



COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING

Ft. Lewis College, Durango, CO

May 12, 2016

Meeting Summary

COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Tom Sinclair, Chair
Catherine Condon
Pearl Chamberlain
Dale Ryden
Tom Pitts
Lisa Yellow Eagle
Michelle Garrison
Brent Uilenberg
Kristin Green
Patrick McCarthy
Leland Begay
Absent
Absent

REPRESENTING:

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

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT:

Sharon Whitmore, Program Coordinator	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2
Melissa Mata-Gonzales, Asst. Program Coordinator	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2
Scott Durst, Science Coordinator	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2
Nathan Franssen, Program Biologist	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Reg. 2

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

Kathleen Callister, CC Alternate	Bureau of Reclamation
Bill Miller – BC Chair	SUIT
Brian Westfall – BC Member	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Matt Zeigler – BC Member	NM Department of Game and Fish
Mark McKinstry – BC Member	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Tom Wesche – BC Member	Water Development Interests
Harry Crockett – BC Member	Colorado State Parks and Wildlife
Ron Bliesner – BC Alternate	Bureau of Indian Affairs
Dale Lyons – BC Alternate	The Nature Conservancy
Ryan Christianson	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Susan Behery	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Marc Miller	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Tara Ashby	U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Paul A. Montoia	City of Farmington
Molly Jackson-Nielsen	San Juan Soil and Water Conservation District
Melissa May	San Juan Soil and Water Conservation District
Marian Wimsatt	BHP Billiton
Carrie Lile	Southwestern Water Conservation District
Robert Kirk	Navajo Department Water Resources
Steven Platania	American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers

Michael Farrington

American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers

Introductions/changes to agenda – Sinclair welcomed the group and a round robin of introductions took place. To allow adequate time for the diversion study presentation and questions, Sinclair suggested going through the agenda until 10:50 a.m. and start the presentation at 11:00 a.m. If additional agenda items remain, a conference call can be scheduled. Sinclair requested additional agenda items; none were added. Condon informed the group that she needed to leave by 11:00 a.m.

Whitmore said Westfall, a BC member representing BIA, asked if he could also be the CC alternate for Chamberlain, BIA CC member. The Program has a policy of not allowing an individual to be on more than one committee but does it apply to alternates? The CC suggested having this discussion at a later date and, if Chamberlain could not attend the meeting, Westfall could participate as a member on the CC for the day.

Approval of Feb. 17, 2016 conference call notes – There were no changes to the conference call summary. Ryden moved to approve the summary, Garrison seconded, and the summary was approved.

2017 Draft Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP) – Whitmore informed the CC of the process for developing the AWP. This is the first draft and it is quite rough. The BC just reviewed and discussed the draft for the first time two days prior. They will be continuing to review and prioritize the Scopes of Work (SOW's). The AWP process has just started and there will be several drafts before finalization. Last year, there were four drafts before the CC approved a final AWP. The process is that the BC will provide a recommendation of which projects should be funded to the Program Office (PO). The PO will revise the plan and balance the budget and provide a new draft AWP to the CC with all BC recommendations and any justification for changes made by the PO. The goal is for the CC to provide final approval of the AWP around the first of September, if possible. This timeframe gives McKinstry adequate time to do the necessary contracting before the end of the fiscal year. Whitmore asked how the CC would like to proceed in evaluating the SOW's. McCarthy asked for an overview of the SOW's and how they differ from last year. Whitmore replied that many of the SOW's are similar to last year with only slight variations but there are several new projects. Whitmore will put together a side by side comparison of FY2016 and FY2017 funding for AWP SOW's for the CC.

Miller stated that the BC discussed the draft AWP and the new projects at their meeting two days prior. They did not discuss what should or should not be funded. The BC needs to evaluate which of these projects would help with recovery (e.g., will a project help identify recruitment bottlenecks). McCarthy asked if the BC is evaluating the new projects against existing projects and will the BC be including those projects in the prioritization exercise. Miller said yes. Whitmore reiterated that the BC will provide a recommendation to the PO on which projects should be funded and the PO will use their recommendation to revise the draft AWP and provide it to the CC for approval.

Pitts said his copy of SOW 17-17, nonnative monitoring and species control, looks the same as what was done in the past and not what was proposed last year. Ryden said the SOW does reflect the new study design for nonnative monitoring and removal that was approved for 2016. The study design is currently being implemented for the 2016 field season. Pitts reaffirmed that the Program will have a nonnative removal workshop after data is collected and analyzed. Condon asked when the workshop will be held. Whitmore, Sinclair, and Miller said it will be held sometime in December. The BC is considering adding an extra day to the two-day meeting BC meeting in December. The BC anticipates the workshop will include a half-day presentation of data and results. The CC was asked what they would like to see at the workshop. Pitts indicated he has questions regarding the methodology and prioritization of nonnative removal versus population estimate monitoring. Whitmore pointed out the BC will be addressing this at their next conference

call and it may require a vote similar to last year's vote on doing nonnative fish control. Pitts said that based on what was presented by Franssen the day before, our current nonnative fish exploitation rate of 15% rate is not enough to remove catfish from the river and 25% may be needed to crash the population but, if we stop removing nonnatives, they will come back. Whitmore asked if there are any expectations in the Upper Basin that they can totally eradicate nonnative species. Ryden said no. Pitts pointed out that it is a different problem in the Upper Basin. They are going after escapees from reservoirs and are working on preventing escapement from those sources.

Ryden asked about process and how a decision will be made regarding nonnative control. Pitts wants to make sure the BC can provide some answers about what effect nonnative fish removal is having. Miller said we may not be able to establish the level of threat catfish are having or their impact on recovery of the endangered fish. Ryden pointed out that most studies are intended to answer important questions but those other studies do not seem to get the same level scrutiny and threat of being terminated as nonnative fish removal. Whitmore said the Service is not willing to take the risk that catfish are not a serious threat to the listed species and discontinue nonnative removal, at this time. Whitmore added that the nonnative control program does have a measurable impact as it removes thousands of pounds of catfish biomass from the system each year. The Service would need some very compelling information to stop nonnative removal. A new study design was developed to try to determine if nonnative removal is effective and the Service wants to see data and results from the effort. Pitts said the Service is making an assumption on a perceived risk. Whitmore said there is literature and data that suggests nonnative species are a threat.

Ryden suggested that to move this along instead of arguing the biological merits, that the CC send a list of concerns with regards to nonnative removal or catfish being a perceived threat so the BC can address them during the workshop. Pitts said another thing the BC needs to assess at the workshop is how long it will take to get an answer (i.e., five, ten years). McKinstry said from a process standpoint, we need to move these projects forward with funding by October because people need to start advertising and hiring folks in advance. He said we could try to make the contracts flexible but they would still need to be in place. McKinstry said reallocating funds in December is hard. Condon asked, if we can do this sooner? Sinclair, McKinstry, and Franssen added that timing of the nonnative fish control analysis will be difficult because it is dependent on data and analysis from Fall Monitoring. Condon said it doesn't sound like it is possible to get it done in November and said she doesn't want the CC to be in a situation like last year where they were forced to fund a project (i.e. nonnative). McCarthy stated the results in December are likely to be inconclusive so it should not hinder the decision. Durst said we don't know what the results will be and can't say they will be inconclusive. Ryden said he doesn't believe any results will change our decision come December.

McKinstry said the biological questions that are being asked are about competition. These animals are competing for resources and it will be hard to come up with definitive answers. Whitmore asked Franssen's opinion on how many years of data it will take to see an effect with the current design. Franssen replied these are difficult questions and we just don't know how long it will take. We are not good at predicting the future. Pitts said the crux of the issue is that if do population estimates, we can't do nonnative removal. The problem can be solved if we can do both. Whitmore and Sinclair agreed but there are other concerns about doing both such as the amount of additional electrofishing that would be done. Can nonnative removal and population estimate monitoring be done at the same time? Miller reiterated Ryden's suggestion to get comments from the CC on what they want to hear from the BC. The CC should also coordinate with their BC counterparts to discuss the issues together.

Miller reported BC members and peer reviewers will provide comment on SOWs to Principle Investigators (PI's) and the PO by June 15th. All BC members will provide the PO a ranked list of SOWs they think are important for recovery prior to or during the next BC call. The PO will schedule a conference call in late June

or early July to discuss the revised SOWs and priorities. CC members should provide their comments on Annual Work Plan priorities to their respective BC member prior to the BC's deadline for comments of June 15, 2016. CC members should also provide questions they would like addressed at the nonnative removal workshop to their BC member.

2016 Long-Range Plan – Whitmore received comments from Tom Wesche and incorporated them into the current draft which is available on the website. She still has some updates and comments to incorporate so if folks can still provide additional comments. She is will also being working with the BC to address some additional questions. Committee members should send comments on the LRP to Whitmore by June 15, 2016, so the document can be finalized by August.

2016 SJR Environmental Flows/Navajo Dam Release Recommendations – Durst gave a recap of the environmental flow recommendations revision process. Implementation of the 1999 flow recommendations resulted in: 1) frequent low magnitude releases from Navajo Dam; 2) few years when releases matched the Animas River peak to produce high flows; and, 3) limited ability to evaluate flow recommendations. The BC formed a workgroup to evaluate the flow recommendations and improve the effectiveness of implementing them. At Workshop #1 and a workgroup meeting (Feb. and Dec. 2015), the workgroup determined that the biological purposes of the 1999 recommendations were still valid but the way they were being implemented was not. A new implementation process was adopted using End of Water Year Storage Target (EWYST) to calculate available water for environmental releases from Navajo Dam. A flexible EWYST was selected using 6,063 feet for the EWYST and 6,050 feet to determine available water for release (resetting to 6,063 feet after a peak release), and only targeting higher Type 3 and 4 releases. The flexible EWYST process was further refined during Workshop #2 (April 2016) and interim operations for 2016 determined. A revised flexible EWYST decision tree was developed to release maximum days at 5,000 cfs (max release). For 2016, a pulse flow release will be done if enough water is available to do at least 21 days at 5,000 cfs timed to match Animas River peak. The release will end after the Animas peaked or available water is depleted. Target baseflows (500-1,000 cfs) will be maintained throughout the year. The new process will include monitoring to address flow-specific hypotheses and to measure response to flow (peak and base). The modified flow recommendations will be compiled into a final product that includes a narrative synthesis of the workshops and workgroup meetings, details of the implementation decision tree, hypotheses to evaluate, and monitoring needed to test hypotheses and assess environmental flow releases.

Pitts asked for clarification that if available water is less than 292,000 acre-feet, there will no peak release. Durst said that is correct and, if so, the water would be saved for a later release. Pitts asked if our monitoring captures the effects of these releases. Durst stated that the final flow recommendations will include monitoring needed to evaluate the effects but not for 2016. The PO is in the process of evaluating what monitoring is needed and can be done for 2016. Pitts asked if the CC needs to have an action on this flow strategy. Durst said no but the new process will be codified in a final document.

Condon asked if the current habitat monitoring SOW is flexible enough to evaluate the peak flow release in 2016. Miller said the current habitat monitoring contract expired in 2016 and it would be difficult to fund an additional habitat component for 2016. We will be okay with monitoring fish data but not habitat. Pitts said a peak release is a rare event and needs to be evaluated and asked how we get it done. There is ongoing monitoring at the TNC restoration sites that can be used. McKinstry stated that he doesn't have approval from the CC to move money around to fund habitat monitoring for 2016 but using NFWF money would be a possibility. Miller said the BC recommends we get digital imagery in 2016 post peak release to evaluate secondary channels. Whitmore said NFWF funds can be used for the imagery. Miller said ground truthing is the portion of the project that will need funding from the Program but the digital imagery will still be valuable without it. It will cost about \$52,000. Ryden asked if it is possible for the larval crews to do some of the

ground truthing. Miller replied probably not because the larval crews do not cover all secondary channels. Vince Lamarra, who has been doing the ground truthing conducts monitoring on every secondary channel. Miller said he and Lamarra submitted a new flexible habitat monitoring SOW for 2017 that includes a variety of monitoring activities that can be used to measure effects of different environmental flow releases.

2016 Peak Flow Release Update – Behery reported the most probable forecast shows enough available water for a spring peak release. Plans at this time are to start releases on May 18 with a 5 day ramp up to 5,000 cfs. Once the Animas peak is over (most likely peak after Memorial Day) and at least 21 days of 5,000 cfs has occurred, a 12-day ramp down will begin. After that, baseflows will be maintained during the rest of the year.

Endangered fish stocking in the Animas River - Durst reported a workgroup of BC members sent a memo describing a proposed plan for stocking in the Animas River to the BC for review back in August. He received comments from water development, Southern Ute, and NMDGF. He sent a modified memo with a point-by-point response to comments to the BC on May 3. Comments on the memo and response to comments are due to the PO by June 15th.

Population estimates of endangered fish SOW - Franssen provided a possible process for conducting pop estimates of the number of stocked endangered fish in the San Juan River to the nonnative fish removal program PI's to come up with budget estimates. The process follows the methodology established in the upper basin. Whitmore said the draft AWP includes only the budgets (total of \$442,529). They are included at the bottom of the budget estimate spreadsheet for informational purposes. Franssen reported on the process to the BC on Tuesday as well as giving the pros and cons of conducting these efforts. The BC asked for a more detailed SOW for this project. Franssen will write a brief SOW for estimating the numbers of stocked fish in the river for review by the BC.

Pitts asked if it would take at least three years to have scientifically valid estimates. Ryden responded that the upper basin's 3 years on/2 years off monitoring method was based on the need to work in multiple basins not necessarily because of scientific validity. Pitts thought the 3 years on/2 years off was implemented to reduce the effects of electrofishing on the fish populations. The CC requested a recommendation from the BC on length of time (number of years) population estimates should be conducted.

Fruitland Diversion Dam Renovation Project Update – Kirk and Bleisner reported. The diversion is owned by Navajo Nation but is located on property owned by the City of Farmington across from Westland Park. This diversion structure has always had a prescriptive easement but they are in the process of obtaining a permanent easement. The objectives of the project are to provide reliable water supply to Fruitland Canal water users, reduce annual maintenance costs, provide consistent upstream fish passage, and provide fish entrainment protection. The last two are both SJRIP identified capital improvements. In addition to numerous headworks components the project will also include a long-crested weir similar to Hogback, but smaller and less complicated, to prevent fish entrainment. Bliesner showed a table of proposed cost allocations. Costs to the SJRIP are estimated to be \$972,000 capital costs, \$28,000 O&M, and \$86,000 total annual.

Pitts asked about the \$86,000 annual costs in the table. Bliesner explained that it is up-front costs to replace the structure. Pitts asked how this project would get funded. Uilenberg said the project is budgeted for \$2.3 million in 2017 and there are several options based on the person/entity they contract with. Bliesner said there have not been many concerns about the proposed design except for the high water velocities at the sluice where the weir will direct fish back to the river. Also, there was question about locating the weir at the first sluice instead of the second. They chose the second sluice because the design is better than the first. This brought up the question about if the sluices would be replaced as part of the project since they are originals and maybe not be the best design for a fish return. Bleisner said it isn't part of the current plan but it can be considered.

Ryden asked if the first sluice dewaterers completely. Bleisner said he doesn't know that answer but as of right now, that sluice leaks so it is always wet. Uilenberg asked about the timeline for the project. They plan to finalize the design by Fall 2016 and initiate construction in the Fall of 2017 (late-October). Ryden asked where the money for O&M will come from. Whitmore stated it would need to come from base funding. Pitts asked when the funds need to be approved. Uilenberg said it is not too soon to approve \$972,000 of capital funding for the project now. Pitts motioned to use \$972,000 of capital funds for the SJRIP part of the Fruitland Diversion Dam renovation project and to begin negotiations for a contractor. Condon seconded the motion and it was passed.

FY16 appropriations/DC trip update – Pitts

Pitts, Miller, Condon, McCarthy and several others were in DC and emphasized the importance of Program partners being present at the DC meetings. The value of in-person representation is quite important. McCarthy stated that the briefing book is a good idea, but a lot of people probably do not read it. However, the brochure for the path of recovery was great but could be improved by shortening it. McCarthy agrees that our presences at these meetings are critical and they were well represented by the Program partners. Kyle Weaver asked when the recovery programs will be over and asked if the fish will be recovered by 2023. When recovery will occur and the programs will end was discussed quite a bit in DC. Pitts stated Congress understands we are responsible for recovering these fish and frequently asks when they might be delisted. Miller added they get a lot of technical questions and asked where we are on the curve of downlisting or delisting. The Congressionals and their aides seem aware of what methodologies are being used. Pitts said they need to start working on the request for extending appropriations to 2023. The Service is starting work on a DOI Report to Congress that describes the schedule for downlisting and delisting the species to support the request for funding extension.

Capital funding/capital projects update – Uilenberg stated that work is continuing on the Hogback barrier to make sure that the pit tag system is compatible with the existing infrastructure of the diversion. In 2017, the conversation needs to be expanded to include expenditures in the San Juan besides the Fruitland project. In 2017, there should be over \$4 million in capital funds available. We will need to have discussions with the Upper Basin Program about transferring funds to cover expenditures for the Fruitland Diversion. Another potential capitol funds project is a fish passage at APS. Whitmore replied that fish passage is part of the Four Corners Power Plant project. The BO designated \$620,000 dollars towards a fish passage. Uilenberg asked if the Program will be responsible for complementing these funds and if there will be costs to the Program for implementation. There is also a conservation measure in the BO to minimize entrainment impingement at APS. Their primary strategy is to develop a pumping plan that includes timing flexibility to prevent entrainment and impingement of fish. APS does not have a cost estimate for fish entrainment as yet. APS is conducting several investigations to quantify the amount of entrainment.

Uilenberg said he is not aware of any other capital projects planned in the future. Whitmore said there are several other potential capital projects listed in the Long Range Plan that need to be on our radar including Jewett Valley Ditch, San Juan Generating Station, and Farmers Mutual Ditch. Bleisner added if we are putting fish on the lower Animas, there may be other diversion structures that should be under consideration. Whitmore said the diversion study looked at structures in both the San Juan and the Animas rivers and should help identify where there are problems spots. Miller said the list of structures on the Animas have passage issues not entrainment and only entrainment was considered in the study.

2016/2017 annual base funding update – McKinstry stated that 2016 funding was received very late in the year which has made it difficult getting all the money obligated and has resulted in delays in allocated funds.

For 2016, they are estimating a 2% CPI increase to base funds. He emphasized again they do have some issues with holding \$500,000 as a placeholder.

Completion of San Juan program by 2023 – Pitts initiated a discussion about completion of the San Juan Program by 2023. Pitts stated that in 2023, the San Juan Program will have been in place for almost 31 years and the Upper Colorado Program for 35 years and over \$500 million dollars will have been spent on the programs. Should we fail in our recovery effort? We should be achieving recovery in some form. Region 6 has initiated a Species Status Assessment which will be incorporated into the downlisting/delisting process. The Long Range Plan goes to 2023 then stops but the Program is not going end after 2023. Some activities will need to continue including management of environmental flows, O&M of recovery facilities, conservation agreements with various parties, and ESA requires 5 years of monitoring after downlisting. What are our priorities for the next 7 years? Pitts said we also need to discuss the San Juan River's role in recovery of the species. If we cannot obtain a self-sustaining population in the river, then how will it contribute to the recovery of the species? These are all questions that need to be brought up and discussed. McCarthy asked if there is a need to differentiate between what the Program will look like after 2023, e.g., post delisting of species or one or more still being listed. In terms of risk management, it would be judicious of us to have several contingency plans. McCarthy asked if there are examples of other recovery plans that have successfully down listed a species that we can learn from. Pitts said he only knows of two fish species that have been delisted.

The PO will coordinate with the Upper Colorado Program, as necessary, on DOI's Report to Congress regarding fish status and time to recovery and develop a straw man course of action for post-2023 management using scenarios of Colorado Pike minnow and Razorback Sucker with and without recovery.

2016 SJRB Hydrology Model Gen 4 – Whitmore reported that Reclamation sent out a Model Completion and Validation Summary and asked for feedback/comments by Feb. 18. Westfall, Harris, and Condon worked with Behery on a couple of issues. Condon and Green indicated they wanted a webinar before they provided comments. A webinar will be held on June 13th from 1 to 3 p.m. After the webinar, a comment period will be set after which Reclamation and the Service will consider the model final. Condon asked if the model is going to be peer reviewed. Whitmore replied that there is no easy way the model can be peer reviewed. This is a product that is developed by Reclamation for the Service as a requirement of the Animas-La Plata BO. Condon said the BO does not say a peer review is required but the Program has peer reviewers and she believes the model should be peer reviewed. What if there are mistakes? Westfall said Behery inherited a mess but we could take some time to go through the model and look at the depletions and linkages to Gen 2. Uilenberg said Reclamation is capable of this review. Bleisner asked what the sources of change are and how/why those changes were made. No one really knows where some of the numbers come from. There needs to be a review and a summary of those changes. Miller stated that changes overtime or complete documentation needs to be provided. Pitts asked if the depletions numbers are consistent with the existing water rights. Whitmore said it is up to Reclamation to maintain and operate the model and emphasized it is not a water rights model.

Uilenberg said Reclamation has good validation of the model and it can replicate past patterns. The fundamental problem is that we rely on flow statistics. We can say the Program is doing good and water rights are not being impacted but recovery is not happening. We need to develop a flow model that will benefit recovery. It would take a lot of time and effort to try to validate the model or have it peer reviewed. Bleisner said the baseline needs to be teased out and the Service may need to say something about what the baseline is in the model and how they will use it. Whitmore said the model is a tool to evaluate depletions in the San Juan River for section 7 consultations. Pitts said it is not used for determining sufficient progress and agreed with Whitmore that it is a tool for evaluating the effects of water depletions on the endangered fish for

consultations. Westfall said BIA would like to see something in writing on how the model will be used and what the new version means for the numerous past consultations that hinge on it. Uilenberg said the ALP consultation did not hinge on the flow model but on the flow statistics which are dependent on the snowpack and hydrology we get. Whitmore said the Program is making sufficient progress by implementing environmental releases from Navajo Dam not by meeting the flow statistics. The new model is available for Service use if a major depletions project consultation comes across our desk. Westfall again emphasized BIA would still like to see some clarification on use of the model and if the new model will have any impact on any previous consultations. Whitmore said numerous memos and documents about model use and roles and responsibilities have been provided to the Program in the past. Pitts said we should probably re-evaluate previous memos on this subject and the Program's Principles for Conducting ESA section 7 consultations. Whitmore will locate and resend previous correspondence that clarify how the hydrology model will or will not be used for sufficient progress, consultations, etc.

San Juan and Animas Rivers Diversion Study – Farrington and Lyons reported. The final draft report will be completed by June 1 and comments due by July 1. Lyons described the methodology for compiling physical information, photos, maps, diversion data, and river discharge data. Twenty-four diversion sites were identified on the Animas and 14 on the San Juan. Site visits were done during the week of August 17, 2015. They visited 18 sites on the Animas and 9 on the San Juan. Sites not visited were due to either no response or decline for a site visit. Lyons said all the physical information, photos, maps, diversion data, and river discharge data is compiled in a map book. Farrington reported on the methodology and data sources for fish capture data.

Pitts asked about the Farmington diversion being an impediment to fish movement. Farrington said during a subgroup meeting in January, they were advised not to consider fish movement or impediments to fish movement. Pitts asked if this presentation completes the study. Platania said it's just a presentation, a written report will be provided to the Program committees. Pitts asked how the information is going to be used. Platania responded that it is just an assessment of the existing structures on the landscape and can be used by the Program to assess potential risks to recovery from those structures. Pitts pointed out the stocking program has been a success with the existing diversion structures in place. Platania replied that it is up to the Program and BC to decide what to do with this information. Uilenberg said a number of these diversion structures are on our capital projects list but he is not sure how they got placed on it. Miller said they were originally identified because they were the biggest diversions on the rivers. Whitmore said many of the diversions are identified in the LRP as potential threats to recovery due to entrainment and/or fish blockage. The BC and PO asked for this information so they can use it to assess which diversion structures pose a threat to recovery and to prioritize structures for future capital projects. McKinstry said there have always been decisions made on modifications to diversion structures with very little information. This study will provide solid information that can better inform our decisions in the future. Whitmore said this information can also be used to inform the stocking program on when and where fish should or shouldn't be stocked. Pitts asked who would review this study. McKinstry replied the CC, BC and others who have participated in the calls or have interest can review the project report. It is up to CC members to coordinate with others they want to review the report.

BC and CC members should provide ASIR with comments on the San Juan and Animas rivers Diversion Study by July 1, 2016 (study report will be available around June 1, 2016).

Schedule meetings:

- 2016 SJRB Hydrology Model Gen 4 Webinar – June 13, 2016; 1-3 p.m.
- Next CC meeting - PO will send out a Doodle Poll to CC members to schedule a July-August conference call/webinar. Primary agenda item will be to review/approve the FY2017 Annual Work Plan.