



BIOLOGY COMMITTEE MEETING
4 May 2021 – Virtual Meeting
Summary

BIOLOGY COMMITTEE (BC) MEMBERS:

Ryan Besser
John Alves, alternate
Stephen Davenport
AJ Keith
Vince Lamarra
Colin Larrick
Jacob Mazzone
Mark McKinstry
William Miller
Carrie Padgett
Benjamin Schleicher
Brian Westfall
Matthew Zeigler (Chair)

REPRESENTING:

U.S. Bureau of Land Management
State of Colorado
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Conservation Interests
Navajo Nation
Ute Mountain Ute Tribe
Jicarilla Apache Nation
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Water Development Interests
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
State of New Mexico

COORDINATION COMMITTEE (CC) MEMBERS:

Ryan Christianson
Jason Davis, Chair
Steve Whiteman
Stanley Pollack
Roland Becenti
Michelle Garrison
Jojo La

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
State of Colorado
State of Colorado

PROGRAM OFFICE (PO):

Melissa Mata, Program Coordinator
Eliza Gilbert, Asst. Program Coordinator
Scott Durst, Science Coordinator
James Sykes, Administrator

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES:

Lorelyn Hall, CC alternate
Jenny Dumas, CC alternate
Rudy Keedah, CC alternate
Colleen Cunningham, CC alternate
Christina Noftsker, CC alternate
Kathleen Callister, CC alternate
Dan Lamarra, BC alternate
David Speas, BC alternate
Adam Barkalow, BC alternate
Jill Wick, BC alternate
Ben Zimmerman, BC alternate
Ron Bliesner, BC alternate

Southern Ute Indian Tribe
Jicarilla Apache Nation
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs
State of New Mexico
State of New Mexico
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Navajo Nation
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
Southern Ute Indian Tribe
U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs

Nathan Franssen	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Nate Caswell	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Weston Furr	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Steven Mussmann	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Melody Saltzgiver	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tracy Diver	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Chart	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Tildon Jones	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Manual Ulibarri	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Wade Wilson	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Steve Mussmann	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Katie Creighton	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Brian Hines	Utah Division of Wildlife Resources
Matt Bogaard	Kansas State University
Keith Gido	Kansas State University
Sophia Bonjour	Kansas State University
Casey Pennock	Utah State University
Emily DeArmon	University of New Mexico
Jeff Cole	Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife
Kim Yazzie	Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife
Jerrod Bowman	Navajo Nation Fish and Wildlife
Steven Platania	American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers (ASIR)
Stephani Clark Barkalow	American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers
Michael Farrington	American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers
Melissa Trammel	National Park Service
Blaine Snyder	Tetra Tech
Pam Norris	Arizona Public Service
Cameron Corley	Arizona Public Service
Matt Owens	Public Service of New Mexico
Richard Valdez	SWCA
Jamie Shockey	City of Farmington
Teresa Garcia	(?)

Introductions and changes to agenda

Blaine Snyder from Tetra Tech asked to present on Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) water contaminates study and Gilbert added a request for the BC to review the Long-Range Plan

Approve draft summary from 17-18 February 2021 BC meeting; review Action Item list

Minor comments from McKinstry, Barkalow, and Zeigler were incorporated into summary. Mazzone motioned to approve the summary. It was seconded by McKinstry and with no objections was approved by the BC.

Review of the Action Item list:

1. ASIR will look at their data and report on how many individual Razorback Sucker and fish identified as "catostomidae" that could be genetically analyzed to assess hybridization – completed and report provided during today's meeting.
2. Comments on the fish passages reports are due to McKinstry and Gilbert by the end of February. Please make comments via line numbers. – completed, the final reports were sent to the BC, and request for recommendation on today's agenda.
3. Bowman, Yazzie, and the PO will come up with a suggested plan to deal with Razorback Sucker from NAPI that are <300 mm total length – completed and results on today's agenda.
4. BC to complete the diversion prioritization exercise by end of March – completed and discussion on today's agenda

Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Contaminants Study – Snyder

Navajo Nation EPA and Tetra Tech (Tt) will be conducting a San Juan River fish tissue contaminants study for the Navajo Nation starting in the fall of 2021 and finishing in spring of 2022. This study will increase the spatial sampling from previous work in 2017 (i.e., two reaches). The current study will consist of 300 miles of the San Juan River from Navajo dam through Lake Powell. The study will be broken into 6 reaches. The focus will be to continue monitoring the metals previously evaluated but chemicals of concern at lower detection limits as well as legacy contaminants such as DDT/PCBS and recent chemicals of concerns such as PFAS/PCBs/pesticides will be included in the study. The Navajo Nation EPA would like to leverage other sampling programs such as the SJRIP to provide fish specimens for analysis. They would need to obtain 3-5 frozen whole fish (Channel Catfish, a sucker species, trout, and anything else that might be consumed by humans) from each reach. Eric Rich and Steve Austin are leading the study for Navajo Nation EPA and both Yazzie and Bowman of the Navajo Nation Department of Fish and Wildlife will be conducting most of the fish sampling. Snyder provided his contact information as blaine.snyder@tetrattech.com and 717.495.2168. Snyder will send an email with additional details to the PO to share with the BC.

Discuss draft FY2022 Annual Work Plan (AWP) – BC

New 1- Non-native vegetation to enhance in-stream habitat for native fishes

Bliesner thought this was a research action that could lead to recovery management, was a good approach to increasing edge roughness, and encouraged the SJRIP to include this scope of work (SOW) in the AWP. McKinstry thought the SJRIP's ability to conduct habitat manipulation was limited and this SOW would allow the SJRIP to test the ability of habitat complexity creation to result in increased survival of stocked Colorado Pikeminnow. He thought that because the vegetation piles were not hard to create, habitat manipulation could be scaled up if there were positive fish responses. He was supportive of the SOW and thought it was a good test of a potential management action. McKinstry also said that most of the cost of the SOW was in passive integrated transponder (PIT) tag antennas and there were ways to modify the scope to reduce that cost. Miller didn't think low velocity habitats were limiting Colorado Pikeminnow survival. He thought it would be better to look at areas of the river that are identified as having complex habitat, assessing how Colorado Pikeminnow over winter there rather than introduce a management action, and did not support the SOW. Gido, thought doing the research as an experiment was preferable because it allowed a clearer identification of a distinct response and mechanism, and tested the effects of a potential management action. Mazzone was supportive of the SOW because it was a small-scale project that could be scalable should fish show a positive response. Mazzone did not think habitat that was currently present was providing the habitat needed for recovery. Zeigler thought the SOW was well devised and would answer the question posed. He said he did not understand why vegetation piles were hypothesized as a habitat that Colorado Pikeminnow needed for recovery. Davenport agreed and asked whether large woody debris is limiting Colorado Pikeminnow. However, Davenport thought the SOW was still worth considering. Mazzone, thought one of the purposes of the project was to answer Davenport's question. Keith asked whether the SOW could be redesigned to look at Colorado Pikeminnow's response to habitat that was already present or incorporate a comparison into the study. He thought the SOW had value and would support including it in the AWP.

New 2 - Determining age at maturity of Razorback Sucker in the San Juan River

Zeigler thought the SOW had potential to answer the questions that have come out of the N_b work. He thought the results from this SOW could inform management actions. McKinstry supported the SOW but thought older fish should be included. He also thought it was important to sample fish below the waterfall because they are some of the older fish present in the system. Diver said they intentionally limited the lethal collection of older fish but would include older fish in second year if the results from the first year suggested it was needed. She agreed that the waterfall would be an important place to sample but for the first year of the study, the purpose was to tie the results back to N_b which comes from sampling the river upstream from the waterfall. McKinstry thought that if there was a difference between age at maturity of fish below the waterfall versus upstream of the waterfall that this would be important to know and thought a comparison would be useful. Schleicher wanted to know what management actions the SOW would inform. Zeigler said he thought that if younger fish are not mature then the SJRIP would have to focus on ways to retain older age classes. However, if results showed young fish are mature that would lead to a very different set of management actions. Davenport said the impetus of the SOW was to understand the mechanisms behind the bottleneck the SJRIP has identified.

Lamarra wondered why it would be anticipated that there is a different age at maturity in different environments and gave the example of young fish spawning in NAPI ponds. Diver said that there is an expectation of differential age at maturity with varying environments. Lamarra was supportive of the SOW. Mazzone supported the SOW because he thought it would inform whether a shift in management would be needed and thought knowing what an “adult” was in the San Juan would be helpful. Westfall supported the SOW.

New 3 - Razorback Sucker spawning areas in the upper San Juan River

Zeigler said that identification of spawning locations was a task that has been in the Long Rang Plan for an extended period. He thought this method was novel and a good way to accomplish that task. McKinstry was supportive of the SOW but concerned that high water clarity would cause fish to scatter. He suggested the SOW first test the success of the method in locations where there are known fish aggregations such as McElmo, Four Corners or Slickhorn Canyon. Miller thought the SOW’s approach was good and agreed with McKinstry. Mazzone supported the SOW and suggested a thermograph be placed on the antenna to evaluate temperature at mesohabitat scale. Lamarra suggested that the principle investigators look at reports of spawning bars at river mile 154 and 130 as well as his 2004 report of a spawning bar. Platania said he thought it was possible to add one to two trips to test the method.

New 4 - Dispersal, behavior and habitat of stocked Colorado Pikeminnow

Zeigler thought the SOW would obtain information on fish habitat use and it could be especially important to know if they are moving downstream and not retaining closer to where they are stocked. Westfall asked whether a consumed fish would confound results. Gido responded that a consumed fish would pass through the gut within a few days and the tags had a mortality switch. Miller thought it was a good study and would provide the SJRIP with needed information. Miller asked how much time would be spent on tracking a fish and Gido responded that they would track six fish per trip for 24 hours. McKinstry supported the SOW but asked why there was a focus on age 2 and 3. Gido responded that this age class was where an identified bottleneck was, and the purpose of the SOW was to understand what might be influencing that bottleneck. Durst concurred that there is consistent and persistent low survival of age 1 through age 3 fish, which is contrary to the expectation that survival would increase as fish age. He said it was this low survival that was limiting the accumulation of fish into the system. Franssen did a recent analysis that indicated that once fish were age 5 to 7 they retained in the system. Schleicher thought it was a good SOW especially for age-1 fish but was concerned there were too few age-2 and 3 fish in the system. Gido said they would consider a contingency plan in case they were unable to catch enough age 2 and 3 fish. Keith thought it was valuable study as the age class was important to track and understand their habitat use.

41a - Translocation of Razorback Sucker

Zeigler was surprised the SOW was framed as a research study rather than a management action and questioned why so much time was allocated to captures since there was evidence that fish have a more distinct temporal distribution. Schleicher said this was the only SOW that proposed to conduct work at the waterfall for this next AWP and capture effort was based on the range of dates that PIT tag antenna detected fish. He said the SOW was partially a management action but that the intent was also to make sure the management action increased contributions to spawning. Mazzone spent time at the waterfall this season and said the size of the fish below the waterfall suggested this was a source of sexually mature fish. He thought moving fish above the waterfall was something the SJRIP should expend serious effort on, it was integral to the program to know how these fish contribute to recovery, and this SOW would help the SJRIP decide what type of decisions needed to be made pertaining to management at the waterfall. Hines thought it was important to make sure there was a component of the SOW that assessed whether the transported fish contributed to spawning and that based on BC comments they would be refining the SOW. Diver said that COVID reduced the number of genetic samples that were collected last year to assess transported fish’s contribution to spawning, and would advocate of another year of genetic sampling. Mussmann reported that 173 larvae were collected to test for spawning contribution, which was much less than the 900 that was originally estimated. McKinstry thought there was little point to move fish if you did not determine whether they were contributing to the spawn.

Davenport wondered if the SJRIP was ready to call the FISH BIO traps a failure. McKinstry said the traps changed the flow and moved sediment which may have reduced trapping success. However, he said the second trap was set in the thalweg and so it wasn't flow that was deterring fish. In addition, there were detections of Razorback Sucker at the mouths of the trap but they were not captured in the traps; they would have had to consciously turned around to not go in the trap and this showed they do not like to be trapped. Franssen said that both variables the SJRIP thinks is an issue at PNM - no eddies and concrete - were not present at the waterfall traps and so that may not be why fish are averse to being trapped. He thought what was in common was the vertical bars. Mazzone said that to say after 9-days of effort that the traps were a failure might not be a just conclusion but it was very concerning that the traps did not capture any fish and thought the traps deserved further investigation. Hines thought trapping required too many people and electrofishing was more efficient because it only takes an hour. Trammell said the National Park Service was reluctant to support actions that involved building structures, would be reluctant to call the traps a failure, would urge more testing with the trap, and continued to support transport of fish upstream of the waterfall. Keith was in support of testing different ways to trap and move fish above the waterfall and said he was beginning to think that a fish bypass was a more suitable management option. Keith cited research (Muth, Robert T., and Jack B. Ruppert. "Effects of two electrofishing currents on captive ripe razorback suckers and subsequent egg-hatching success." *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* 16.2 (1996): 473-476) suggesting eggs of Razorback Sucker that were subject to electrofishing have lower hatching success and it would introduce bias as to whether these fish were contributing to spawning to electrofish them before transporting them above the waterfall. He said he would support ways to get fish above the waterfall without electrofishing. Trammell agreed. Schleicher said they were not opposed to continue to test the traps, but the scope would change to add personnel if traps would be used

Additional suggestions for the SOW and work at the waterfall included: McKinstry suggested the work begin the second week of March and thought tracking of fish that still had telemetry tags should be included in the SOW. Mazzone thought McKinstry's idea from last year to build a spawning bar below the waterfall should be reconsidered. Franssen thought it would be useful to understand Razorback Sucker behavior around the traps and thought that if we could get past the hurdle of getting fish into the traps it would help us increase passage at PNM. He thought that if electrofishing was only occurring for an hour then fish could be radio tag and their interactions with the traps monitored. McKinstry thought that if you wanted to see how fish interact with the trap you shouldn't do it in conjunction with electrofishing as you would not want to electrofish fish after they had surgery.

Other AWP SOW comments

Support was voiced for adding another year of Razorback Sucker telemetry tagging at PNM and this would be incorporated under the *New 4*.

Davenport said there was a comment on their nonnative fish removal SOW to consider pausing it until the symposium occurred and asked for other opinions. McKinstry was concerned the minimal removal of Channel Catfish was resulting in a maximum sustained yield function. Davenport was not sure the SJRIP needed a 3rd year of the nonnative fish methodology as proposed in 2019. He has been discussing other options for removal with his staff and waiting for the symposium to present them for BC feedback. He thought they could effectively remove Channel Catfish in the PNM to Shiprock reach. McKinstry, Westfall, and Zeigler voiced concern with the extrapolation of the Channel Catfish diet study that suggested there was population effect on Colorado Pikeminnow and questioned whether there was an actual threat from Channel Catfish. Schleicher said he was a proponent of nonnative fish removal, thinks larger fish are threat, and the SJRIP needs to continue removal until a better method is found. Franssen said there is more of a population effect on Channel Catfish if you remove fish before they get big.

McKinstry thought the SJRIP needed to continue larval fish work above barriers but wondered whether the monitoring could be scaled back. He thought that saved effort could be used for identifying spawning bars or more targeted work with drift sampling especially below the waterfall. McKinstry also thought adult monitoring could be scaled back. For PNM, he thought the SJRIP should consider keeping it open. This would mean personnel would only be needed to make sure the trash rack is clean. He said that the intake for Navajo

Gallup may be constructed at PNM and this could provide an opportunity to turn the weir into a rock ramp. He questioned whether we were getting enough fish passage at PNM for the effort extended.

Pertaining to the spring effort to sample for age-1 Razorback Sucker, Miller thought it was important to keep assessing whether hybrids were present in the system. Franssen said that sampling could happen during demographic monitoring and a separate trip might not be needed. Zeigler thought that sampling could also occur in the fall and didn't need to be a separate trip. Schleicher said adding this sampling to fall work might reduce the number of fish captured as the fall effort targets all age classes. Schleicher said this last spring trip resulted in captured of 25 individuals and they were all captured below Four Corners.

Recommendation on fish passage alternative at APS – BC

Miller, Zeigler, and McKinstry supported the rock ramp alternative and asked that the BC have review and approval at 60 and 90% design. McKinstry said that APS preferred the rock ramp rather than a structure that extended upstream of the weir. All BC members voiced support to recommend the rock ramp (concept alternative 1) to the CC for their approval. Zeigler said he would report that to the CC at the next day's meeting rather than writing a letter.

Implications of razorback sucker hybridization on future management – Miller

Miller thought the SJRIP should try to understand why hybridization is happening. Durst thought the more important issue was that the pure larval Razorback Sucker are not recruiting and that is the bottleneck that needs to be understood and alleviated. There was general interest agreement that what was interesting was why the pure Razorback Sucker did not recruit and the hybrids did. Lamarra hypothesized that the hybrids were using a different habitat in which they were able to recruit. Mata showed the genetic data that indicated 90-95% of larvae identified as Razorback Sucker were pure. Platania presented the data they gathered on larval fish identified as "Catostomidae". He reported that 21 of the individuals from 2020 will be tested by Mussmann's group, another ~280 fish could be assessed from other years for hybridization, and ~70 individuals in larval fish collections are noted as possibly being hybrids. Miller agreed the key for the SJRIP was still to figure out the bottleneck with Razorback Sucker recruitment and teasing out the hybrid issue was still important to understand. Saltzgiver said they had mitochondrial results from the hybrids for both larval and age 0-1 from this past year indicated all the hybrids had Razorback Sucker mothers. Mussmann said some of the fish collected from the waterfall that were newly tagged were pure Razorback Suckers. Miller said the information continues to support the idea that there is a bottleneck with low velocity habitat retaining fish to recruitment.

SJRIP updates

Update on status of FY2021 funding – McKinstry

Funds were received from Power Revenues and BOR expects to get a budget this year.

Update on fish trapping at waterfall – McKinstry

McKinstry provided a review of the draft report that Gilbert sent to the BC. Gilbert asked the BC for review/comment on the draft by June 1. See earlier information under *41a - Translocation of Razorback Sucker*

Update on fish passage in the Animas River – McKinstry

McKinstry reported that the Animas River watershed group received funds through the BOR's salinity programs to help rehabilitate diversions. Construction at the Ranchman-Terrell diversion occurred this past November. It was planned to have two drop structures but only one was constructed, which means the water is flowing at a higher velocity than anticipated but the diversion is less of a barrier than before. McKinstry said he was unable to install the antenna across the river because water was too high, will install it this August/September, and antennae installation at the intake pipes occurred.

McKinstry said there is work going on in the Animas whether the SJRIP is part of it or not and if we are not part of it that means we do not get to participate in construction design. He reported that the Animas watershed group is thinking about ways to help rehabilitate the next significant upstream barriers (Kello-Blanchett and

then Eledge Mill). Mazzone, Davenport, Zeigler, and Keith thought supporting efforts of the Animas working group would be useful especially if the SJRIP could have a seat at the table to participate in designs. Westfall said he would caution against discussions about adding more river miles. Padgett said she was part of the Animas watershed group and shared their report where they identified the six diversions that they would like to have improved (<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vonvm8SRAjDIYTmfAIPflewLV133Mrk/view> - pg 121 lists the top six identified structures).

Update on BC recommendation for SJRIP peer reviewers – McKinstry

The peer review SOW is a five-year contract and because the program may not get funding post-2023 the SJRIP has not identified the reviewers. McKinstry recommended holding off funding a peer review SOW until 2023. Miller asked whether peer review could be done on an “as needed basis”. McKinstry said the SJRIP would have to develop what the needs are and identify reviewers. Meeting participants said the peer reviewers had provided useful “end of year” and “what is needed for recovery” assessments. It was stated that the Upper Basin recovery program rarely has outside peer review and does not pay for review. Westfall thought peer reviews have been valuable to the program, would not like to see that SOW be removed, but understood the problem. Davenport and Keith supported peer review on an “as needed basis”. Mata said the Program Document require peer review but would allow for an “as needed basis”. Mazzone thought that given the new scopes, it would be good to have peer reviewers who could provide input. In general, meeting participants thought having peer reviewers on an “as needed basis” was fine as long there were reviewers present during the more important meetings such as the Channel Catfish symposium. McKinstry said that all prior peer reviewers had said that they need to be present as often as possible so they could understand the issues and material to be able to provide good reviews.

Discussion of potential stocking locations for age-1 Colorado pikeminnow – BC

Gilbert thought it would be best to stock below diversions if stocking is to occur before irrigation season ends and thought that stocking should occur as early as possible to allow fish to acclimate to the river before winter. Ulibarri said the biggest issue was getting close enough to the river to temper fish and if they did reconnaissance before the stocking it could be figured out. He also thought stocking mid-to late November was difficult because it was hard to temper fish to that low degree of water temperature. He wanted to move fish out of the hatchery early to mid-October.

Source-site experimental design for razorback sucker and path forward for stocking fish < 300 mm TL – PO

The BC supported the PO to conduct the source site analysis. Bowman said they had decided that if there were more than 1000 fish <300 mm total length, they would be stocked at the waterfall. If there were less than 1000 fish, they would be held over in the ponds until stocking in the spring.

Presentation and discussion on combined BC input for diversion prioritization exercise – Gilbert, Zeigler, Miller

Gilbert presented the summarized rankings from BC diversion prioritization. There were no significant issues voiced that would require the small group to refine the ranks. The BC supported the small group to incorporate the rankings into the draft document.

Update on operation of PNM fish passage – Franssen

Franssen reported on the data showing multiple pulses of Razorback Sucker being detected at PNM and one pulse of Pikeminnow. He reminded the BC that the passage is nonselective in the spring and selective in the summer. He showed that Colorado Pikeminnow passage efficiency is ~50% whether the passage is run nonselective or selective. For Razorback Sucker, passage efficiency is ~40% when nonselective and a little less than half (~25%) when selective. The loss of Razorback Sucker passage efficiency occurs consistently from the last rock structure to the outlet. With the support of the PO and Jicarilla, the Navajo Nation has put in rocks and baffles to try to help with flow and make eddies. There hasn't been any demonstrated increase in Razorback Sucker passage efficiency from these changes. Running the passage open year-round runs the risk of allowing Channel Catfish passage. The PO and Navajo Nation most recently installed a funnel upstream of the last set of rocks to try and keep fish closer to the trap to increase passage. This has not shown to have an increase in passage efficiency and no negative effects has been detected. The next effort will be to increase the

bar width of the outer trash rack because the data suggest that large Colorado Pikeminnow (550 mm TL) only have a 50% likelihood of passing, which may be due to the narrow bars, and these big mature fish are some of the most important fish to provide passage to.

Update on release from Lake Nighthorse and Navajo Reservoir – Behery

Due to time limitations this item was postponed to the next day's Coordination Committee meeting and reported on in that summary.

Update on operation of Phase III wetland – Davenport and Bowman

Davenport reported the inlet at Phase III is open and will remain open for the Month of May. New Mexico Fish and Wildlife Conservation Office (NMFWCO) and Navajo Nation will be monitoring Phase III closely. Starting on Monday May 10, 2021, NMFWCO will have a temporary employee (Diego Araujo for at least 60 days) assisting with Phase III monitoring. In addition, Aquatic Consultants will be on sight this week to begin revegetation of the site. Bowman also remind cooperators that if they plan to access the site to be sure to communicate with him as he will be the point of contact between cooperators and landowners.

Long Range Plan - Mata

Mata let the BC know that they would be receiving an email to review Appendix A of the SRJIP Long Range Plan. The Coordination Committee asked the PO to simplify and consolidate Appendix A of the Long-Range Plan and asked to seek feedback from the BC. The PO office completed the task and it is now ready for the BC review.

Action items

1. Snyder will send a write up of their request to Durst to distributed to the SJRIP – completed 5 May 2021
2. PO will email details regarding Navajo Nation and Tetra Tech contaminant study – completed 5 May 2021
3. Principle investigators will respond to SOW by 4 June 2021
4. ASIR will work Mussmann to analyze fish for hybridization.
5. BC will provide review/comment of the draft waterfall trap and transport to Gilbert by 1 June 2021.
6. PO will email the BC seeking input on Appendix A of the Long-Range Plan