

**Flaming Gorge Working Group  
Meeting Minutes  
April 17, 2024**

**Participation**

This meeting was held Wednesday, April 17, 2024, from 10:00 am to 12:00pm MT, at the Uintah Conference Center in Vernal, Utah and via Microsoft Teams virtual meeting. Attendees are listed on the last page.

**Purpose of Meeting**

The purpose of these working group meetings is to inform the public and other interested parties on Reclamation's current and future operational plans and to gather input from the public and stake holders regarding and interested parties regarding resources associated with the dam [Flaming Gorge Reservoir].

**Alex Pivarnik from the Bureau of Reclamation – Welcome, Purpose, Agenda**

This is the second Flaming Gorge Working Group meeting this year. The earlier one was in March. We have a short agenda today with only two presentations before we go into questions. We had an update on DROA last time. Just a quick update in case you missed the last working group, DROA Recovery has been completed and all the water that was released from Flaming Gorge over the last couple of years has been recovered and now back in the reservoir. That was completed as of February 28<sup>th</sup>. We are still going to hit that drawdown target of 6027' for this spring. Tildon Jones, who usually gives a Recovery Program presentation, is not giving one today so we will just have an update from CBRFC regarding the current conditions on hydrology then we will jump over to Flaming Gorge operational scenarios and the technical working group overview from Mike Callahan from Reclamation. We will turn this over to Brenda Alcorn.

**Brenda Alcorn from the Colorado Basin River Forecast Center**

Brenda talked about the current conditions on the Upper Green and the Yampa River.

A map and table for the 'Water Year to Date Precipitation, October 1 – April 16, 2024' as a percent of average was presented. Just going over how we have gotten to where we are right now, and we will talk a little bit about our current forecast. The map is showing the water year to date. The yellows and greens on the map are a near average with yellow being 90 to 100% of average and the greens being 100 to 110% of average. On that map and then over in the table, the top row at overall for the water year, we are looking at near average in the Upper Green for precipitation to date while over in the Yampa River Basin there is a little more. The blue colors there are a little above average overall but really what is notable is how we got to that total at this point and what really stands out is November and December. We really had a slow start to the season and that kind of hurt that start of the snowpack building. But January, February, and March really picked up and really got us to this near average point. So far in April we have had really poor precipitation; just 35% of average in the Upper Green to date. April and May are really important precipitation months for this area. We can really get a lot more snowpack in the higher elevations that are going to help the water supply so hopefully things will pick back up again. The Yampa River Basin overall has been doing better

and again even April it has been below average, but nothing like in the green sitting at 80% of average so far this month. So that leads into where the snowpack is.

Brenda, then, presented a map of the “Upper Green River Basin Snow Conditions” showing shaded areas of snowpack within our hydrologic model. And it is only showing the snow in the areas that really contribute the most to the runoff. The squares on the map are the SNOTEL sites run by the NRCS with the same color schemes. In the Upper Green, the northern parts of the basin, there a lot of yellow on the shading parts showing a little below average snowpack. That is what that is indicating but there also are some orange colors so getting more below average to this point. The graphics on the right side, that is looking at all those shaded areas from our model and putting them together. The darker blue line is this year, and the lighter blue line is the median. The green line is last year so obviously not doing as well as last year but right now, sitting at 96% of average overall, but we did peak slightly above the normal snowpack peak but we really had quite some significant melt his last week when things got kind of warm and most of that, of course, occurred in lower elevations. Good news overall, we are at that 96% of average but that is just averaging. That is including the north slope of the Uintas. That is where the snowpack is really better but that is not where most of the runoff is going to come from. For Flaming Gorge, we are talking about unregulated, that water going to come from up in the Wind Rivers. In the bottom graphic, what you see is we have not reached the median snowpack there. We have stayed below all season, and you can really see in there that slow start to the season and then how it really did pick up after January forward but in April it has flatlined where we would really like to see it continue to build. 90% of average does not sound bad and you know it is not that bad, but we would really like it to build some more snow there and get us back up to that average and not just continue to melt from this point forward because that would hurt our water supply.

Brenda presented the map and table for “Yampa River Basin Snow Conditions”. In the Yampa River Basin, again things have been much better over there. Snowpack overall from in our model is 115% of average. It has peaked quite a bit above that median snowpack, and it is not melting early. It is kind of melting on time. We did get a pretty good warm up and we did see the rivers come up quite a bit over this last week or so. The top graphic shows that overall. The bottom graphic is a single forecast point and broken out into different elevation bands. The lower green line is the low elevation snowpack for this area, below 8000 feet. We have had a normal-ish year with that, and it is melting at a normal time. Where we really have the best snowpack is within the mid elevation 8000 to 9500 feet. It is currently sitting at 140% of median and again it is melting on time but we had a pretty fast melt over this last little bit but there is still some snow up there. Then the highest elevations are doing OK but not as good as that middle elevation. Again, it would be nice to see a little more snow before it just completely starts melting.

Brenda presented the map and table of “April 15 Water Supply Vol. Raw Model Guidance”. So, what does that mean for the water supply role forecasts? On April 1st we had in the Green River basin for Fontanelle and for the Flaming Gorge inflow, we finally reached a near average forecast but, with how dry April has been to this point, the mid-month update it has come down quite a bit there again we would prefer to see additional snowpack being built instead of a flat line and some melt happening there so those have come down a little bit.

Brenda presented graphs “Water Supply Forecast Evolution: Flaming Gorge Inflow” and the “Water Supply Forecast Evolution: Yampa River – Deerlodge”. In Flaming Gorge, we are looking at 880,000-acre feet which is 91% of average right now. The Yampa is doing a bit better. It has not come down as much there from that April 1st forecast looking 110% of average right now. So, you can see how it has evolved through the season and things really improved. We see that drop off with this latest mid-month update, these being probabilistic, when we put that 50% out that means 50% of the time the forecast is likely going to come in higher but 50% of the time it is going to come in lower. We also have 10 and 90% bounds. On the top if we were to get a wet spring, there is a chance we could get up to 1.26-million-acre feet inflow. If it turns dry from this point forward, we may be looking at something like 645,000-acre feet which is just 67% of average. Then there is a 20% chance we come in outside of those bounds so hopefully we stay on that the upper. The Yampa River Deer Lodge forecast has been doing better. We did not start the season quite so low, and we are still looking at slightly above average forecast at this point. Even at 90% exceedance level if it were to turn dry, we are expecting still that we could get 90% of average runoff there.

Brenda presented the graphs “Forecast Verification” of Flaming Gorge Inflow and Yampa River (Maybell) Inflow. So how well did these forecasts verify? In March, April, May, the percent error decreases, and we start getting a better handle on things as we have more information available to us. The largest source of uncertainty is future weather. So extreme dry or wet events obviously result in larger errors. There is some error due to “do we have the snowpack modeled correctly in the soil moisture” but those are all parts of our model that we are looking at very closely day-to-day.

Brenda presented the “Peak Flow Forecasts – Daily Points vs. Special Points” maps. Briefly talking about peak flow forecasting, we have two different kinds. We have on the left, the number of points that we are creating every day. There are raw model guidance updates for those. Then on the right is the map of the forecast that are manually done because there is significant upstream regulation to these points like reservoirs and diversions. So, it requires some manual work to create those. There is just a handful of those. The Green at Jensen and the Green River Utah downstream from Flaming Gorge are two of the points that we do that for. At the Yampa Deer Lodge, there is minimal regulation about that so that is one that you will see every day that is updated. If you click on that point on the map, it will bring you to a lot of information. Brenda presented the ‘Peak Flow Forecast: Yampa River-Deerlodge’ On the upper left in the red box, what it will tell you when the model was run. It gives you what the flood flow is and from this model run with that 50% forecast peak flow. This is a mean daily peak flow based on snow melt. An instantaneous peak would likely be higher but right now for the Yampa we are forecasting about 50% peak about 15,000 CFS. The average peak is about 12,700 so we are forecasting an above average peak but looking at the graphic, that it has different critical levels. The red dashed line is the flood flow. We are likely going to stay below that unless we get some kind of significant rain on snow event or on the backside of some warming where we are already melting a lot. Again, these are probabilistic just like the models and so we do put some bounds on there with those 10 and 90% exceedances. We do not forecast a time of peak. These are long lead and there is a table that shows you a peak timing but really in the long lead like this it is going to just be pointing to the normal time of peak. The normal time to peak on the Yampa is about mid-May into the beginning of June and in the table on the lower right that is kind of what it is also saying with that 90% and 10% encompassing that normal time. The page shown is mostly for a long lead. As we are getting closer to the actual time of peak, you really want to look at our daily forecast hydrographs to see what is really going to be happening.

Brenda presented the “Peak Flow Forecast at Green River – Jensen”. The latest peak flow forecast

for the Green River at Jensen, again this was the beginning of this week the middle of the month, we made an update. The flood flow here defined as 24,100 CFS and right now the forecast is for 19,000 as at the 50% level. At the 10% level it is up to 24,000 but still remaining below flood levels. If it were to get to that point, I am sure Reclamation would modify to make sure that it does stay below flood since the Yampa is not going to be causing that much flow. Again, this is a forecast based on preliminary Reclamation reservoir operation plans that can definitely change as the situation is evolving and also, that long lead peak flow forecast from the Yampa.

Brenda presented the “Peak Flow Forecasts: Impacts of Spring Weather”. Just to mention peak flows are highly dependent on the spring weather temperatures, precipitation that occurred during the melt. So how we get to that probabilistic forecast is we have 30 years of historical weather. Right now, we are using 1991 through 2020 and this is the same thing that goes into the model forecasting so we get 30 possible hydrographs and then we use that to analyze either for model or for peaks - what might happen in the long lead. Again, you really want to start looking at the daily forecasts. The daily forecasts are the better thing to look at the closer we are getting closer to that time of peak.

Brenda presented the “Daily Streamflow Forecast: Green River -Jensen” maps and graphs. We are making these forecasts every day. We try to get them out by about 10:00 AM but they include seven days of actual forecast precipitation and 10 days of forecast temperatures versus using all these historical years of actual weather. We also can include any known upstream reservoir release plans or diversions as well. So, on the map I have highlighted the word YDLC2, the Yampa and there is a bunch of points above that. The Yampa Deer lodge is that outlet point into GRZ1 is Flaming Gorge and you can see all the forecast points above that, as well. Anything to the left of the red line is in the past or observed and to the right is the future of forecast. We have temperatures, that is the squiggly line, those are the diurnal temperature patterns observed. Then we have the 10 days of forecast. Precipitation are the blue bars. These are 6-hour time step. We have observed precipitation and then we have forecast precipitation. The model has its own snowpack and based on temperatures it is going, at this time of year, melt possibly and those are the green bars. We can see how much melt it is producing. We can see this for each of those forecast points. In the model for the Yampa River at Deer Lodge we have the observed data to the right of that and the red that we are getting from the USGS. We are making sure our models are tracking that as closely as possible so that gives us some confidence that our forecast is going to be good. We had observed rises with the melt and precipitation that occurred and then there was a cool down and then we were going to be forecasting another big rise.

Continuing with the Daily Streamflow Forecast slide, Brenda shows a forecast from last week for Flaming Gorge. We are getting information from Reclamation, so we have the observed portion from the USGS, but we also have that release pattern in our model from Reclamation. This was at a time when they were going to change that release pattern and so we are able to incorporate that into our forecast and so that is obviously very important when you go down to the Green River at Jensen that we can see the changes that they are planning to make. That is why it is better to be looking at this as we get to that time of peak rather than the long lead because it does not have the exact pattern. It is using historical weather instead of an actual weather forecast for the next 7 to 10 days. You can get these on your website every day. This is from yesterday the forecast for the impact Deer Lodge is on the top. This is showing what the forecast was from last week. We did see some pretty good rises. We are going to see a little bit of cooling before it comes back up. Then on the bottom there is the Green River at Jensen.

Current future weather, we just had a system come through. It actually did have some pretty good precipitation over in the Yampa River basin. Unfortunately, the Green did not get much out of it at

all. The map on the left, you can see that is the seven-day forecast precipitation. This was from yesterday morning. There is a chance for additional light precipitation in the next few days mostly in the higher elevations and again unfortunately the big green BLOB in the northern parts of the Green that is actually on the other side of the basin. It is not in our side of the basin. It is not expected to get much [precipitation] up there, maybe a little more than in the Yampa. We are having this little bit of cooling, but they are expecting things to warm back up by the weekend and dry out. Then an 8-to-14-day precipitation outlook, it is interesting to see it is green which means there are increased chances for above normal precipitation. So, fingers crossed that does happen but what they were saying is mostly additional chances for storms, but weak storm systems, to continue to move through the area and hopefully be bringing precipitation. Again, it says increased chances for above normal, but it does not tell us how much precipitation and from what I could tell they were not expecting any big storms. But along with that, the forecast is for above normal temperatures so that is hopefully not too hot but we will see how that works out but that is what they were saying yesterday. I am sure it has changed today. The spring things change quickly.

Here is some contact information and how to get to our website, if you are interested in learning more:

Brenda Alcorn, Colorado Basin River Forecast Center, Hydrologist-Green River Forecaster. Email is [Brenda.alcorn@noaa.gov](mailto:Brenda.alcorn@noaa.gov) and phone is 801-524-5130 extension 334. Operational Hydrologist is available 7 days a week: 6:30am – 4pm. Email is [cbrfc.operations@noaa.gov](mailto:cbrfc.operations@noaa.gov) and phone number is 801-524-4004. If you are interested in learning more, go to our website: <https://cbrfc.noaa.gov/> and for the CBRFC Water Supply Presentations: <https://www.cbrfc.noaa.gov/present/present.php>

Clarifying question regarding times shown on graphics. Brenda said they are in Zulu time. Be careful with that. 12Z is about 6am.

### **Flaming Gorge Working Group, Hydrology & Forecasted Operations, Flaming Gorge Operations – Mike Callahan from the Bureau of Reclamation**

Flaming Gorge and the 1956 Colorado River Storage Project Act (CRSP) – Authorized construction of Flaming Gorge Dam and other projects for: allowing Upper Basin states to utilize their 1922 Colorado River Compact apportionments, regulating flow of Colorado River (and its main tributaries), storing water for beneficial consumptive use, reclamation of arid and semi-arid lands, flood control, and hydroelectric power generation.

Operational background information – Geographic scope: Reach 1: Flaming Gorge Dam to Yampa River Confluence, Reach 2: Yampa River Confluence to White River confluence, and Reach 3: White River confluence to confluence of Green and Colorado Rivers.

4 Step Process – would ensure that the 2000 Flow and Temperature Recommendations and the authorized purposes of Flaming Gorge Dam are considered in a balanced and fair manner as each year’s operational plan is developed.

Upper Colorado Recovery Program Flow Request Development (end of February)

- Step 1 before March 1 – completed
  - Official flow request from Recover Program sent to UC Region and FGTWG
  - Flaming Gorge initial draft Operational Plan (FG Ops Plan) developed and sent to FGTWG
- Step 2 March 1 to mid-March – completed
  - FGTWG – develop and finalize FGTWG proposal
- Step 3 mid-March to mid-April – currently in process

- FG WG – FGTWG Proposal presented and updated FG Ops Plan shared with FG WG Meeting/Stakeholder review
- FG WG provides input and comments (by mid-April)
- Step 4 Early May – to occur in early May
  - Reclamation finalizes FG Ops Plan

Going into the Forecasted Hydrology, Mike presented the ‘Flaming Gorge Forecast’ graph [similar graph Brenda shared] which helps with hydrologic classifications. What I wanted to point out is the big pink bars are the official beginning of the month forecast. In our last meeting, in March, those pink dots between the bars, that is what we had in the Ops Plan that we sent out. The line has gone back down so we are now at the point where we will tweak some of the graphics. This will be sent out to be reviewed. We are back to where we were in Mid-March, a little above it but differences/changes are negligible.

Going over the ‘2024 Flaming Gorge Inflow Forecast Hydrologic Classification’. We are looking at the average below classification like I was talking about in March. This sets our bills. Whenever you move into a different classification, the targets change. It is also better to be at the upper end of that classification. It usually means the target stays the same, but you have a little bit more water in the classification. We are at the lower end so that means our budget is a little tight.

Looking at the Yampa at Deerlodge is a similar story. We are a little bit more steady and luckily we are a little above average. Yampa has hydrologic *conditions* not classifications. The classification is what drives those bills that is on the Green. The Yampa helps with us meeting those targets in Reach 2. It is not what is setting the target. Even though the Yampa is doing a bit better, it should be able to help us out, but it is not ‘driving the boat’ on this. It is still at the lower range of average above.

Looking at the Peak Forecast for our peak flows, it helps dictate what targets to hit in our releases. It is very weather and timing dependent. Then Mike showed the ‘spaghetti’ chart “Trace Ensemble for YDLC2L\_F”. With this much lead time right now, this chart shows when is it going to happen? At this point, without having that specific weather data, that is just going to average out. Then showing a cleaner version of the chart to better show the average. The end of May period to be our rough peak.

Showing the Recovery Request and the FGTWG Proposal Summary, this is where that average below and above median comes in. This is sent over from the Recovery Program to FGTWG and has different priorities for those different classifications. We are in that first column, the average below median, right now where the Smallmouth bass spike flow was their top priority and then experimental base flows [that is those summer flows] and then three, spring releases consistent with LTSP. We will get into what that means for targets.

That goes into the FGTWG proposal which then gets sent and incorporated into the Operations Plan wherein that average below median so that dictates those proposed targets that we are looking at. Showing the FGTWG Proposal Summary Table, showing the proposal for those different classifications.

Getting into the DRAFT operations, I am going to start with the dry. So because there is a big range in the forecast we have 5 different operations in here. I am going to start with the driest and then work our way up. As I was mentioning earlier, we have the big red arrow to the average below median. It is our most likely scenario right now, so I am going to spend more time on that. I am going to follow this same order so I am going start talking about mod dry and then the second one is going to be the one that is the most likely scenario at the moment and then we will roll through the remainder.

Mike presented the “FG Ops Plan 2024-2025 Mod Dry Release w/Lower and Upper Bound” chart. This is that mod dry. We are just going to show the graph on this one and then the next one we are actually going to show a table that has a lot of words on it, but it gets into the details of what is showing on the different graphs. This is if the forecast all of a sudden goes down. This is what we are going to be looking at. We are going to be hitting about 900 maybe 950 to begin the period. We are going to hit the low target for that initial bump up that is that LTSP that I mentioned a minute ago. The second bump is small mouth bass so you can

see that LTSP is small, so we are hitting the low targets on this one doing the small mouth bass then doing the summer base flows. We drop down for that fall period then bump back up for the winter period. At this point, because it is hard to budget out what is really going happen in the winter, that will pretty much be what do we have left in the budget and that is also for power considerations that bump up in the winter there.

Moving on to the table for the average below median. This is what I am saying is a very wordy table. We are going get to a graphic that explains this here, but I wanted to spend some more time on this one because it is the most likely. So that prespring peak, we could be anywhere from the low end are the lowest which is 800 to full power plant generation. That is a bit dependent that very specific weather that we are going get. We are going be aiming at 950 for that spring peak and you will see that in the graph here in a minute. Then we get to the spring peak trying to time it for LTSP. We are going to be aiming at above 14,000 CFS. If we can, which we are predicting that we might be able to do, we are going try to get to 18,600 for at least one day. That is why Brenda is showing rounding up to 19 for the most likely peak and that is why that is showing that is if we can we are going try to get above 18,600 for at least a day in that spring peak period. And we are ramping down ramping down and pretty quick rate ramping out of 2000 CFS a day to be until releases are anywhere from 800 to 1200 CFS. We are going be trying to target again that 950 small mouth bass is then that second peak and this is a 72-hour period at full power plant. Then ramping that back down we also talked about some specifics on the units on this one because it there is a temperature component to that experiment. Then we have the summer base flows where we will be targeting 2400 CFS for two to five weeks and then releases will still target 2400 CFS in reach 2. This is probably going to end up going down a little bit. This table was based off of that April 1st forecast this is going need to be updated. Now that we have been going back down in April, we saw that. That is part of the challenge that we recognize with this whole process. We are trying to be as transparent as we can but as things change, we have to tweak some of these things as we are going. As you saw, it went way up at the end of March and then we are kind of going back down so there will be some values in here that will need to be tweaked slightly based on the evolving forecast and most likely the summer base flow will be a little bit lower. So average daily release will be 2200 CFS depending on the Yampa River and as high as 300 CFS ramp up and ramp down may be used between flow regimes. Then moving into autumn, average daily flows of 1600 CFS in reach 2. So that means the releases will be about 1200 CFS from the dam to be achieving that 1600 in reach 2 because they will be dependent on what is the Yampa providing at that time. Winter releases bumping up to the plus 25% base flow period not to exceed 3000 CFS in reach 2. Average daily releases will be 2200 CFS. This is also likely to change slightly because of the updated forecast and so that value will probably go down a little bit here in this winter base flow period. And then and the end of the Flaming Gorge OPS plan transition period That is technically like right now we are in the transition period for last year's OPS plan this is when we have to fluctuate those flows to achieve that upper limit drawdown so like right now targeting 6027 that is what is going on at the dam right now is that transition period.

So I know I just said a bunch of things but that is this is the actual graphic of what that means so that LTSP is that first peak you can see how there is that one day ramp that goes all the way up we are using bypass on that one day trying to hit that raw target of 18,600 the reason it says variable in both the timing and magnitude of this is because it is very dependent on that specific Yampa run off what really happens here in the next month with temperatures.

### **Audience Questions:**

Question from GROGA about clarification of LTSP trigger. Mike Callahan and Dr. Bestgen responded to the question.

Response- LTSP is largely driven by temperature in the different rivers. We see that larval show up in the river usually right after the peak but then it is dependent on how quickly is that Yampa peak declines. All start dates are variable. Hitting 18,600 cfs peak is also variable on the conditions in the rivers system at the time of the releases.

Question about Smallmouth Bass Spike Flow timing (concerns of river guides and recreation needs as much lead time as possible) – Dr. Bestgen responded.

Timing is variable on smallmouth bass spawning models and timing flows to maximize the disruption to spawning. In past cases, there was approx., 6-7 days of lead time before the releases.

Tim Gaylord expressed gratitude for increase from 800 cfs o 950 cfs between flow spikes, but asked for more flow if possible.

Question on why the decrease in flows between flow spikes. Respond from Mike Callahan: Yes, the reduction in flow after the LTSP experiment sets up the smallmouth bass releases. The reduced flows after the smallmouth bass experiment sets up the summer base flows for Colorado Pike Minnow. In both cases, the reduced flows in between operations encourages the movement of the fish in the river system and starts the behaviors needed for the operations to be successful.

Request to codifying language to stay at 950 cfs average. Response: will be taken under consideration.

Question about Memorial Day Language in LTSP section. Response was to clarify that the notification will be sent on Tuesday at the latest if flows were to be initiated for the Memorial Day weekend.

Question about flow fluctuations in March and April, Mike Callahan responded with the fluctuations are due to the changes in the forecasts and observed flows on the need to hit the May 1<sup>st</sup> elevation target.

Clarification question on maximum power release: Max power release is dependent on reservoir pool and ranges between 4,500 cfs and 4,600 cfs.

Question from UDNR: Can accommodations be made for the repair of the boat ramp just downstream of the dam. Response: Further coordination will be required on the exact timing of the repair and if flow requests can be accommodated.

Alex Pivarnik – Closed the meeting with a thank you to all attendance and a request to sign the sign in sheet.

### Next Meeting

- August 28, 2024 (scheduled on June 12, 2024).



## Attendees

Amanda Becker – BOR	Michael Callahan – BOR	Alexander Pivarnik – BOR
Tana Allen – BOR	Brenda Alcorn – CBRFC	Ryan Rowland – USGS Water Science Center
Julie Stahli, Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program	Courtney Harris, WAPA	Becki Bryant, BOR
Andrew Freel, USGS Utah Water Science Center	Kat Mueller – WRF Guides	Kevin Bestgen – Colorado State University
Dave Speas - BOR	Lucerne Valley Marina	Cherette Bonomo – ANF FGRD
Nicole Lavoie, OARS	Chris Eaton, Trout Creek Flies	Will Pedro, DINO NM NPS
Susan Behery - BOR	Jayden Guymon – USFS	Clyde Watkins – Duchesne County Water Conservancy
Rick Baxter – BOR	John Walrath – Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Green River	Roxann Reid – BOR
John Brewer – Public	Kevin Clegg & Jayson Roundy – USFS	Calli Veautour – USFS
Derek Fryer – WAPA	Kate Lunz – USFWS	Emily Young – ADWR
David Graf – Upper CO River Recovery Program	Peter Crookston – BOR	Bryan Seppie – GR/RS/SwCo-Joint Powers Water Board
Jonathan Friedman – USGS	Ryan Jones, Utah Department of Agriculture and Food	C. Cunningham
Richard Clayton – BOR	Nicki Gibney	Gretchan Hinkhouse – Flaming Gorge Resort
Hattie Johnson	Jen & Tony Val...	Jessica Lockwo...
Tildon Jones – Recovery	Erik Knight	Lisa Herrera
Cat McClure	Michelle Garris...	Nicole Lavoie
Robb Keith	Aaron Selig	Tim Gaylord
John Rauch	Uintah Mosquito	Jason Griswold
Jordan Detlor – UDWR	Brant Williams - Lucerne Marina	Darell Gillman
Jordan Dimick	Jerry Taylor – Lucerne Marina	