

**COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
DRAFT**

**Washington County Water Conservancy District Office
533 East Waterworks Drive
St. George, Utah**

Advisory Council Beginning Time: **Wednesday, May 16, 2018, 1:30 p.m.**

Designated Federal Officer: Kib Jacobson

Presiding: Chairman Eric Millis

I. Welcome and Introductions **Millis**

Advisory Council (Council) Chairman Eric Millis called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the meeting. As there was no one in attendance who had not been previously introduced at the Forum meeting held earlier, he decided to dispense with introductions. A roster was circulated to take attendance for the meeting. A copy of the attendance roster is attached to these minutes as **Appendix A.**

II. Opening Comments, Acceptance of letters appointing substitute members **Jacobson**

Kib Jacobson thanked Utah for putting the meetings together in St. George at the Washington County Water Conservancy District offices. He accepted the letters he had for alternates who were at the meeting in place of regular Council members. These were Andrew Burns for John Entsminger from Nevada and Rolf Schmidt-Petersen for Tom Blaine from New Mexico.

III. Review and Approval of proposed Agenda **Millis**

Chairman Millis asked for any suggested changes to the agenda. As there were none, a motion was made to approve the agenda. The agenda was approved and a copy is attached as **Appendix B.**

IV. Draft Minutes of 2017 Fall Council Meeting – Sacramento, CA **Jacobson/Millis**

Jacobson noted that everyone should have received a copy of the meeting minutes for the fall meeting of the Advisory Council in Sacramento. He asked if there were any changes or corrections to be made in the minutes. As there were none, Millis asked for a motion to approve the minutes as final. A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded. The motion passed.

V. Charter Renewal Status **Jacobson**

Jacobson explained that it was time to renew the charter. That work was going forwarded, but there were some changes that were added to the charter. He provided comments from Council members regarding those changes, but they have not been willing to change the language in the charter. One of the changes in the ethics section had to do with any conflict of interest with the government which might preclude some Council members from participating in the Advisory Council during certain topics. After trying to work with the Solicitor on changing the language somewhat, it was rejected at the federal level. Robbins commented that it is what it is and it will be up to the individuals to deal with any issues that might come up as we move forward. Jacobson noted that the other significant change had to do with the designation of

alternates. They wanted the governors to designate not only the Council members, but the alternates as well. As this would put additional burdens on the governors, it was suggested that the governors be allowed to delegate to the Council members the authority to designate their own alternates. This was acceptable to the folks in Washington. Language has been prepared and letters have gone to the governors to effect this change, but not all governors have yet followed through on this. The other language added to the charter stated that at the conclusion of each meeting or shortly thereafter, the Council must provide a detailed recommendation report, including meeting minutes, to the designated Federal Officer. It is up in the air as to how quickly we get the meeting minutes completed. Usually we work with Barnett and his office and we get the meeting minutes together within a couple of months. We are going to try and stay on that schedule as we have in the past. The other one had to do with written recommendations to the federal agencies. Jacobson explained that those recommendations have been included in the annual report that is written at the end of the year and provided to the federal agencies. They will proceed with that process until they are told differently. Jacobson noted that the charter is on track to be renewed by July.

VI. Agency Reports on Responses to the 2017 Advisory Council Report

Millis

Chairman Millis explained that they have received a number of responses from federal agencies to the Advisory Council Report. He invited the agencies to give a brief report on their responses to that report.

USDA-NRCS

Anders Fillerup

Anders Fillerup noted that their draft report is waiting for approval and a signature, but he responded to the group for NRCS. NRCS will continue to do the M&E reports. They have been trying to make those more concise and useful to the group and are making progress on that. They have been working with the Work Group on TA calculations, and they are pretty much in agreement that they would like to have a uniform method that the three states use to report TA for the Basin States Program. As for ineligible contracts, they have been forwarded to Utah and Colorado is currently working on theirs. The final issue has to do with funding and staffing to meet the needs of the various areas. They have been working on improving efficiency and making sure the staff is aligned with the work load and needs in the salinity area. They will continue to work on that.

Reclamation

Jacobson

Kib Jacobson addressed the topics they were to respond to in the 2017 Advisory Council Report. The first was the Paradox Valley Unit, which had already been discussed in detail in the Forum meeting. Another recommendation was to continue the efforts of the Science Team, which they plan to do. They feel that the Science Team works well and contributes a lot. Regarding Pah Tempe and LaVerkin Springs, they have learned much in their efforts. The concern is how to go forward with a study and how to proceed if it becomes a project. Jacobson did some research on this in past reports, one of which was published by Reclamation in December 1981. Reclamation had done some extensive study on how to remove the salt, but at that time they determined it just wasn't feasible, but that it could perhaps be addressed at a later time. Jacobson reported that after his research he put together a white paper on this. His interpretation was that we do have authority to do studies at LaVerkin Springs, and we should do that. If we find a project that is economically feasible and cost effective, then his recommendation would be to go back to Congress and get it authorized like one of the original units. We would look to get that authorization and also the funding to do whatever it takes to put a project in place. He passed this by their Solicitor's office for their interpretation, but has not yet had a response. Another topic had to do with progress reports which are required every two years by legislation. They just completed the 25th Progress Report and are starting on the 26th Progress Report. It was recommended that Reclamation work closely with the Work Group in putting that together so they will be in sync with the next Triennial Review and not have any conflicting data, etc. In regard to the economic damages model, which has been ongoing for quite a few years, they have been coming up with the input by indexing up the values. After close to 20 years, they felt it would

be a good idea to get a contractor to come in and update the model and the values and inputs. They had discussed splitting the cost for the study between the Upper and Lower Basins at \$150,000 each. The solicitation went out a couple of months ago with responses from three different entities. One of them was chosen by an evaluation committee, and the contracting officer is currently working with them on an agreement. It will be a two-year agreement which will probably not be completed in time to include in the 2020 Review. The other recommendation was in regard to the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund (LCRBDF) and how to utilize those funds and burn down the accrual at the same time. The plan is to spend about \$16 million over the next three years, which will burn down the accrual but will also reduce the ending balance of the LCRBDF to about \$1 million. This will keep the accrual down below the high levels which were a concern to Reclamation.

BLM

Doug Curtis

Doug Curtis noted that BLM's response was in front of the Assistant Director and should be approved soon. He explained that the presentation on the Framework document that was requested by the Council had been given earlier in the Forum meeting. Another request from the Council was to prepare a uniform report similar to the reports from NRCS and BOR. They will work with the salinity coordinators to get that done. Another comment had to do with BLM working with ARS on an all-inclusive report on the work they have been doing together for some time. This report is scheduled to be presented in December 2018. The Council suggested that BLM have a salinity coordinator in Salt Lake City. They have had a salinity coordinator in Salt Lake City for years, but that person has now moved to Denver to work in their National Operations Center. Curtis wasn't sure what would happen, but they would have to see what the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of BLM want to do with that. He noted that that person is available for contact at most any time. The Council requested that BLM work on the Paradox Valley Unit with Reclamation. Their Uncompahgre office has been working with them pretty closely and will continue to do so. BLM will take actions on implementation of the project as needed when Reclamation gets the EIS done. Lastly, the Council requested that BLM continue to spend their \$1.5 million appropriation on salinity control. Curtis commented that they would continue with that commitment into the future, subject to the will of Congress.

USGS

David Susong

David Susong commented that USGS would like to express their appreciation to the Advisory Council and the Forum for the recognition they have given to USGS scientists for their contributions to the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program. They are committed to continuing to advance the science and provide the necessary support for the program in the future. Susong recognized that they have a timeliness issue on a few projects and products and they are making a significant effort to try and get some of those projects completed. Regarding the efforts at Pah Tempe, USGS is working very closely with Reclamation and Washington County. They are looking forward to drilling the additional well and continue the testing and the analysis and the modeling associated with that. Susong wanted to report that they have had some significant interest and recognition for some of the work they have done for the Forum. He explained that Christine Rumsey was asked to give a presentation the following day regarding some of her work on trends. Her study looking at base flow load trends in the Colorado River Basin was funded by the Forum. Susong reported that they were specifically asked to give a briefing on that study to the Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, Tom Petty, along with Andrea Travnicek, the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary. That went very well and they were quite interested. Don Barnett followed up with them on that briefing when he was back in Washington. Susong noted that since he will be retiring, Tom Marston will continue to work with the Forum and the Science Team. He suspected that Christine would continue to be involved in those studies. Also, Pat Lambert will be participating and providing input as well.

FWS

Don Barnett

As Creed Clayton could not be in attendance, Don Barnett gave his report. He noted that FWS did send a response to the Advisory Council Report. They focused on their role to provide an independent review of wildlife replacement activities. They have committed to continue that role and work with the agencies. They also talk about their role to continue to consult under Section 7. In particular, they are watching a couple of species that are in the salinity project areas. They also recognize Reclamation's leadership in trying to look for long-term habitat replacement, and they pledge that they will continue to work with Reclamation and the other agencies to try and find better and more long lasting replacement projects. As to the comments that the Advisory Council gave them relative to being a little bit more flexible as to having off-site mitigation, they have agreed to continue to do that. FWS would rather have something on the ground and proportional and concurrent than to restrict wildlife replacement opportunities for only on-site replacement. They will continue looking at the wildlife evaluation procedure that Reclamation is working on and as soon as that procedure is put in place, they will work on developing scoring for wildlife values so that effort can be completed. They also mention the recent Solicitor's Opinion which is 180 degrees from the prior Solicitor's Opinion relative to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. They will continue to monitor that and provide input as the agency reacts and develops criteria associated with that reversal of opinion.

EPA

Peter Monahan

Peter Monahan reported that EPA was appreciative of the Forum's encouragement of their participation in the 2017 Triennial Review. They will continue to cooperate with the Paradox NEPA process, whatever alternative is decided. They will also encourage the states and tribes, when they submit adoption for water quality standards to use the 2017 Review standards. Region 8 will continue to be the lead region for 6 and 9 for the salinity coordinator. They will also push to get the charter signed in a timely manner this year.

VII. Basinwide Program

Brad Parry

Brad Parry provided some information regarding the Funding Opportunity Announcement (FOA) that was completed in 2017 (see [Appendix C](#)). From that announcement eight applications were selected which turned into seven projects with the merging of two applications into one project. The cost per ton increased a little from \$48 to \$53. Three Basinwide projects were selected, which are all in Colorado. Five applications (or four projects) were selected under the Basin States Program for \$16.3 million, three of which were in Colorado and one in Utah. Parry noted that there were 5500 on-farm acres that expressed interest in doing on-farm work afterwards, and every project that was selected in the Basin States Program was like that. Parry reported to the group that during the middle of the FOA process they received notice that Reclamation's funding for 2019 and 2020 would be reduced by \$2 million. As a result, they had to cut some of the competitive range projects that would have been funded. Parry felt that it was a good FOA, and they had a lot of positive feedback. Don Barnett added that three representatives from the states were invited to participate on the Application Review Committee for the FOA. He complimented Reclamation for a well-conducted FOA, which has resulted from a lot of good work on the part of Reclamation and their successful efforts in streamlining the process. He also commended the state agencies for their increased efforts in reaching out and helping applicants to submit smarter applications which focus on the goals of the salinity control program.

Parry continued by addressing the Basinwide Program. He shared a graph showing funding for the year and the projects it will go to (see [Appendix D](#)). Some of the projects got a late start, but Reclamation was able to make the funding available so they could begin building in the fall. There are also several projects that will be completed. He pointed out the number for appropriations of \$10.374 million. He explained that a week earlier the number was \$8.374 million. He got a call from the budget officer who told him he had an additional \$2 million if he could spend it, so he was happy for that bump-up from the Department. However, this may preclude any end-of-the-year funding being available. Longer term, depending on the budget amount that Reclamation actually receives for 2019, the next FOA will begin either in March or December of 2019. He encouraged the group to start planning soon for the next FOA.

VIII. Update from Reclamation's LC Region

Rich Eastland

Rich Eastland stated that there was not a lot to report from the Lower Region. They continue to support the Forum and the activities that are occurring. They transferred up about \$10 million from the Lower Basin Fund to support the FOAs this year. With the extra \$2 million that Parry reported, they will probably transfer up a little more to help compliment that. As of the end of April, there was about \$2 million in the Lower Basin Fund and they expect to generate a revenue of about \$8.8 million for this year.

IX. Items from the Forum

Bill Hasencamp

Bill Hasencamp reported that there was only one item coming from the Forum to be shared with the Advisory Council. It was the recommendation to support the EIS process in the Paradox evaluation and to keep it within the schedule so we can avoid Reclamation seeking a waiver.

XI. Basin States Program (BSP) Parry/Eastland/Marcie

Bainson

Parry addressed the Basin States Program funding. He referred to some spreadsheets for the Lower Colorado River Basin Development Fund (LCRBDF) going out through 2020 (attached as Appendix E-1 & E-2). He noted that the ending balance in the fund for the year 2018 is anticipated to be about \$6 million, but there will be a decrease as construction gets underway for the new FOA projects. He showed what was projected for revenues over that time and said that things are trending in the right way. He noted that they are on track to get to \$8.8 million. Eastland said that they are doing all they can to support paying down the accrual in the fund.

Marcie Bainson shared a spreadsheet showing the Basin States Program funding forecast (see Appendix F). She discussed the status of the NRCS agreements and the state agreements. She noted that the agreements for the coordinators work will soon be expiring, but in discussions on this subject it was suggested that this effort continue, so those funds will remain in the state contracts. The contract will list the tasks to be performed and the states can determine how and to whom they will assign those tasks. This will include the type of work the coordinators have been performing related to the FOAs, which has been very helpful.

Patrick Dent added that the Work Group had spent quite a bit of time discussing this subject. He explained that when they first determined to hire salinity coordinators, it was on a trial basis to see how effective it would be in terms of the use of funding. The conclusion was that we gained significant value by bringing them on board, from the producers who participated in the program down to the quality of the applications that were received. So the consensus in the Work Group was that they wanted to find a way to continue to have some form of coordination occurring through the states. Dent explained that this program originated from some studies that were done, with the implementation being limited to the Uinta Basin in Utah and the Lower Gunnison in Colorado. The Work Group discussed the possibility of branching out into other locations in the Basin which might be helpful in the implementation of the program. At some point the Work Group will bring this idea to the Advisory Council and the Forum for discussion after they determine how this modified idea for the new contracts will fit into the program.

Bainson continued with the status of the FOA contracts and other miscellaneous contracts. She noted that the quotes for the Salinity Economic Impact Model came in a little bit higher than expected, so they have added an additional \$20,000 from the Basin States fund. She also explained what was going on with the Pah Tempe SIR project. Funds were needed for the additional drilling that had been discussed. The Basin States Program is putting in an additional \$75,000 on that. Washington County is also adding another \$75,000 and the State of Utah is contributing as well.

Bainson then used a spreadsheet to review some of the open SIR projects (see [Appendix G](#)). Some are completed. A lot of them are just waiting for final reports, and USGS is stepping up to get those submitted. Reclamation's report on the Desert Lakes studies should be out soon. Bainson noted that they track the SIR studies closely going way back. When the reports are in, they show that study as complete and move on to the next one.

XI.e. TAG BSP Funding Recommendations

Dent/Susong/Christine Rumsey/Millis

Patrick Dent then addressed the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) BSP funding recommendations. He explained that the Science Team had made proposals for new SIR studies. The Work Group reviewed those proposals and recommendations were prepared by the TAG. A memo was prepared from the TAG to the Advisory Council in addition to a proposed corresponding letter to Reclamation recommending that these studies be funded. Dent asked Susong to review those recommendations with the group. Susong mentioned that there are five proposed SIRs for the next year. He asked Christine Rumsey to give an overview of the first proposal because she is the person who will actually be doing all the real work on it.

Rumsey explained that this proposal is to study long-term trends in water quality in the Upper Colorado River and also to pair that with land use change and try to determine what kind of processes might be driving some of the things that are being observed. Rumsey reported that in a recent project they were looking into dissolved solids trends and base flow trying to interpret what was happening with the base flow loads, and they decided to just look at the trends in the stream. She decided to send all of the data they had collected to USGS, which turned into a pretty striking plot (see [Appendix H](#)). The plot showed the concentration of dissolved solids from about the mid-1930s until today. She noted that this concentration trend was just steadily headed downward, even prior to any salinity mitigation project. That downward trend started to flatten out in about the 2000s and onward. So there were some interesting things going on and some interesting questions that arose as to what is driving the trends prior to salinity control implementation. It suggested there are really large scale processes happening in this system that we may not yet understand. This study would be to address those questions. Rumsey explained that what makes this possible is that they have data from several sites since the 1930s, which is pretty remarkable, so this would be a good opportunity to try to find answers to these questions. She noted there are at least a dozen sites that they could explore.

Susong then reported that the second proposal was a review of salinity data, estimated loads and data gap analysis. He explained the steps that were followed as we began to consider new project areas. The SPARROW models allowed us to take a basinwide look at where salinity loads may be coming from. Following that, the Work Group and the Forum went through a prioritization exercise, using the results of the SPARROW work and modeling efforts to begin to consider where we might look at new salinity control areas. So we have a list of prioritized areas that met a certain set of criteria. The next step is to determine what data is available to actually begin to estimate what the salinity load numbers are. So this proposed work would be to look at the top priority areas and to go in and do some data analysis to determine what data is available. In some areas, most of the data may already be available to go ahead and make an estimate of what the salt load out of that area may be. Other areas may actually need a typical salt study as we have done in the past. So the idea is to analyze these areas to see what data is available and where there may be gaps and then come back with a recommendation.

Susong explained that the USGS is working in the White River Basin on some additional water quality studies, really focusing on some ongoing algal issues within the White River. As part of that effort there is a whole set of sampling going on. This third proposal is simply to add a little bit of funding to allow for additional sampling on those trips that will provide some missing data that is not available for the White River Basin. It is a smaller scale effort that is really piggy-backing on some other fairly sizeable investments going on in the basin.

The fourth proposal comes from the Bureau of Reclamation which would pull together the final information on the Huntington Cleveland project. Jacobson explained that the Huntington Cleveland project was selected in 2004 and was mostly in one basin that had kind of a collection point down at the bottom. This would be a good opportunity to analyze what kind of impacts a salinity project has in an area. He noted that this idea was Jack Barnett's brainchild to see what the salinity projects really do. Jacobson explained that over the years they have had people taking pictures at certain locations. These pictures show how the vegetation has changed and the cropping patterns have changed. They have also monitored some wells that were put in at the bottom of the area to see how salinity levels have changed as the project has moved along. The project is mostly completed now. So the idea is to go in and pull all the data together into a report that would show what happened with the Huntington Cleveland project.

Susong mentioned that the fifth proposal has to do with the additional drilling at Pah Tempe Springs that was discussed earlier. The objective of this drilling is to get deep into the geothermal system upstream of the fault zone to gather information on water quality, temperature, hydraulics, core, etc. This will allow us to understand what it is we are dealing with in the event that we actually try to pump from deeper in that fault zone and capture some of that thermal water before it gets up into the near surface and begins to disperse into the shallow alluvium. Unfortunately, the earlier drilling didn't go as smoothly as was hoped and we got into a lot of difficulties because of the environment. Any time you drill into a geothermal system or a fault zone, you have issues. So this additional funding would allow us to continue that effort and try and complete this last hole. We are hoping with the change in drilling method that we will have more success because it is a method that has been widely used in some of these really fractured environments. Once it is in, we will be collecting cores out of it, along with water samples, to give us a better picture of the flow system at that depth.

Dent mentioned that they have been trying to engage BLM about contributing directly to the trends study. Millis recognized the conversations that have gone on about this, but he didn't know where they sit currently. He wondered if it would be possible for BLM to contribute \$150,000 for each of the next two years to help fund this. Doug Curtis from BLM responded that the idea had been brought up at an earlier meeting. He didn't know if they could come up with that much money at one time. He was hopeful that they could do that, but if not, they would look for some other solution, perhaps a longer period of time or something. Millis noted that this is a great and important project, and it would be very helpful to get that assistance from BLM. Dent explained that there was some "lukewarm-ness" towards the funding from Basin States moneys through the Huntington Cleveland Chronicle, so he suggested that if Reclamation finds some internal money from another pot to help with that project, it would be warmly received. Dent then pointed out that these are the five studies they are moving forward to the Advisory Council for recommendation. A motion was made to accept these recommendations which passed unanimously.

XI.g. Lower Gunnison Basin Coordinator

Jacobson/Cindy Lair

Jacobson explained that they have had coordinators in the Lower Gunnison Basin and the Uinta Basin for a couple of years. Brett Prevedel has been the coordinator for the Uinta Basin and Beth Karberg for the Lower Gunnison Basin. They made some great contributions to the projects there and in the proposals that were received for the FOA. Jacobson explained that more recently they had broadened the scope for the coordinators which allowed them to do additional work in other basins. This was a great help and it brought in projects from areas that had been struggling for some time. So it was a good move. Jacobson reported that Karberg had moved on to a different job, so there was currently no coordinator in Colorado. He explained that these positions have been funded through 2018, so that time frame is coming to an end. He noted that there seems to be a desire to continue those coordinator positions, especially in light of the anticipated 2019 FOA. So Jacobson recommended that they continue these coordinator positions for at least another year or two. He also noted that the Work Group discussed the idea of reaching out to some other basins that need help.

David Robbins commented that on behalf of Colorado, they very much appreciated the Forum's support and Reclamation's support. The coordinator position has made an enormous difference to the state in improving their efforts to control salinity, and they would appreciate that support going forward. He asked if he might prepare a letter to be signed by the Chairman and Becky Mitchell to Beth Karberg thanking her for her outstanding service. Chairman Millis gave his approval.

Cindy Lair said she would echo what was said and expressed her appreciation for the comments that were made in regard to Karberg. She noted that she has been contacted by people who are interested in filling that position, so she is anxious to get someone on board so they can get up to speed and be ready to go.

Robert Hougaard commented that they have been very happy with the work that Prevedel has been doing. As he has expanded his work into different watersheds, he has been a great help in getting some NRCS projects going and assisting in other ways. Hougaard noted that Prevedel expressed his interest in continuing in this role for another year or two. So he was supportive of the recommendation to continue this program.

A motion was made by David Robbins encouraging Reclamation to continue funding and supporting the coordinator positions in any states or areas where the Forum believes it would be beneficial for the salinity program. The motion passed.

XII. Items for the Forum

Hasencamp

The one item to take back to the Forum was the recommendation for a letter of appreciation for Beth Karberg for her work as a salinity coordinator for Colorado.

XIII. Additional Items

Millis

There were no additional items brought up at this time.

XIV. Public Comment

Millis

There were no comments from any of the public in the audience.

XV. Other Business/Actions

Millis

There was no additional business.

A motion to adjourn the Advisory Council meeting was passed, and the meeting was then adjourned.

AGENDA
COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL ADVISORY COUNCIL

Washington County Water Conservancy District Office
533 East Waterworks Drive
St George, Utah

Advisory Council beginning time: **Wednesday, May 16, 2018, 1:00p.m.**

Designated Federal Officer: Kib Jacobson

Presiding: Chairman Eric Millis

- I. Welcome and Introductions Millis
- II. Opening Comments, Acceptance of letters appointing substitute members Jacobson
- III. Review and approval of proposed Agenda Millis
- IV. Draft Minutes of 2017 Fall Council Meeting – Sacramento CA
 - a. Review Jacobson
 - b. Action Millis
- V. Charter Renewal Status Jacobson
- VI. Report on the responses to the Advisory Council report Millis
 - a. USDA-NRCS
 - b. Reclamation
 - c. BLM
 - d. USGS
 - e. FWS
 - f. EPA
- VII. Basinwide Program Jacobson/BradParry
 - a. Funding Opportunity Announcement
 - b. Agreement and Funding Status
- VIII. Update from Reclamation’s LC Region Rich Eastland/John Shields
- IX. Items from the Forum Bill Hasencamp
- X. Public Comment Millis

Recess Meeting: **Approximately 4:30 p.m.**

Agenda Continued on Next Page

Reconvene Meeting:

Thursday, May 17, 2018, 8:30 a.m.

- XI. Basin States Program (BSP)
 - a. Basin Fund status and accounting Parry/Eastland
 - b. Program Status Jacobson/Marcie Bainson
 - c. Contracts w/ Federal and State agencies Bainson
 - d. Accounting of past Studies, Investigations, and Research (SIR) Bainson
 - e. Technical Advisory Group (TAG) BSP Funding Recommendations
 - i. Continuing Recommendations Patrick Dent
 - ii. Studies, Investigations, and Research (SIR) David Susong/Dent
 - f. Recommendations of the AC
 - i. On items i and ii above Millis
 - g. Lower Gunnison Basin Coordinator Jacobson/Cindy Lair
 - h. Uinta Basin Coordinator Jacobson/Robert Hougaard
- XII. Items for Forum Hasencamp
- XIII. Additional Items Millis
- XIV. Public Comment Millis
- XV. Other Business/Actions Millis

Adjourn Meeting:

Approximately 10:30 a.m.