



**SAN JUAN RIVER BASIN RECOVERY
IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAM (SJRIP)
COORDINATION COMMITTEE**

Thursday, May 16, 2019 - San Juan College, Farmington, NM

Final Meeting Summary

COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CC) MEMBERS:

Jason Davis, Chair
Catherine Condon
Leland Begay
Daryl Vigil
Roland Becenti, CC Alternate
Dale Ryden
Tom Pitts
Stanley Pollack
Michelle Garrison
Ryan Christianson
Rolf Schmidt-Petersen
Patrick McCarthy

REPRESENTING:

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (Service), Region 2
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
Jicarilla Apache Nation
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA)
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 6
Water Development Interests
Navajo Nation
State of Colorado
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation)
State of New Mexico
The Nature Conservancy

PROGRAM OFFICE (PO):

Melissa Mata, Program Coordinator
Scott Durst, Science Coordinator
Eliza Gilbert, Biologist

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

Lorelyn Hall, CC Alternate
Jojo La, CC Alternate
Kathleen Callister, CC Alternate
Christina Noftsker, CC Alternate
Jacob Mazzone, BC Chair
Mark McKinstry, BC Member
Matthew Zeigler, BC Member
Tom Wesche, BC Member
Carrie Padgett, BC Alternate
Stephen Davenport, BC Member
Brian Westfall, BC Member
Harry Crockett, BC Member
Benjamin Schleicher, BC Member
Steven Platania
Cameron Corley
Nathan Franssen
Deborah Freeman
Colleen Cunningham
Lee Traynham
Susan Behery

Southern Ute Indian Tribe
State of Colorado
Bureau of Reclamation
State of New Mexico
Jicarilla Apache Nation
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
State of New Mexico
Water Development Interests
Water Development Interests
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
State of Colorado
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2
American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers
APS/Four Corners Power Plant
U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Region 2
New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission
New Mexico Interstate Stream Commission
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation

1. **Introductions/Changes to Agenda – Davis**, No changes.

2. **Approval of February 8, 2019 conference call notes – Mata**

Typographical errors need correction. There was concern that things in the summary were not said during the meeting and other comments were not incorporated. The PO had contacted those people whose statements were questioned to make sure they were accurate and inquired as to whether those people wished their comment to remain in the summary. The PO will contact individuals who made comments to address their concerns. Ryden moved to table approval, Pollack seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

3. **Review of Action Items from 8 February 2019 – Mata**

A. **The Service will review the Program Document to seek a resolution as to whether a project review and approval process is required for activities that are not part of the allocation of SJRIP capital or base funds.** The PO coordinated with the Service's Ecological Services Field Office Supervisor and Regional Director and sent a memo to the SJRIP on 27 March 2019.

B. **The PO will develop a quick reference of BC and CC responsibilities/processes with specific examples.** Not completed.

C. **Davis will draft a memo summarizing the CC's approval of the BC's request to review Statement of Work (SOW) budgets during the AWP process.** Completed.

D. **The PO will summarize the main points of the BC's discussion on planning a habitat workshop and share that with the CC. The CC (3-4 members) will coordinate with the PO and provide input on what they would like to see from such a workshop. Some CC representatives will attend that workshop.** The BC did not discuss this at their last meeting. The exercise during the annual meeting obtained participation from both BC and CC members, which the PO will synthesize to complete the action item.

E. **The PO will revise the 2019 AWP and update the online version.** Completed.

4. **Discussion of Annual Meeting content and structure – CC**

The PO incorporated last year's feedback regarding only giving the summary presentation and removing the more detailed hot topic presentations. Demonstrating the life-cycles, bottlenecks, and synthesis of the legal framework in the summary presentation was useful. Some members may need more detail and more in-depth presentations for specific hot topics similar to last year focusing on big stories with supporting data. One idea for next year could be a synthesis of fish below the waterfall, transbasin movements, metapopulation management, and contribution to recovery. The habitat workshop exercise provided committee members a way to interact and should provide better direction for the workshop but did reveal there were a wide range of ideas. Laying out the options provided and the one that will be ultimately followed will help workshop organizers to explain the process. The field trip helped bring projects to life and tied together information presented in the morning. Having the field trip in the afternoon may have discouraged some CC members from attending the annual meeting.

5. **2020 Draft Annual Work Plan (AWP) and Budget – Program Office**

A. **AWP Statements of Work (SOWs) and technical review process**

During the last BC meeting (i.e. May 14), BC member's technical comments were discussed and that conversation will be a basis for the PO's AWP recommendation. A second AWP draft will be completed by 1 July 2019 and include Principle Investigators (PI) responses to technical comments. CC approval will be requested in late July or early August. High level comments from the CC (e.g., budgets or justification for hydrology model) should be submitted by 14 June 2019.

B. Compiled BC, Peer Reviewers and PO comments on SOWs (see Table 1 for reference to specific SOWs)

SOW 40

This SOW was intended to address larval fish emigration over the waterfall. A common thread of the comments was that, while the proposal would determine emigration rates, the BC preferred to understand this in the context of the overall river. For example, if 100,000 larvae go over the waterfall how many still remain in the river? This is a larger question than that addressed in the SOW. PIs withdrew the SOW and will develop a 2021 SOW that can better answer the BC's larger question.

Fish surviving below the waterfall would count toward recovery once recruitment by the species is demonstrated. This is why investigations below the waterfall are occurring. However, this SOW would not address the fate of fish that go over the waterfall but would help understand the dynamics of retention in the river. The current Kansas State University SOW is estimating the Razorback Sucker population below the waterfall but too few Colorado Pikeminnow are captured to estimate the Colorado Pikeminnow population below the waterfall. A summary of the existing SJRIP knowledge below the waterfall and role of fish in Lake Powell in contributing to recovery (in consultation with Region 6) was requested. This information would help identify a programmatic approach to the fish in Lake Powell and enable identification of information needs and priorities on a programmatic basis, rather than one SOW at a time.

SOW 41

This SOW is a proposed management action to be implemented and assessed for two years. The PIs will trap and transport Razorback Sucker to locations above the waterfall and the PNM fish passage and track these fish to assess how moved fish contribute to spawning.

SOW 42

This SOW proposes to mechanically open the mouths of secondary channels. The main concern from the BC was permitting feasibility and PIs were asked to identify permitting constraints and how those could be overcome.

SOW 43

This SOW is a 20% feasibility engineering design and cost estimate for fish passage at Arizona Public Service (APS) and the waterfall. The work would be conducted by Reclamation's Technical Services Center staff, who, in conjunction with Service and other fish passage experts, visited sites and developed potential ideas. The SOW would identify preferred approaches and support the NEPA process. The SOW could be funded with capital funds. Such funding would not affect construction of the Fruitland weir or Upper Colorado River Endangered Fish Recovery Program (UCREFRP) projects, as those are delayed. Pitts moved to approve capital funds for this proposal, McCarthy seconded after Christianson's update on capital funding/project (agenda item 13), and the motion was unanimously approved.

This SOW will provide details for feasible options to support fish passage. APS should be easier to decide upon especially since there is some outside funding (i.e., from APS). Solutions to the waterfall may include concurrence from National Park Service (Park Service) since it is within lands they manage. Moving a passage structure from the waterfall to Clay Hills would reduce risk a passage would be inundated if lake elevation rose. Construction would have to go through the Park Service's NEPA process and they would like the SJRIP to contract a feasibility study for trapping and transfer methods to use as comparison to building fish passage. Reclamation engineers thought opening the old channel and construction of a selective passage was feasible. Trap and transfer feasibility will not be in parallel with completion of New 4 unless a contract for that work is made in FY 2020.

When the SJRIP gets to a decision point about the waterfall, it will be important to understand how Razorback Sucker and Colorado Pikeminnow below the waterfall contribute to recovery, the best method for fish movement upstream, and the need for movement upstream. There is sufficient evidence in the form of PIT tag detections or physical captures that fish want to move upstream at the Piute Farms Waterfall. Over 2,000 Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker have either been detected or captured at the waterfall in the last 3 years. Additionally, SOW 41 will provide information on Razorback Sucker behavior once moved above the waterfall and that study will help clarify how providing fish passage at the waterfall could support recovery. Most Razorback Sucker in the San Juan arm of Lake Powell are fish stocked in the San Juan River but there are some from the Colorado and Green rivers (35% of fish tagged in the Colorado River arm of Lake Powell moved into the San Juan arm; one Green River fish made a 345 mile migration, recaptured in the San Juan River after transportation above the waterfall). The bottleneck is at the waterfall, as fish move back through the lake to the Colorado River as was demonstrated by a San Juan River fish detected at Tusher Wash in the Green River. The Peer Review report suggested the Upper Colorado River and San Juan River populations of Razorback Suckers should be managed as a metapopulation. The report did not explain what that would mean and there is currently no management of either Razorback Sucker or Colorado Pikeminnow in the lake. The information about the Razorback Sucker or Colorado Pikeminnow below the waterfall and transbasin movement has been developed within the last few years, presented to the BC, and at last year's annual meeting. This is emerging information and a reason an overview of current data for Lake Powell is important in the context of recovery contribution to inform and prioritize projects in the future.

SOW 44

This SOW proposes a workshop to integrate data related to Colorado Pikeminnow and habitat. The SOW also proposed subsequent fieldwork, re-doing research from 2008-2009, and assessment of Colorado Pikeminnow habitat use. The PIs will work through comments and possibly produce a substantially changed SOW. New Mexico CC representatives spoke with the NM State Engineer who identified a 6 acre gravel pit near Hogback and a number of ponds controlled by the City of Farmington. It may be worthwhile to tie some of these into this SOW. In some other upper Colorado rivers repurposed gravel pits have been used although there are nonnative fish issues to consider.

SOW 11 and 15

The budget for these SOWs (PNM fish passage and NAPI ponds) may be reduced as the Navajo Nation has outside funding to support that work.

SOW 17

The purpose of the SOW is to remove nonnative fish. However, a Channel Catfish diet study is underway to determine the level of predation on endangered fishes in order for the SJRIP to

implement a commensurate level of removal. Thus, SOW 17 is a placeholder, would require approval before the diet study results are complete, but could change substantially once those results are provided and incorporated. There was not 100% BC support for the SOW but the Service still has a memo in place stating nonnative fish control is an important recovery action that minimizes the threat to our endangered fishes. PNM could be considered as a location for removal but there is a much lower density of Channel Catfish in that portion of the river.

SOW 32

This SOW includes installation of a pit tag antenna at Hogback's fish passage and would allow evaluation of the fish use of the passage. There was expressed concern that the pit tag antenna would not work because of an existing interference from the Hogback Variable Frequency Drive (VFD) pumps. However, Keller Bliesner Engineering informed the BC that the interference with the antennas could be fixed with \$25,000, which was new information. Reclamation asked Keller Bliesner to submit a separate, new proposal because capital funds could not be used if it is operation and maintenance. This will allow Reclamation to determine if these costs can be covered with Program funds or other available funds. It would be good to have all the antennas at Hogback working, especially since the fish passage is dry when the irrigation canal is not running to understand if fish are passing through the weir. Schmidt-Petersen motioned to approve capital funds to install the antenna, Garrison seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved. Reclamation will coordinate with Keller-Bliesner Engineering to understand how the VFD can be fixed and who can pay for the repair, since a VFD replacement was included in a prior consultation.

The PO SOW budget increased by 4% and the allocated proportions from the Service and base funds have been redistributed to fully fund the Program Coordinator and Science Coordinator (100% will be provided by SJRIP base funds for these two positions). This would allow these positions to proceed with business as normal in the event of any federal shutdowns. The Service is contributing almost \$200,000 to Program staffing for other positions.

Table 1. Draft annual work plan by statement of work number, program element and project title.

SOW	Program Element and Project Title
	Element 1 - Management and Augmentation of Populations and Protection of Genetic Integrity
7	Horsethief Canyon Ponds O&M at Ouray NFH
8	Stocking & Acclimation of Age-0 CPM & Age-1+ RBS
9	Colorado Pikeminnow Fingerling Production (combined with 10)
10	Rearing Razorback Suckers (combined with 9)
11	RBS Augmentation/NAPI Pond Management
12	SJRIP PIT Tags (purchase)
	Element 2 - Protection, Management, and Augmentation of Habitat
13	Maintenance and Operation of SJR Hydrology Model
14	Stream Gaging and Flow Measurements
15	Operation of PNM Fish Passage Structure
16	San Juan and Animas Rivers Temp Gauges
C-1	Capital Projects Management

SOW	Program Element and Project Title
C-2	Repair of Capital Projects (e.g., fish passage, fish weir)
C-3	SJR Habitat Restoration Phase III
	Element 3 - Management of Non-Native Aquatic Species
17	SJR Nonnative Species Monitoring and Control
	Element 4 - Monitoring and Evaluation of Fish and Habitat in Support of Recovery Actions
18	UCR and SJR Centralized PIT tag database
19a	Demographic Monitoring for CPM and RBS
19b	Spring Age-1 Razorback Sucker Study
20	YOY/Small-Bodied Fish Monitoring
21	RBS/CPM Larval Surveys (Combined SOW)
21a	RBS/CPM Larval Surveys - Upstream Expansion of Study Area
22	Specimen Curation/Identification
25	Habitat Assessment
30	Razorback suckers in SJR-Lake Powell complex (4 of 4-yr project)
1	Backwater productivity assessment (2 of 3-yr project)
2	Nb and genetic diversity
32	PIT Tag Antennas O&M & Evaluation of Data
32a	Hogback PIT Tag Antenna Install
41	Facilitated fish passage in San Juan River (1 of 2-yr project)
42	Enhancing channel complexity and low-velocity habitat
43	San Juan fish passage investigation
44	Integrated bottleneck recruitment (1 of 3-yr project)
	Element 5 - Program Coordination and Assessment of Progress Toward Recovery
35	Base Funds and Contract Management BOR
36	Peer Review
37	Program Management FWS
38	Remote Biologist
FCPP	SJRRIP Biologist (FCPP/NMEP)
	Element 6 - Information and Education
39	Education and Outreach (funds transfer to UCRRIP)

6. BC Update – Mazzone

The majority of the BC's meeting was devoted to the draft AWP including considering whether adult monitoring could be converted to a spring trip if endangered fish reproduction resulted in fall survival.

The BC recommended withholding FY19's production and stocking of Colorado Pikeminnow. This recommendation is partially included in a draft Colorado Pikeminnow adaptive stocking plan the BC has been considering. The plan hypothesizes (based on species response to 2016 and 2017 flows) that

high flow will result in successful reproduction. High flows are likely to occur this year with Reclamation's maintenance release and predicted Animas River runoff. While there is a risk to not stocking, it would benefit the SJRIP to withhold stocking to address multiple questions: 1) recruitment of wild spawned fish; and 2) differential survival between wild and hatchery fish. The draft adaptive stocking plan could result in multiple years of withholding stocking but only given a positive reproduction trend. The plan will be revised at least one more time and another review provided by the BC. It is an accomplishment for the SJRIP to be in a position to consider whether to stock in a given year and this could have implications for the next Sufficient Progress Report. Colorado Pikeminnow is a long-lived species and the effects of not stocking one year would have minimal impacts on the population. CC members were asked to voice any objections to the BC's recommendation and none were voiced.

Successful 2018 Razorback Sucker cohort recruitment was documented during the spring trip (capture of 45 age -1 fish from 100-199 mm total length). This represents another SJRIP milestone and accomplishment. The Razorback Sucker augmentation plan is out for comments with the BC.

Jerrold Bowman gave an update on construction of a kettle at a NAPI pond. Funding for this was externally provided by the BIA and Bowman has more funding to construct another kettle. Anthony Begay, a college intern, provided an update on the McElmo larval Razorback Sucker stocking.

7. Peer Reviewer report – Program Office

The report was sent to the CC. Two reviewers are retiring; there are no current plans to replace them.

8. 2019 SJR Environmental Flows/Navajo Dam Release Update – Behery

The maintenance release is part of Reclamation's plan to be able to release 5,000 cfs and based on a recommendation from their Technical Service Center. The release will be timed to match Animas River runoff. The original proposal was for one day but the BC suggested additional days. Precipitation in March increased the available water calculation and the proposal was increased to 5 days, which also meets Technical Service Center report recommendation. If Reclamation's forecast is to meet 10,000 cfs downstream target, Reclamation will continue to make the release for additional time to meet the 5-day duration of this flow target. Snowpack peaked near 150% of average but meeting a 10,000 cfs target will depend on how the Animas system melts. Matching the Animas peak is hard to achieve given Reclamation provides a 7 day notice, a courtesy to the public. This is the only system where the public is given that much notice and Reclamation may consider exploring reducing the amount of notice provided. The maintenance release is not in the flow recommendation decision tree and effects of this release on meeting flow targets has not been considered. Reclamation considered meeting the 8,000 cfs flow target (an increase of flows from 5 to 12 days) but did not have enough time to communicate this to the public. Reclamation will be conducting cross sectional and sediment surveys to better understand the system's response. If the decision tree had been followed, the SJRIP would have 22,000 acre feet to conduct flow management. Lake elevation is anticipated to end at 6059.

In 2017, releases triggered a National Weather Service's (NWS) flood warning. Now that the release is planned, San Juan County Office of Emergency Management (SJCOEM) will have resources available to deal with a trigger. If the flood warning does not cause flooding it will demonstrate a 5,000 cfs release can be realized without causing damage. The release will move sediment and push back floodplain encroachment. SJCOEM does not think there will be issues with structures in the floodplain. Reclamation and U.S. Geological Survey conducted a river trip and saw some riprap, light

structures, and other materials in the floodplain. San Juan County has started to institute floodplain management and now has a floodplain manager.

9. Update on stocking larval Razorback Sucker in McElmo Creek – Navajo Nation

Jeff Cole planned to present the update but could not attend and Mata provided the update. About 300,000 larvae were stocked on 11 April 2019. These excess fish, produced and hatched on 2 April 2019, were marked with oxytetracycline on 9 April. Fish were tempered (i.e., temperature of the water fish were residing in was slowly adjusted to the creek's temperature) for 45 minutes prior to release. The nexus that resulted in the Section 7 consultation was the source and transport of fish from a federal hatchery.

10. Program Document Findings on Non-Program funded recovery activities (Communication and Collaboration is the key)

The PO consulted with the Service's Region 2 Regional Director and determined the Program Document did not clearly define a review or approval process for projects that did not require SJRIP funding. These outside funded activities go on without consultation with the SJRIP. If there is a federal nexus, the project receives Section 7 consultation by the Service, which is part of the SJRIP. In the cooperative nature of program, it is encouraged for partners to seek technical review from the BC, but this is not required. It is unclear what the CC's role is regarding outside funding of activities that occur without consultation with the SJRIP. In particular, the CC's role is to approve work plans associated with SJRIP base and capital funds to ensure those funds go to SJRIP priorities. If there are projects that could affect data collected by the Program, those should be vetted by the BC and brought to the CC for the comfort that scientific integrity is maintained, but this is not required. Some entities such as New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, the Navajo Nation Department of Fish and Wildlife, etc. bring projects to the BC to ensure no duplication of effort or to make sure the project is not detrimental to ongoing activities, but this is not required. One example of external funding to support recovery was \$500,000 the Navajo Nation acquired from BIA to construct NAPI pond kettles. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish brought their riparian habitat restoration project to the BC to ask for a release from the reservoir. Partners are encouraged to bring projects to the SJRIP but there is not a requirement they do so.

The McElmo Creek project was discussed with the BC but the BC was not asked to approve it. There was disagreement in the BC as it was contrary to a BC decision to stock Razorback Sucker >300 mm total length, but others became convinced the project helped to understand a recruitment bottleneck. There was a communication issue, as the project was discussed many times by the BC but the CC was unaware of those discussions. The Jicarilla Apache Nation CC representative expressed that this project was collapsed into a conversation of tribal sovereignty and that was an inappropriate approach given that the participating program partners signed a cooperative agreement. There was confusion as to why federal agencies were defending that position and it appeared to jeopardize the cooperative nature of the SJRIP. If the BC had been discussing the project over a long period, it should have been included into the augmentation plan, which would require vetting from the BC, and added as an addendum to the stocking plan.

It is difficult to predict what outside funded projects the CC wants to vet. Phase I and II habitat restoration project were not, but the population model was vetted. For example, Keller Bliesner Engineering worked closely with the BC on Phase I and II habitat restoration projects but it had not occurred to them to discuss it with the CC given those projects were externally funded. However, based on these discussion it appears that stocking is one activity the CC wishes to have approval over.

In addition, it was pointed out that the Program Document indicates the Service will advise program participants when consultations are initiated and this would keep program participants informed of project outside the scope of SJRIP approved projects.

The CC recommended that augmentation plans be reviewed and commented by the BC and then CC. Any stockings associated with a specific SOW would subsequently receive a BC review and CC approval while stockings outside approved SOWs would receive BC input to ensure they would not be detrimental for other recovery activities.

11. Fiscal Year 2020 appropriations/DC trip update – Pitts

The purpose of annual trip is to maintain support for the Upper Colorado and San Juan recovery programs in the administration and Congress in order to assure continued appropriations and needed amendments to the federal legislation that authorizes funding for the programs. Sixteen non-federal participants in the two recovery programs attended 32 meetings with elected officials offices and Department of Interior representatives. Participants from the SJRIP included Henry Day (Arizona Public Service), Aaron Chavez (San Juan Water Commission), Cat Bowler (The Nature Conservancy), Rolf Schmidt-Petersen (State of New Mexico), Jojo La and Michelle Garrison (State of Colorado), Carrie Padgett (Southwestern Colorado Water Conservation District), Bill Miller (Southern Ute Indian Tribe, and Tom Pitts (Water Development Interests). The downlisting news was well received. The funding for these programs are in the President’s budget for FY20, and are supported in the House budget. The Senate Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee informed the group that support from Senators from the upper and lower basin states must occur if the recovery programs were to be funded in FY20. Both programs still have strong support from the Congressional delegations from the four Upper Basin states. Members are appreciative of the parties bringing a solution to the potential ESA conflict in the Upper Colorado and San Juan basins. All members of the House and Senate delegations were asked to support funding in the Reclamation budget for the recovery programs, and the Grand Canyon Adaptive Management Program in their requests to the appropriations committees. Senator Gardner submitted a letter of support. Partners are optimistic that the Programs will be funded in FY 2020. However, New Mexico CC representative expressed during their DC trip that there were still questions from delegates as to why the programs should be funded and what the federal interest was, which may indicate an incomplete understanding that these programs provide federal compliance for all Reclamation projects upstream of Lake Powell.

The DC trips are essential to maintaining support and funding at the national level. Tom Pitts recognized Paul Badame, State of Utah biologist, and Bill Miller, representing the Southern Ute Indian Tribe, for providing their scientific expertise in those meetings, which is essential for providing credible answers to questions regarding the status of the species. A trip report is being prepared that will be provided to the Coordination Committee when completed.

12. 2018/2019 annual base funding update – McKinstry

Last June, annual funding shifted from power revenues to appropriations and this applied to FY 2019 funds. In September, 2018, Congress amended the authorizing legislation for the Upper Colorado and San Juan recovery programs (P.L.106-392) to provide annual funding through appropriations through 2023. The bill was signed by the President in February, 2019. When funding came from Power Revenues, it was pretty much a guarantee that the funding would be available at the beginning of each fiscal year, regardless of continuing resolutions or lack of budgets being passed by October 1st.

However, if the funds continue to come through appropriations in the future, funding cannot be guaranteed until the appropriations bill is passed by Congress. In the future, if we are operating under a continuing resolution, funding for the Recovery Programs will be capped at the funding levels in the prior fiscal year. If funds are static through a continuing resolution, decisions on what projects get canceled, delayed, or reduced in scope may be required. Into the near future, automatic Consumer Price Index adjustments will not be occurring. Reclamation is working on incorporating recovery program funding into FY 2022 budget development. For FY2019, all partners now have their funding obligated with the exception of Navajo Nation.

13. Capital funding/capital projects update – Christianson

The Fruitland diversion dam rehabilitation project was part of the Navajo Nation water rights settlement. BIA has contracted with Navajo Nation to rehabilitate the Fruitland irrigation system and install a weir wall (funding for the weir wall was approved by and will be provided by the SJRIP). Design of the new diversion structure began before considering the weir wall. Now the weir wall and diversion structure are in one package and going through the design process, which is currently at 60%. Final design is anticipated for the fall but will be too late to start project construction this non-irrigation season and will result in a year's delay. The \$972,000 SJRIP weir wall funds will be transferred to BIA through an interagency agreement to fund that portion of the Navajo Nation contract. The cost estimate for the weir wall is outdated and the actual cost may increase.

Phase III habitat restoration project was approved on 24 April 2019 and Reclamation is working on ways to get it built. Reclamation could design and build the project using the Provo (Utah) Area Office force account, but that is not likely as their schedule is overbooked. Reclamation could make a request for proposals, but that has the disadvantages of a long lead time and a complicated approval process. The third option, which is preferred, is to provide a grant to the Navajo Nation and let the Nation contract out the project (the kettle construction at NAPI was completed within nine months of receiving funds from BIA). Permitting and NEPA may increase the costs, but once the method of contracting is determined, a better estimate can be provided to the CC.

The capital funds are shared between the SJRIP and UCREFRP. There is approximately 14 million dollars under the cost ceiling, but only the amount appropriated by Congress each year can be spent. Reclamation has authority to carry capital funding over year to year and will be using that ability next year to carry over any funds that were not obligated in FY 2019 (it is still to be determined but may approximate a little less than \$2 million). For FY 2020, there are some scheduling pinch points, which include Ridgway Reservoir fish screen (UCREFRP), Fruitland weir wall, and Phase III habitat restoration project. Fish passage at APS is programed on the spreadsheet for \$2 million, but has yet to be approved. There is no authorization to spend unallocated funds under the cost ceiling past 2023; a reasonable effort needs to be expended now to get projects started. However, it is possible if a contract is in place and funds are awarded prior to 2023, then the project may continue for completion post-2023. The disposition of authorized funds remaining under the cost ceiling will be addressed in post-2023 report to Congress for consideration in authorizing legislation will be approved by 2023.

New Mexico is sending \$420,000 to the National Fish and Wildlife Fund (NFWF). This will bring the fund to ~\$1.3 million and New Mexico has ~\$250,000 remaining to contribute. The states' NFWF account is a fourth option to support the Phase III habitat restoration project construction.

14. Sufficient Progress Report – Mata

The most recent report was sent to program participants in February. The Service has recommitted to providing a report every two years and will begin the next report in FY 2020.

15. Report on Post-2023 planning – Mata

The PO obtained guidance from the BC and will develop a draft table of post-2023 activities for the BC to revise/review, which will then go to the CC for use in an exercise to determine program priorities post-2023. The PO will develop a schedule to align with UCREFRP's schedule. Program participants were reminded that it took three years to negotiate the existing cost sharing arrangements and is the reason why the report to Congress needs to be submitted well in advance of the 2023 Program sunset. The report will recommend future activities, annual and capital costs, cost sharing arrangements among federal and non-federal participants in the programs, and recommended amendments to the recovery programs authorizing legislation. Reclamation was requested at this meeting to project post-2023 costs of operation and maintenance of existing project facilities, any needed new projects, and the cost of rehabilitating existing projects. Reclamation will provide the information for both programs.

16. Morgan Lake fish screen – APS, Cameron Corley.

The screen was a requirement from the Four Corner's Power Plant Section 7 consultation as the lake contains nonnative fish and drains into arroyos that connect to the San Juan River. Corley provided a power point presentation that was previously provided to the BC. The BC suggested the CC see the presentation. The screen was completed December 2017 at cost of \$830,000 and has had some design changes. The structure screens 6.3-6.5 million gallons per day and is successful at catching the nonnative fish released from Lake Morgan.

17. Schedule next CC meeting(s)

A doodle poll for a conference call to review and approve the AWP is needed for July/August.

**ACTIONS ITEMS FROM 16 MAY 2019
COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING**

1. The PO will develop a quick reference of BC and CC responsibilities/processes with specific examples.
2. CC comments on the draft AWP - due date 14 June 2019.
3. The PO in coordination with Region 6 will summarize the contribution of Lake Powell to recovery
4. The PO and Reclamation work to provide the \$25,000 to fix the Hogback Variable Frequency Drive pumps.
5. Reclamation will split SOW 32 into separate operation and maintenance and capital fund SOWs.
6. Clarification on any proposed future stocking will be proposed as amendments to SJRIP augmentation plans.
7. The PO will develop a schedule for completion of post-2023 activities in conjunction with the Upper Colorado Program.
8. The PO will call relevant program participants to discuss the 8 February 2019 draft summary.