | |
| | II.A.1.b. Develop management plan. | Complete | 5/94 | | | | | |
| I. > | II.A.1.c. Implement restoration/construction actions. | | | | | X | 4/98 | |
| | II.A.1.d. Monitor and evaluate success. | Through 00 | | | | | 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 and adult fish entrainment preclusion structure for Redlands canal. | complete | | | | | | |
| | II.B.1.b. Implement viable options to restore fish passage. | | | | | | | |
| | II.B.1.b.(1) Design passage, conduct NEPA compliance. | | X | | | | | |
| I. > | II.B.1.b.(2) Construct fish ladder and fish entrainment preclusion structure. | | | X | 10/95 | | | |
| | II.B.1.c. Operate and maintain fish ladder. | ongoing | | | X | X | X | X |
| | II.B.1.d. Monitor and evaluate success. | Through 99 | | | X | X | X | 99 |
| | II.B.2. Restore passage at Hartland. | | | | | | | |
| | II.B.2.a. Assess and make recommendations for fish passage. | | | 9/95 | | | | |

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|--------------|--|----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| II.C. | Support actions to reduce or eliminate contaminant impacts (especially selenium). ¹ | | X | X | X | X | X | |
| III. | REDUCE NEGATIVE 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. | Evaluate angling mortality on endangered fishes below Redlands. | | | X | X | | | |
| III.A.2. | <u>Remove nonnative fishes (northern pike and centrarchids) from the Gunnison River and Paonia Reservoir to other acceptable waters.</u> | | | X | X | X | | |
| IV. | MANAGE GENETIC INTEGRITY AND AUGMENT OR RESTORE POPULATIONS (STOCKING ENDANGERED FISHES) | | | | | | | |
| IV.A. | Augment or restore populations as needed. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1. | Razorback sucker. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.a. | Develop experimental augmentation plan and seek Program acceptance. | complete | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.b. | Implement experimental augmentation plan. | | | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.b.(1) | Acquire fish. | Complete | X | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.b.(2) | Stock fish. | Complete | X | | | | | |
| IV.A.1.b.(3) | Monitor and evaluate results; make recommendations regarding further augmentation. | | 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 squawfish and razorback sucker inventory in Gunnison River above Redlands. | | X | | | | | |
| V.A.2. | Identify additional spawning sites of endangered fishes on the Gunnison River. | | X | | | | | |

¹ Contaminants work (in all reaches) will be conducted independently of and funded outside of the Recovery Program.

| | ACTIVITY | STATUS | FY94 10/93-9/94 | FY95 10/94-9/95 | FY96 10/95-9/96 | FY97 10/96-9/97 | FY 98 10/97-9/98 | OUT YEAR |
|----------|--|--------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 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. | | | X | | | | |
| 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. | | X | X | 12/95 | | | |

5.0 RECOVERY ACTION PLAN BUDGET PROJECTIONS (IN MILLIONS)

| ACTIVITY/PROJECT | FY 94 | FY 95 ¹ | FY 96 | FY 97 | FY 98 | FY 99 | FY 00 | TOTAL |
|--|--------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET ² | 3.00 | 3.12 | 3.25 | 3.37 | 3.51 | 3.65 | 3.80 | 23.700 |
| FACILITY OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE | 0.220 | 0.322 | 0.360 | 0.618 | 0.707 | 0.810 | 0.870 | 3.907 |
| CAPITAL FUNDING: | | | | | | | | |
| Redlands fish passage | 0.183 | 0.928 | | | | | | 1.111 |
| Price/Stubb fish passage | 0.017 | 0.050 | 0.336 | | | | | 0.403 |
| Cameo (Government Highline) fish passage | | | 0.040 | 0.100 | 0.100 | 1.160 | | 1.400 |
| Grand Valley fish passage | | | 0.400 | | | | | 0.400 |
| Yampa River fish passage ³ | 0.070 | 0.400 | 0.230 | 0.800 | 0.750 | 0.750 | 0.600 | 3.600 |
| Yampa River water acquisition ⁴ | 0.120 | 1.350 | 1.400 | 0.475 | 5.800 | 6.800 | 6.300 | 22.245 |
| Grand Valley water management | 0.200 | 0.350 | 0.250 | 0.200 | 2.900 | 2.900 | | 6.800 |
| Coordinated reservoir operations | 0.050 | 0.300 | 0.300 | | | | | 0.650 |
| Collbran operations | 0.043 | 0.090 | | | | | | 0.133 |
| Silt operations | 0.050 | 0.075 | 0.065 | | | | | 0.190 |
| Flooded bottomland restoration | 0.400 | 1.600 | 2.000 | 2.420 | 2.250 | 1.650 | | 10.320 |
| Endangered fish augmentation facilities | 0.200 | 1.000 | 2.500 | 2.500 | 5.800 ⁵ | | | 12.000 |
| TOTALS | 4.553 | 9.585 | 11.131 | 10.483 | 21.817 | 17.720 | 11.570 | 86.859 |

¹ FY 95 funding amounts are uncertain at this time, and shortfalls appear possible. If shortfalls occur, they will need to be reprogrammed into the FY 96 budget.

² The average breakdown of the annual operating budget (FY 89-94) has been:

- I. Instream flows: 38.6%
- II. Habitat restoration: 3.2%
- III. Nonnative fish management: 3.3%
- IV. Propagation & genetics management: 21.3%
- V. Research & monitoring: 17.4%
- VI. Information & education: 2.2%
- VII. Program management: 14.0%

³ Recovery Program cost may be adjusted to reflect analysis of benefit.

⁴ Costs may be reduced by cost-sharing by other project beneficiaries.

⁵ Augmentation facility costs beyond FY 97 are still being refined by Recovery Program participants.

6.0 LITERATURE CITED

- Bestgen, K.R. 1990. Status review of the razorback sucker, Xyrauchen texanus. Contribution 44, Colorado State University Larval Fish Laboratory. Fort Collins, CO. 92pp.
- 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 Bureau of Reclamation, Northwest Fishery Research, Clifton, CO.
- 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.
- Moyle, P.B. 1976. Fish introductions in California: history and impact on native fishes. Biological Conservation 9:101-118.
- Schoenherr, A.A. 1981. The role of competition in the replacement of native species by introduced species. Pgs. 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, CO.
- 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, CO, USA.
- Tyus, H.M. and C.A. Karp. 1989. Habitat use and streamflow needs of rare and endangered fishes, Yampa River, Colorado. Fish and Wildlife Service. Biological Report 89(14). July 1989. 27 pp.
- 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. 35 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1991. Colorado squawfish recovery plan. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Denver, Colorado. 56 pp.
- Valdez, R.A. and W.J. Masslich and A Wasowicz. 1991. Dolores River native fish habitat suitability study: Annual summary rpt. 1990. BIO/WEST, Logan, UT.

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 will 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 will avoid the likely destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat for the endangered fishes. Specifically, the RIPRAP already includes 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 proposed critical habitat modifications to the RIPRAP are not extensive. They are 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 has 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 agreement for uncommitted water remaining in Ruedi Reservoir after Round II water sales are completed or commitments to contracts are agreed to.
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 squawfish. Although the Recovery Program has begun a program to evaluate and restore flooded bottomland areas, the fishes 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 are not yet sure exactly how such mechanisms might be implemented so development of an issue paper concerning restoration and protection of the floodplain has been recommended. The issue paper will address: 1) biological merits of restoring the floodplain with emphasis on endangered fish recovery; 2) restoration and protection tools/approaches; 3) institutional options for floodplain restoration; 4) integration of a broader floodplain restoration initiative into the current Recovery Program floodplain restoration program; 5) priority geographic areas; 6) costs/funding strategy; and 7) implementation steps and schedule. After completion of the issue paper, a restoration strategy would be

implemented in selected geographic areas (e.g. Grand Valley and Ashley Valley).

- 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 squawfish passage, the annual bulldozing in critical habitat in the river that is 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 this annual bulldozing and 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 structures," adult fish, especially razorback suckers may go into the diversion canals. To keep fish in the more secure river habitat, a modification was made to include entrainment structures to the proposed passage structures at the Government Highline diversion (Roller Dam) and Redlands Diversion Dam. Including these screening devices during the initial design and engineering phase of the passage structures will be more economical than adding them on later.
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 from 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 problem 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 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.