

**Aspinall Operations EIS  
Cooperating Agency Meeting  
January 19, 2005**

**FINAL MEETING SUMMARY**

The third Cooperating Agency Meeting for the Aspinall Operations Environmental Impact Statement was held on January 19, 2005 at the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation Western Colorado Area Office at 2764 Compass Drive, Suite 106, in Grand Junction, Colorado. All cooperating agencies were present for the meeting. Cooperating agencies include the State of Colorado (Colorado), Colorado River Water Conservation District (CRWCD), National Park Service (NPS), Platte River Power Authority (PRPA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), and Western Area Power Administration (WAPA). A total of 31 people participated in the meeting including Reclamation staff from Grand Junction, Montrose, and Salt Lake City. A copy of the meeting attendees is attached.

The meeting began at 9:45 a.m. All participants were present and no one joined the meeting via conference call.

---

**Introduction and Welcome**

Ed Warner (Reclamation-WCAO Resource Division Manager) facilitated the meeting and started with introductions of cooperating agencies and others in attendance. Reclamation reviewed the agenda with the cooperating agencies and no changes were proposed.

---

**Review and Discussion on December 6, 2004 Meeting Summary**

Cooperating agencies reviewed the Draft Meeting Summary for the December 6th Cooperating Agency Meeting. PRPA, Colorado, SWCD, and CRWCD requested minor changes which will be incorporated into the Final Meeting Summary and distributed to Cooperating Agencies and posted on Reclamation's Aspinall EIS website.

PRPA suggested titling the Meeting Summary as "Draft" until reviewed by the Cooperating Agencies during the next cooperating agency meeting. Reclamation agreed to this addition.

---

**Draft Letter on Lead/Coop Agency Responsibilities**

Steve McCall (Reclamation-WCAO) led the discussion on a draft letter regarding Reclamation's and cooperating agency responsibilities. The draft letter to cooperating

agencies was distributed via email to cooperating agencies prior to the meeting. Copies were also made available at the meeting.

NPS suggested that in the interest of keeping the cooperating agency process open, the letter should reflect that when Reclamation meets with one cooperator, an invitation be extended to all cooperators to participate. Item F under Lead Agency Expectations and Item B under Joint Expectations could be clarified to address formal meetings. Day to day issues would be excluded. Reclamation asked if NPS meant coordinate the meeting for everyone to attend or cc an invitation to attend. NPS clarified the intent to invite, not attempt to schedule for all cooperating agencies to attend.

Reclamation stated that it tentatively plan to send out the final letter regarding “Expectations of the Lead and Cooperating Agencies in Preparation of the Aspinall Operations Environmental Impact Statement to Cooperating Agencies” in the next week or two.

PRPA asked if the letter should list State water law and contracts, in addition to those laws already listed (NEPA, ESA). Reclamation stated it would add the Law of the River and other applicable state and federal laws and power contracts.

CRWCD asked about termination as described in the draft letter. Reclamation stated that if there were issues with a cooperating agency, it would first attempt to address those issues rather than proceeding with termination of cooperating agency status. Termination of cooperating agency status would be a last resort measure.

NPS stated that there may be times when there are issues for Department of Interior Agencies regarding policy, law, etc. Reclamation stated that if there were discussions within the Department of Interior, Reclamation would present this information to cooperators. PRPA stated that it sees all cooperating agency meetings as open including meetings between Department of Interior Agencies. Reclamation stated that the intent is not to hide anything. SWCD stated that it doesn't consider this a big issue and has no concerns either way. CWCB suggested that the lead agency provide summaries of meetings to cooperating agencies and provide invitations in advance of meetings.

CRWCD liked the intent of NPS's suggestion and stated it understood the limitations. CWCB discussed the recent sufficient progress letter concern with the Aspinall EIS schedule for the Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program. The letter requested expediting the Aspinall Operations EIS process. CWCB stated the letter provided no dates but stated that continual delays don't help the endangered fish. CWCB asked if there are things that can be done to speed up the process. FWS suggested not waiting until the EIS is completed to implement some of the flow recommendations.

---

*Action Item: Reclamation will revise the draft letter regarding expectations of the lead and cooperating agency and mail to cooperating agencies prior to the next cooperating agency meeting.*

---

## **Discussion on draft Baseline, Existing Conditions, and No Action**

Steve McCall led the discussion on baseline, existing conditions and the no action alternative. Steve stressed that the No Action Alternative is an important part of the NEPA document because it is the basis to which all other alternatives are compared to.

Steve stated that the No Action Alternative is how unit would be operated in the future without any special considerations for endangered fish. He stated that in the EIS there would be discussions on how operations have changed over the years. An example used was the history/evolution of the 300 cfs minimum flow below Crystal Reservoir.

NPS asked if the No Action Alternative will include projected changes. Reclamation stated yes. NPS asked if there is intent to have more than one action alternative. Reclamation stated that it expects to develop a range of alternatives to meet the EIS purpose and need.

Reclamation began to review the draft document titled “Existing Conditions and No Action Alternative for NEPA document, Environmental Baseline for ESA consultation”. There was considerable discussion between cooperating agencies and the discussion is summarized as follows:

### ***1) Existing capacities and elevations of Unit structures***

Reclamation stated that there are new flow capacities associated with the Crystal Power Plant improvements but that Reclamation does not know exact flows yet. CRWCD asked if the March 31 target needs to change because of the increases in capacity at Crystal. Reclamation responded that the March target is designed for flood control and to reduce flows that bypass the Crystal Power Plant and it may be adjusted because of the new Crystal capacity. Reclamation suggested that the new Crystal capacities be reviewed and discussed with the Hydrology subgroup.

CRWCD and NPS stated that they need to know current operations to be able to comment on them. Reclamation should develop a list of operating criteria for the cooperating agencies. CRWCD stated that the criteria should include all targets, not just the March 31 target. Reclamation stated that they will include all targets in the information.

### ***2) Aspinall Unit in place, regulating the river using 2004 operating practices, and operating for Unit purposes under highly variable annual inflow conditions.***

CRWCD questioned using 2004 operating practices, stating that it doesn't include flows for the Redlands fish screen. Reclamation suggested using a modified 2004 operation including the fish screen.

There was considerable discussion on historic versus current Unit operations. WAPA asked if Reclamation considered 2004 operations to be historic. WAPA suggested that historic operations exclude all operations for endangered fish and wants to show changes in operations that have been made for endangered fish.

Colorado stated that there were five years of test flows at Aspinall and there have been changes in operating philosophy (for example: meeting the North Fork flows, and bundling of water). These are normal operations that benefit the fish. We have tried to do more operations that are environmentally conscious and that these changes shouldn't be lost. Colorado stated that the fish screen is appropriate to be included in current operations and that there is a benefit to the endangered fish.

NPS asked Reclamation if it anticipates other changes in operations for other authorized purposes. Reclamation doesn't see anything that would change operations; however Reclamation will continue to tweak operations to meet its multi-purposes. Reclamation stated that East-slope issues may affect future changes in operations but nothing specific has been proposed.

NPS asked if protecting Black Canyon resources are considered an authorized purpose. Reclamation responded in the general context, no, however if considered in context of recreation, it may be an authorized purpose. Colorado stated their position that NPS protection is not part of the authorized purposes of the Aspinall Unit.

NPS asked if current operations are driven by ESA knowledge or whether it is a result of the greening of Reclamation using a more of a natural hydrograph to benefit other authorized purposes.

CRWCD referenced the April 2, 2003 Black Canyon Settlement Agreement and the intent to provide a peak flow. Reclamation stated that bundling of excess water occurs when the flows are anticipated to bypass the Crystal Power Plant. NPS asked if the discretion for operations that benefit fish are authorized from the Colorado River Storage Project Act or Colorado River Basin Act. SWCD stated for describing current operating practices, Reclamation needs to back out some of those actions for endangered fish.

NPS asked if we have changed the definition of No Action in regard to operations. Reclamation stated that it still would have obligations under the Endangered Species Act absent the flow recommendations. NPS stated that Reclamation should ask cooperating agencies to agree or disagree with a list of items included in the No Action Alternative. NPS stated a need to understand Reclamation's current philosophy.

Colorado stated that it doesn't think the Recovery Program would back off things that have been done to assist in endangered fish recovery. PRPA stated that the NEPA process is to compare action with no action.

Reclamation continued to review the items listed under the No Action Alternative for 2004 operating practices.

**a) Existing Spring Flood Control Operations.** Reclamation attempts to keep flows at Delta below 14,000 cfs to minimize impacts by using Blue Mesa drawdown when required (the official number is 15,000 cfs).

**b) Blue Mesa Winter Icing Targets.** Reclamation draws down Blue Mesa's surface water elevation to 7,490 feet by the end of December to reduce chances of upstream flooding. Reclamation stated that there is no legal requirement by law or contract and Reclamation determined the elevation by studies and on-going operations.

**c) Peaking at Morrow Point and Blue Mesa, Re-regulating at Crystal.** Reclamation stated that there isn't anything in law or contract that requires peaking at Morrow Point and Blue Mesa, but that it is a goal. Jane Blair (Reclamation-Salt Lake) suggested that Reclamation describe peaking in terms of a range of releases and provide documentation so that everyone can understand. NPS stated that it's unclear if peaking power trumps other authorized purposes and asked about priority. Dave Harpman (Reclamation-Denver) stated that the no action alternative is pretty straight forward, Reclamation re-regulates at Crystal to minimize downstream effects.

**d) "Bundling" of "Excess Water" (water in excess of project purposes) into a spring peak during May 15 to June 15 while avoiding bypasses at Morrow Point and Blue Mesa.** Reclamation described bundling water as operating in January-March to prevent bypasses at Crystal. Reclamation stated that the April-May forecasts are better and if the May 1 forecast indicates a bypass at Crystal, the excess water is "bundled" to create a peak flow in May. SWCD asked if this changes the quantity of water released. Reclamation stated that it affects the timing of releases and if the forecast is in error may affect the quantity of release. Colorado asked Reclamation to make this clear.

WAPA stated that in 1991 BOR and NPS put together a contract for Black Canyon, but the contract was not executed. Secretary Beard instructed BOR to operate Aspinall under the terms of the contract. Reclamation experimented with peak releases and developed the idea of bundling. Hydrologist would look at the water available in the forecast, identify what water might bypass Crystal and put that water together into a peak. WAPA is interested because if forecast is wet, there is a need to evacuate water based on the forecast. January and February are peak power months and moving water to the spring reduces water available for power generation during the important winter months.

WAPA stated that some of what Reclamation does is written down and some are in the heads of operators, subject to significant change. No Action is a range of operating rules. FWS stated that a range would be an accurate portrayal because NEPA looks at current operations. NPS stated that this is the basis of what other alternatives are compared to. WAPA stated that some operations are not done consistently and have no documentation. WAPA suggested to include documentation and that if there is no documentation, it will be difficult to include in the No Action Alternative.

---

Meeting broke for lunch at 12:45 p.m. and resumed at 1:28 p.m.

---

Discussion continued on the No Action Alternative.

Colorado suggested that “excess water” be described as water anticipated to bypass the Crystal Power Plant.

**d) Ramping Rates per Operation Matrix and Present Practices (while recognizing flexibility available to address specific situations). Ramping Rates for day to day operations and also for special circumstances such as flood control.**

Steve McCall described the ramping rates presented in the operations matrix. He stated that ramping rates change under special circumstances. NPS asked what the most common rules are. Reclamation pointed to the matrix for day to day operations and to the model for flood control operations.

WAPA asked if the ramping rates were 400 cfs per day or 15% or greater ramp down. Colorado responded that the ramping rates are 250 cfs per day up and down to protect trout during normal operations recommended.

**e) State Instream Flow Rights including the State of Colorado 300 cfs Junior Instream Gunnison River Right and Reclamation’s historic operations to meet this 300 cfs except in certain cases of significant drought (as determined by reservoir elevation projections) and Unit Emergencies.**

Colorado recommended No Action includes a 300 cfs minimum flow except during extreme drought and maintenance activities to protect trout.

**f) 2003 Black Canyon Federal Water Right Settlement Agreement in Place (300 cfs Senior, State Instream Flow Spring Right).**

Reclamation stated that Black Canyon Agreement is in place and if it is overturned, Reclamation will take it out of the No Action Alternative.

**g) Avoidance of Gunnison Gorge flow decreases after October 15<sup>th</sup> for Brown Trout Spawning when Practical. Avoidance of Flow Decreases after April 15<sup>th</sup> for Rainbow Trout Spawning when Practical.**

Colorado recommended that for brown trout, Reclamation should avoid decrease after October 15 and after April 15<sup>th</sup>. PRPA asked if the recommendations were more for brown trout than rainbow trout. Colorado responded mostly for brown trout but that the state still wants to maintain a rainbow trout fishery. WAPA stated that it is contained in a 1994 letter from Reclamation. WAPA suggested using meeting notes, letters, etc. for documentation of current operations.

**h) Deliver 100 cfs to Redlands Fish Ladder (June-September) (Migration Flows of 300 cfs Not Included Because No Contract will be in Place, and**

**i) Deliver 40 cfs to Redlands Fish Screen (Year-Round).**

Reclamation explained that it included 100 cfs for the operation of the Redlands Fish ladder and 40 cfs for operation of the Redlands fish screen. Reclamation did not include the 300 cfs migration flows because the Redlands contract expires in 2005 and cannot be renewed. CRWCD stated that there is no need to deliver water to these structures if there are no migration flows; therefore migration flows should be included. There was considerable discussion between the cooperating agencies and Reclamation on why the contract could not be renewed.

Colorado stated that it thinks Reclamation needs a contract to deliver to the structures. Reclamation stated that it owns both structures and that it makes no sense to write a contract with itself. Colorado asked why the 300 cfs migration flow is not included in the No Action. Reclamation stated that absent a contract, it could not deliver water to a river reach. Recent drought conditions have resulted in less water being delivered and fish still used the fish ladder.

CRWCD suggested using the language “sufficient flows to operate the fish ladder and fish screen”. FWS questioned the long-term effects on endangered fish with flows at 150 cfs. FWS stated that the minimum flow has not been evaluated; FWS developed the 300 cfs migration flow based on fish ladder use and available river cross section data.

CRWCD ask why Reclamation can't use the language “water sufficient to operate the ladder and fish screen”. Reclamation responded that it needs a number for modeling. WAPA stated that it seems cleaner that the fish ladder, fish screen and migration flows be included in an Action Alternative. CRWCD suggested adding “subject to water availability, Reclamation will release water of sufficient quantity to operate the fish ladder and fish screen”. Colorado stated that if releases are made to keep flows are above 140 cfs, a contract or water right is needed for the State to protect the releases.

**3) Existing Water Contracts from the Unit.**

WAPA said it will provide a description of the operation of the units for power including Power contracts and power operations. Colorado asked that conditions like ramping rates be included. FWS stated the information is available. WAPA stated that if you're using new research, then it should be used in an action alternative.

**4) Estimated Portion of the 60,000 af Subordination Being Used at This Time (i.e. 10,000 af in Place Now) Plus use SWSI Estimate for Future Uses in Basin.**

Colorado stated that this subject is hotly debated and suggested including existing uses in the baseline. Colorado recommended using 0 or the total reservoir yield to avoid disagreements on future water uses.

**5) Existing Valid Private and Public Water Storage and Evaporation, Depletions, Diversions, and Uses According to the State Priority System in the Gunnison Basin Occurring.**

*6) Future Depletions Occurring in the Basin. For purposes of the EIS, Information Developed for the State Water Supply Initiative will be Used. This Study Includes a Projection of Additional Future Depletions of 14,900 af in the Basin by 2030.*

*7) Dallas Creek M&I Exchange (Assuming Full Use of M&I Water Staged Over Time with Use and Returns Occurring Above Gunnison-Uncompahgre Confluence) In Place.*

*8) Taylor Park Agreement and Refill Right In Place. Aspinall Unit Operated to Protect Uncompahgre Water Stored in Blue Mesa Under the Agreement.*

*9) Narrative Recognition of Role of Dallas Creek and Dolores Projects' Biological Opinions.*

Reclamation asked if Cooperating Agencies had other suggestions on items to include in the No Action Alternative. CRWCD suggested Civil Action 5782. Reclamation explained that some believe Civil Action 5782 requires that Unit keep downstream senior water rights whole subject to water availability.

NPS requested that if the No Action Alternative is defined as current operations projected to the most foreseeable future that Reclamation further define the No Action Alternative and set aside time at future meetings for discussion. Colorado also asked Reclamation to define what "recognition of Dallas Creek and Dolores Projects' Biological Opinions means. WAPA requested Reclamation define why its does bundling and when.

---

## **EIS Schedule**

Reclamation provided a revised EIS schedule to the Cooperating Agencies for review. A copy of the Schedule is attached.

---

## **Update on Hydrology Modeling, Hydropower Modeling**

Reclamation asked Cooperating Agencies to submit Agency representative names to Dan Crabtree to be included in the Power subgroup. Dan will set a date for the initial meeting. Dave Harpman (Reclamation-Denver) stated that a March meeting would be best for him. WAPA would like to see the meeting in February. Reclamation stated that once agencies submit their representatives' names, Dan will try to set up the meeting as soon as possible in either February or March.

SWCD cautioned that in San Juan Basin they created a Frankenstein (model), and that the model is being used as regulatory threshold not as a tool. SWCD proposed developing a description of limits of what the model can be used for. Reclamation will attempt to develop a write-up on the model limitations for Cooperating Agency review.

The Hydrology subgroup will be meeting in the near future but will basically be just a show or tell meeting for now. Once current operations and the No Action Alternative are defined, work on modeling can begin.

---

*Action Item: Cooperating Agencies to submit representative's name to Dan Crabtree for the Power subgroup. Dan will schedule an initial Power subgroup meeting in February or March. Reclamation will develop a draft document discussing model limitations for cooperating agencies review.*

---

### **Action Alternatives-Scope of EIS**

Because of time constraints, Action Alternatives-Scope of EIS was not discussed. It will be discussed at future cooperating agency meetings.

---

### **Public involvement update**

Because of time constraints, discussion of future public involvement activities was postponed for future cooperating agency meetings.

---

### **Public Questions and Comments & General Discussions**

The meeting was opened to public comment, and questions and discussion were as follows:

Bart Miller, representing Western Resource Advocates expressed appreciation in the ability to get the meeting summaries on the web. Bart also provided his email address to be added to meeting summary email list. Bart questioned WAPA's request for documentary evidence for operations and stated that if Reclamation is doing it (operation), it should be part of the No Action Alternative. Bart requested that modeling subgroup meetings be made as public as possible. He proposed that modeling information be posted on the Aspinall web site as well. Bart stated that it may be difficult to move forward with modeling until the issues discussed today are resolved.

Bart asked about an Alternative meeting that was scheduled for February. WAPA stated that it started discussing an alternative to bring to the Bureau. WAPA commissioned Argonne Laboratories to do some work, but doesn't know when the meeting will be. Bart stated that he looked forward to discussion on how the model will be used after the EIS is completed.

Karen Shirley, representing the Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District, commented that in the EIS Schedule “(6)-Establish Web-Site, Public Contact Information, Develop Mailing List” is listed as “completed” and should be changed to “on-going”. Karen stated that the definition of what is No Action needs to be clarified. She said that this issue seems to be rehashed every month.

Karen expressed confusion about CWCB discussion on not using SWSI existing and future depletions. Colorado responded stating the Colorado Water Conservation Board has had discussion of future use as “all or nothing” and this has nothing to do with SWSI. Karen stated how important the subordination agreement is to Upper Gunnison River Water Conservancy District, and that the District wants it recognized somewhere in the process. She also stated that the questions on authorized project purposes need to be finalized before decisions are made on the No Action Alternative.

Mike Gross, representing the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association, Tri-County Water Conservancy District, and Redlands Water & Power Company, stated that the draft Meeting Summary from December 6, 2004 should be revised. He said the meeting summary now indicates that the Cooperating Agencies “recommended” using 2004 conditions as defined in the Summary to reflect Existing Conditions for the purpose of developing the No Action Alternative. He pointed out that today’s discussion shows that no consensus was reached in December by the Cooperating Agencies, and that no decision had been made that could be considered a recommendation. Reclamation agreed to change the word “recommended” to “discussed.”

Mike addressed the list of bullet items included in the January 10 draft “Existing Conditions and No Action Alternatives for NEPA/Environmental Baseline for ESA Consultation” document and suggested the addition of 3 additional items to reflect the way Reclamation operates today under existing rules and obligations:

1. Reclamation will continue to operate the Aspinall Unit in priority according to the water rights obtained by the Colorado River Water Conservation District and assigned to the United States, and will not store water when downstream senior rights experience a shortage;
2. Reclamation will honor the terms of its water-right decrees by using stored water when necessary (and available) to fill downstream senior water rights; and
3. Reclamation should provide a table of storage targets for each month, reflecting the way the Aspinall Unit is being operated.

As documentation for the first two suggestions, Mike quoted from three sources:

- a. The language in Civil Action 5782, which granted water rights now being used by Reclamation for the Aspinall Unit [water rights obtained by the Colorado River Water Conservation District acting as agent for the United States, at the request of Reclamation and after review and approval by the Regional Solicitor];

- b. The November 22, 1994 letter from the Colorado Water Conservation Board to Carol DeAngelis which stated “Providing enough water out of Crystal to keep mainstem senior water rights from impacting upstream juniors should be the top priority in developing the annual operating plan.”; and
- c. The February 5, 2003 letter to Carol DeAngelis signed by the Colorado River Water Conservation District, Upper Gunnison Water Conservancy District, Uncompahgre Valley Water Users Association, Tri-County Water Conservancy District and Redlands Water & Power Company which listed existing commitments of the Aspinall Unit, including: “Releases from the Aspinall Unit will continue to meet all water requirements for the operation of the Redlands fish ladder and fish screen and do so in a manner that protects water rights in the basin. In other words, the provisions of the existing interim fish ladder agreement (Contract no. 95-07-40-R1760) will continue as long as the ladder and/or screen needs to be maintained.” and “Operation of the Aspinall Unit will be governed by the decrees and supporting documents which provide that releases will be sufficient to satisfy the unmet demand of all downstream senior appropriations of water, specifically including the Redlands diversion.”

Mike indicated that the water-rights considerations must be common to all alternatives, and Reclamation must not describe a No Action Alternative which ignores its obligations under Colorado water law. Also, “existing conditions” should include operating the Unit to conform to Reclamation’s actual practice of delivering water to the Redlands fish ladder after satisfying the senior irrigation and hydropower demands.

Mike asked whether Reclamation has been “bundling” releases in dry and average years. Discussion to date has focused only on bundling water which would otherwise have bypassed the Crystal power plant. Hasn’t Reclamation been attempting to enhance peak flows in years with less runoff?

Mike asked Reclamation about its time frame for resolving the water-right decree language issue. He stated that the argument should be about whether sufficient water is “available” to fill downstream senior rights, not whether Reclamation considers its water rights to be an existing condition. Reclamation stated that it understood Mike’s concerns and will continue to work with the Solicitor’s Office.

---

### **Next Cooperating Agency Meeting Date**

The next Cooperating Agency Meeting is scheduled for February 15, 2005 at 9:30 a.m. at Reclamation’s Offices in Grand Junction. SWCD has a scheduling conflict and will not be able to attend.

Future Cooperating Agency Meetings were scheduled for April 1<sup>st</sup>, 9:30 a.m. and May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 9:30 a.m.

---

**Items for Next Cooperating Agency Meeting**

- 1) Additional discussion and resolution of No Action Alternative
  - 2) Discussion of action alternatives
  - 3) Action Area for the biological assessment needs to be discussed at a future meeting
- 

The meeting ended at 3:31 p.m.

---

### **Meeting Attendees**

Steve McCall, USBR-Grand Junction  
Terry Stroh, USBR-Grand Junction  
Dan Crabtree, USBR-Grand Junction  
Ed Warner, USBR-Grand Junction  
Coll Stanton, USBR-Grand Junction  
Justyn Hock, USBR-Grand Junction  
Nancy Coulam, USBR-Salt Lake  
Paul Davidson, USBR-Salt Lake  
Jane Blair, USBR-Salt Lake  
Don Phillips, USBR-Montrose  
Mark Wondzell, NPS\*  
Norm Henderson, NPS\*  
Bill Wellman-NPS\*  
Ken Stahlnecker, NPS\*  
Al Pfister, FWS\*  
George Smith, FWS\*  
Michael Dale, NPS\*  
Wayne Schieldt, CDWR\*  
Randy Seaholm, CWCB\*  
Michelle Garrison, CWCB\*  
Jay Skinner, CDOW\*  
Kent Holsinger, PRPA\*  
Leslie James, CREDA (representing PRPA)\*  
Dave Kanzer, CRWCD\*  
Clayton Palmer, WAPA\*  
Heather Patno, WAPA\*  
Wayne Cook, WAPA\*  
Steve Harris, SWCD\*  
Mike Gross, UVWUA, Tri-County & RWPC  
Bart Miller, Western Resource Advocates  
Karen Shirley, UGRWCD

\*Cooperating Agency Representatives

### Aspinall Operations - EIS

Task	FY 2004				FY 2005				FY 2006				FY 2007				FY 2008		
	Quarter				Quarter				Quarter				Quarter				Quarter		
	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	1st	2nd	3rd
(1) Describe Proposed Action; Purpose and Need	Completed																		
(2) Publish Notice of Intent to Prepare EIS	Completed																		
(3) Initiate Cooperating Agency Process-Develop Public Information Packet	Completed																		
(4) Develop Internal Reclamation Team	Completed																		
(5) Public Scoping Period and Meetings; Prepare Scoping Report	Completed																		
(6) Establish Web Site, Public Contact Information, Develop Mailing List		On-Going																	
(7) Establish Hydrology Modeling Teams-Initial Work				Established, On-going															
(8) Develop No Action Alternative (NEPA) and Baseline (ESA)				On-Going															
(9) Establish Power Team-Review Models				On-Going															
(10) Initial Ideas on Alternatives				On-Going															
(11) Confirm Significant Issues; Identify Any Study Needs; Identify Major Issues to Resolve; Develop EIS Outline																			
(12) Resolution of Significant Issues																			
(13) Compile Existing Resource Data																			
(14) Continue Work on Hydrology Model; Coordinate with Agencies and Organizations on Modeling; Information Meetings for Common Understanding of Modeling																			
(15) Public Information Meetings/Reports																			
(16) Initiate Informal Consultation on ESA with Fish and Wildlife Service																			
(17) Refine a Range of Alternatives-Prepare Technical Descriptions & Model																			
(18) Request Planning Aid Memorandum (PAM) from Fish and Wildlife Service (FWCA)																			
(19) Initial Analysis of Alternatives and Selection of Alternatives to Review																			
(20) Detailed Analysis of Alternatives																			
(21) Review Draft FWCA Report with Cooperators																			
(22) Select Preferred Alternative																			
(23) Preparation of Advanced Draft EIS; Advance Draft Biological Assessment; Review with Cooperators																			
(24) Prepare DEIS with Biological Assessment; Public Distribution and Review; Public Hearings																			
(25) Review Draft BO with Cooperators																			
(26) Prepare Advance draft FEIS and Review with Cooperators																			
(27) Receive Final FWCA Report from Fish and Wildlife Service																			
(28) Receive Final BO from Fish and Wildlife Service																			
(29) Prepare FEIS and Distribute																			
(30) Prepare Record of Decision																			
Fiscal Year	FY-2004				FY-2005				FY - 2006				FY-2007				FY-2008		