

Technical Committee Meeting Draft Agenda
Gila River Basin Native Fishes Conservation Program
BLM Field Office, Safford, AZ
December 13, 2016

Item

1. Welcome/Introductions

Doug Duncan, USFWS, (Technical Committee Rep)
Mike Ruhl, NMGF (Technical Committee Rep)
Tony Robinson, AZGFD (Technical Committee Rep)
Bill Stewart, USBR (Technical Committee Rep)
Brian Ferguson, NMGF
Tom Sinclair, USFWS
Rob Clarkson, Retired BOR
Heidi Blasius, BLM, Safford AZ
Tim, BLM, NM
Julie Carter, AZGFD
Kent Mosher, AZGFD
Kelly Bergin, USBR (note taker)

2. Budget Update

- Bill provided a brief overview of the history of the funds transfer program and stated that the “funds transfer program” in its historical sense was halted in 2015. However BOR will still transfer money to FWS for NM conservation office work tasks and other work as necessary by the technical and policy committees. The current agreement with FWS ends September 30, 2017. Agreements with BLM, NMGF, AZGFD, ASU and any other agency that was previously funded through FWS will now be funded through BOR from here on out. It was explained that while it was easier on BOR’s end to simply transfer money to FWS, it added an additional step to get funding to the agencies conducting the work. Rob asked if it would be better for BOR to directly fund USFWS New Mexico Conservation office. Doug preferred that we still keep the umbrella agreement open in case other projects come up that might be better administered through FWS.
- There was general discussion about how this group handles the extra unallocated funds. There is generally a scramble to fund projects if funds are available. Bill stated that we should be proactive and have canned projects with scopes of work and budgets prioritized and ready to go in the event funding remains. Possibly set up a series of conference calls to spell out these projects.
- Tim brought up service first initiative that allows for better sharing of resources. This was initially done sharing office space within interior, expanded to include DOI and forest service (USGS). Tim will email out the service first information. Bill will check to see if BOR uses

service first. Thomas stated that this is a good way to save money because you don't pay overhead costs.

- Mike explained that they are doing cooperative agreement with BOR and quarterly reports are a requirement on their agreement. Two thirds of the time they submitted them on time, but when they don't get them in on time they received an email about funding cut off. If you have a cooperative agreement with BOR it is important to follow up with the grants office to make sure they received your reports because there has been a lot of turnover in the grants office and things get lost. Bill asked to please email him anytime you or your finance people submit financial reports or progress reports so I can verify that they were received and follow up if necessary. Any time a report is overdue our regional office starts writing letters and sending emails charging time to this program which can eat away at our budget simply because we are behind on reporting.

3. Fish Barrier Update

- Bill provided a handout with status updates of barriers that are currently in planning phases.
- *West Fork Black Barrier*- this barrier was completed May 2016. There is a requirement to monitor for fish for 5-years post barrier construction.
- *O'Donnell Barrier*- Audubon is opposed to the barrier. Existing structure extending wing wall, cuts erosion. BOR isn't willing to roll over Audubon to get this work completed. If there is a strong need to finish, other agencies like FWS and/or AZGFD will need to push the Audubon group. Rob explained that headcutting is the issue, but it is not progressing as fast as originally thought. Doug thought it wouldn't take much flow for it to cut past the barrier. Bill stated that Sean discussed setting up meeting to discuss the option of BOR walking away from this. Tony said this is important as this is last population of Gila Chub in the San Pedro drainage upstream of Interstate 10, and is a unique genetic management unit. Doug reiterated that this in an important site and can't be replaced with one in Santa Cruz like on Sonoita Creek, which has not been actively considered in last 5 years. Doug will have Steve call Sean. Bill asked to please give me a heads up when this will happen so I can inform Sean. The issues is that there is an individual at Audubon that doesn't want any impacts, all natural, no impacts to research project. Tony said that this individual has concerns about this project will impact a rattlesnake den near the dam. Doug said we need to get all three agencies to go back to Audubon. Bill will work with Doug to set up a follow up call. It's clear there is a strong opposition to walking away from this one as it is protecting the last of the Gila Chub in the upper San Pedro. Rob asked if AZGFD supports. Tony said AZGFD sent a letter of support during scoping for EA.
- *Redfield Canyon*
Bill- trying to work through the land acquisition for that project. Targeting for 2018 construction.
- *Eagle creek*

Bill - FWS writing EA with BOR, Freeport paying for barrier up to 4 million. New target date late spring or fall of 2018.

- *Verde Barrier*

Bill discussed a site visit last week where they talked about the potential of two barriers. The Aravaipa was a double barrier and was too expensive. Bill explained that unlike Aravaipa these barriers would be spaced many miles apart. They looked at a site above Hell's Canyon and one above Sycamore Canyon based on Rob and Jeff Riley's 2010 appraisal. Each barrier was estimated between 3-4 million dollars. Rob thought those barriers are probably closer \$10 million each. Julie said AZGFD mentioned it in the watershed plan and would likely to support such a project.

- *Middle Fork*

Mike asked Rob if there was a high level BOR political concern about a Middle Fork GilaGila barrier. Rob said no and that the concern was about burying hot springs, and that BOR was waiting on NM report. Mike said NMGF had an engineering memo. He will look for it and email it out. Mike said a statewide fisheries management plan has been published and he said the Middle Fork is one of the places to be managed specifically for native fish within the plan. Rob thought there are benefits and certainly worth looking into. Rob thought they had identified 3 or 4 sites, lowest one before canopy opens up, but no engineering was done. He thought they would be long barriers, but had good road access, not like the Blue River barrier. Mike said there is a copy of fish management on public tab on website. Bill will find and send out to the group. www.wildlife.state.nm.us/.../NM-Fisheries-Management-Plan-2016-SCG-Approved.pdf

- *Spring Creek (Tonto)*

Tony indicated that AZGFD still thinks this project is worthwhile. It was postponed because of the Haigler Creek project. Julie said with Haigler Creek, the public was upset with a treatment and that a conservation easement with the private land owner is being negotiated, which needs to happen before barrier built. The grant money was lost and needed to be repurposed. NEPA and public scoping was put on hold. When conservation easement is completed, the project will resume. Doug asked if NGO partners like AZ Water Land and Trust can participate? Julie – yes, not sure about AZ Water Land and Trust. Julie indicated that the land owner was working with TNC, but TNC backed out and wanted AZGF to handle it.

- *Other Barriers*

Doug said we need to start thinking about other alternatives for barriers beside what is currently on the list. We need to revisit the barrier list. Bill wants to follow up with meeting to discuss what's been looked at and what's worth revisiting. Doug asked to make sure to include Arizona Game and Fish Department with decisions on O'Donnell.

4. Gila River Basin Monitoring

Status/accomplishments of existing contract & New Contract

- Tony- 5th year of the 5 year monitoring contract is up in June. Tony had several handouts which were emailed out prior to the meeting. Tables 1-3 are related to the Gila River Basin Monitoring contract. *Note about form (table 1)*: Italics added to reference projects that started after contract started, gray area references other programs that conducted the monitoring. There have been 63 streams monitored and target fish have been detected in 36 streams. Tony explained that the italicized sites were added after the start of the contract. Tony said the number streams header was used to summarize the spreadsheet. Bill said that we are working with contracting folks to get out the new contract hopefully this spring. Tony explained that some of the sites were difficult to access sites and outside the scope of the current contract. Bill would like to include these difficult to access sites in the scope of the new contract.
- Rob provided a short history of the monitoring program. It started out monitoring the canals, Gila River, and Salt River for 15 years. The program thought it was better use of the funding to monitor sites where T&E species are likely to be found. Decreased frequency of monitoring canals, Gila River and Salt River to once every five years.
- Tony stated that after initial list of survey sites was established it was discovered that some of the state's monitoring overlapped with monitoring sites identified in the contract. Bill asked if more sites need to be added to list. Tony said if repatriation efforts resulted in a species establishment, then those sites need to be rolled over to monitoring. Rob said in theory some sites may be deleted. If either fish are present or it's the same suite of nonnatives each survey. Tony didn't think they should be deleted, but reduce the frequency in sites where they are only non-native only sites. Doug suggested to monitor streams with natives, or could have natives. If natives are not present or not likely to be present then no need to monitor unless getting ready to do project there. Bill suggested that we develop a long term monitoring plan that establishes monitoring frequency for sites. For example established sites once every three years for sites where only nonnatives exist, maybe once every 10 years unless some management action happens or some large scale natural event (ex. Fire and flooding). Bill will work with Tony and others to adjust list for monitoring status of streams. Tony added that sites shouldn't be on the working list if monitored by other programs. Bill thinks a general list of who's monitoring what would be helpful. Similar to what Tony handed out, but add other sites that are being monitored (ex. Aravaipa, Eagle Creek) and list the entity that is conducting the monitoring.
- Bill said this contract will be flown competitively similar to last time. Bill asked if when this contract went out for bid the first time was the intent of the annual reports to summarize a calendar year or some other time frame. Tony explained that contract reports are for the calendar year although funding came in the middle of year. Bill said under the BO, Reclamation owes FWS a 5 year summary report of the monitoring.
- Bill asked if there were any New Mexico sites missing from this list? Most sites were monitored by NMDGF, the only one that AGFD picked up was Whitewater Creek. Mike said the Gila monitoring effort has 10 fixed sites. In transition, was funded by sportfish program and considered community surveys, but asked if there was a desire for CAP to fund a portion of those surveys. Gila, West Fork, East Tularosa. Bill asked if the Gila monitoring information

from the Gila monitoring getting disseminated to the Gila River Basin Native Fish program group. We were going to follow up to see if the Gila monitoring is added to past NMGF reports. There was some more discussion about monitoring needs in New Mexico and Bill said he is planning a workshop to address long term monitoring for rare species that we aren't able to sample very often. He wants to make sure it is useful for recovery plan efforts, is monitoring getting info needed. We have five years of data and thinks it is the right time to evaluate the data collected to see if we are collected the correct data in the correct way. We should set up a separate meeting to discuss the first 5 years of monitoring.

- There was more general discussion about monitoring. Tony said that we are getting a good idea of status of populations at some of the smaller sites. He said roundtail chub were not captured in the Lower Salt River. Tony said the weakness of sampling regime is fixed sites and missing info in-between. Julie reiterated that multiple programs have monitoring sites, so it would be good if all information could be in one location. Bill wondered if there is there a venue to coordinate. Like the native fish conservation team meeting. Mike said he could ask the NMGF permits person to pull every permit in state and break out by basin, to see who is permitted for what, regarding to monitoring. Bill asked if the NM FWS Conservation office conducting other work beyond collaborating with NMGF. Tom said just working with NMGF. Julie shared an example of the service doing species status assessment and how things like spot surveys were not very informative. Need to make sure we coordinate so FWS can make an informed decision. Mike said we need to ensure that we monitor under a protocol that's defensible.

5. Conservation and Nonnative control actions

2016 review

Arizona conservation and nonnative control accomplishments

- Tony provided a hand out (table 4) that summarized accomplishments in 2016. Mineral Creek on hold because of State Land Department. Department Assessed sites throughout the year, some of which would be suitable to topminnow. Bill asked how is item 3-84C (assess potential repatriation waters) different than what the monitoring contract might accomplish? Tony explained this is looking for new places to put fish based on Voeltz and Betaso 2003 list and recommendations from forest service. For example, Coconino NF recommended sites to be checked out. These were assessed during a dry period of year, and determined that none were likely suitable for fishes.
- The BLM, Safford Field Office mechanically removed 1,538 yellow bullhead, 3,459 green sunfish, 17, 175 western mosquitofish, and 11, 476 fathead minnow from Bonita Creek in 2016. The removal effort in 2016 coupled with the previous year's efforts has resulted in the near complete elimination of green sunfish. Continued occasional netting trips by BLM in other reaches of Bonita Creek confirms that green sunfish has not reestablished upstream, and

the level of effort to maintain this “clean” area has been considerably less than the effort required to initially remove the green sunfish population.

- Sands Draw Wildlife Exclosure needs additional work prior to native fish being translocated. The BLM is trying to establish a grassland buffer along the wetted habitat to reduce sediment transport into the aquatic habitat. The BLM uses a pump to siphon water from the ponds to isn't water the grasses. Tony asked if they had consulted with FWS? Heidi said it was not priority at this point due to other projects. Doug said it can go in grazing BO. Tony another solution? To get water without impacting fish? It would be impossible to extract water from Sands Draw if fish were present due to small body size of larval and juvenile fish. Heidi did mention that everyone needs to consider labor for manmade refuges as they need at least bi-annual maintenance to keep open water habitat. Additional funds are needed to completely finish Sands Draw and make it suitable for native fish. If had funds could have completed Sands Draw. At Porter Ponds the solar panels are down due to flooding and the pump is buried with sediment. An EA needs to be written to stock fish into Porter Ponds.
- Discussions are ongoing with USFWS and the BLM FWS to determine if should augment loach minnow and stock spikedace into upper Bonita Creek is an appropriate stocking site for loach minnow and spikedace.
- Boyce Thompson- holding pattern because State Parks lost funding for new well.

New Mexico conservation and nonnative control accomplishments

- Mike said one non-native removal was completed in West Fork Gila and that nonnatives remain rare, and natives are doing well. Did not do anything in Turkey Creek because Andrew left the Department and the second trip was cancelled because of a wildfire. Skeleton Creek has not been surveyed yet. More than one non-native in Mule Creek- possible upstream on private land. Could make renewed effort with land owners. Tony asked if they could migrate up when water is flowing down to San Francisco. Mike said reach is dry.
- Brian said they transferred loach minnow into two creeks- 1. From Tularosa to Saliz Canyon and 2. West Fork Gila River to Little Creek. Both translocations had around 100 fish. Would like to do spikedace stocking into San Francisco River. Bill asked why was the number set at 100? Tony said we would like as many as possible, like thousands. There was discussion about repatriation goals. Mike said Andrew had completed a detailed repatriation plan which is included in last year's CAP report appendix. Mike wants to look at repatriation approach with other agencies, i.e.: Tony AZGF. This could be a possible topic of discussion at the future workshop.

BLM, New Mexico

- Tim provided a handout that summarized the surveys of Gila River tributaries. The upper reaches of mainstem. Blue Creek were - sampled in 1984; BC not resampled until 2010 (BLM only). The only new species in 2010 was red shiner. In 2015, the Blue Creek site was dry and had to walk 1 km upstream to find water. Only 5 pools were found to have fish. . In

2016 there was no surface flow during June and July surveys. 2016 surface flow past starting point (road crossing), similar to 2010. Tony asked if habitat was suitable for repatriation of loach minnow or spikedace? Tim said no, but possibly could be a chub refuge or repatriation. Tim suggested that since non-natives not in Blue Creek as of 2016, possible consideration for barrier. Rob indicated that that said if loach minnow or spikedace can't go in BOR won't want to do it. Tim said no fish in upper portion of Apache Creek and he will return regardless of program funding. Possible refugia for spikedace or chub. Check for perennial flows. Portion Lower reach of Apache Creek does not have any fish found. Unknown across Az/NM border. Tim said they caught a gartersnake, but it was not a narrow-headed or northern Mexican and would look in his notes for species.

Other projects

- No discussion

2017 planned

Arizona conservation and nonnative control

- Tony handed out his plan for 2017 (table 5). Work will be similar to what was done in 2016. Sites that were stocked within last three years will be monitored. Will stock some new sites (Oil Well Tank, Maternity Wildlife Pond, Indian Creek, Sycamore Creek, and maybe Copper Creek). Bill asked how this is different than the monitoring contract and thought maybe we should consider adding these sites to the monitoring contract. Tony explained that AZGFD's CAP monitors for 3-5 years after repatriation, and if the species established, then the monitoring shifts to another program.
- Murray Spring: Does not seem like topminnow or pupfish established. The spring is fed from effluent seepage.
- Sands Draw on hold this year.
- Fresno Canyon may not happen this year, but can take steps to get there.
- Plan to dry and treat Ayer Lake at Boyce Thompson Arboretum.
- Heidi plans for nonnative fish removal this year at Bonita Creek and will recheck Horse Camp Canyon, tributary to Aravaipa Creek for, and to assess if green sunfish. Horse Camp Canyon should be green sunfish free due to efforts by the BLM and partners from 2010-2014. have been eradicated. At At Creeksurvey Horse Camp Canyon to assess if are still absent Horse Camp was a source of green sunfish. only are seen

New Mexico conservation and nonnative control

- Mike- NMDGF will continue repatriation efforts. Will complete another survey of Mule Creek to check status of chub. Another pass of Heart Bar on West Fork. Transition away from Turkey Creek to do complete survey of Middle Fork. But will finish up Turkey Creek and survey Middle Fork this year.
- Tim- would like to get to 1984 sites. Political changes since 1984 may allow him to survey sites at confluences with tributaries to Blue Creek and Cherry Creek. , and Wants to continue to assess Apache Creek- use Hobo Temps, to determine if locations are suitable for refuge or repatriation.

Below is Tim's conversation regarding billing and available funds.

- Doug explained that the agreement with BLM and FWS is for 5 years, but can only go to September 30th as it falls under the master agreement for the funds transfer with BOR which expires Sept 30 2017. Tim asked about getting a task order to get rest of money for year, what are available funds and Rob explained that you BLM has to bill to get reimbursed. Tim explained that the first round of funding was not allocated until late fiscal year 2014, and haven't bill for it. However, money available is not enough to cover, and doesn't want to risk losing future funding? Doug told Tim that funding for future years will come from BOR. Doug- as long as you invoice before Sept 2017 can get that \$. Doug's records show as of August BLM has spent about \$2500 of the \$15,000. Additional funding was supposed to be added for years two and three, but BLM did not get the forms in by their deadline. Bill asked that he be cc'd on correspondence with the grants office so he can follow up or continue to nudge. This is also true for any invoicing that gets sent to the grants office. Bill and Tim will touch base and follow up to discuss funding options for this work in the future.

Other planned projects

- No notes for this item

Fish Production

ARCC

- Phase I for the ARCC renovation is nearly complete. Phase I included new spawning tanks and a new sump. Plans for Phase II are still being worked out. Tentative time to begin construction is mid April 2017. Depending upon the cost of phase II, phase III will begin this next summer and could possibly include a new building and quarantine facility.
- Tony- Handed out a table (Table 6) that has the number of broodstock and offspring produced from 2007-2016 for each lineage of spikedace, loach minnow and roundail chub. The gray area on the table references after Matt came on. Rob suggested comparing genetics from population of Blue River to see if same as source population. Tony indicated that that work was being done.

- Mike discussed NMDGF decision to focus on wild to wild transfers this year. He says that we need to get clarification on refuge pops vs production out of hatchery. Are the expectations to support both or do we choose one over other? Mike had questions as to where does renovation of the hatchery fit into that. Bill said he has spoken with Mary Richardson and we would like to plan a meeting to focus on exactly those questions and bring in experts to understand how to get better production out of ARCC. The renovation will certainly provide the capacity to get closer to production goals that this program would like to target. Additionally in the past, staff at ARCC have been stretched too thin.
- Mike said NMDGF will assess priorities which might be based on abundance that determines whether or not to take fish to ARCC, but if fish are abundant we can do both. Mike said they laid out in repatriation plan developed by Andrew, which he will dig up. The recovery actions was to replicate pops in a refuge systems, as in ARCC, in case of disaster and to maintain genetic diversity. Julie asked about the FWS 1996 policy that propagation in hatchery is last resort. Doug indicated that FWS meets standards; at threshold for captive population.. Rob added Gila Chub at Indian Creek, if can maintain 500 at minimum would maintain genetic diversity. Rob stated that Mike's concern is about translocation vs bringing to the hatchery is valid. Mike asked if ARCC had a husbandry or some other unresolved issue. Bill explained that this facility has been run on a shoestring budget. This program only funds about two-thirds of the O&M budget. The renovation will help with that. Bill explained that due to renovation, spawning in 2016 occurred in the grow out tanks. This is not good because the adults will eat the offspring, but it was the only option this year and might explain why numbers are so low. Bill indicated that with Matt leaving now is a good time to have workshop. Tony discussed possibly having a meeting in January for past hatch managers from ARCC and Dexter to provide insight on how to better run hatcheries. Rob mentioned that Mike Childs was able to get multiple spawns off throughout the year by manipulating photoperiod. Don't rely on one annual. Tony also mentioned Dave Ward tried pulsing with turbidity. Rob is glad to hear that AZGFD is trying to separate research from hatchery. Mike said final-priority is wild to wild transfers until restorations done, then maybe readdress.

ASU Topminnow

- Bill- reference Paul Marsh's handout. Paul stated we need Bylas Springs stocks and Doug mentioned that we are working on getting some.

Wild Fish Acquisition

- *White River stock*
Doug discussed that there are plans to survey this spring with AZ FWS conservation office and he needs to talk with Bill. There were discussions to possibly fund a hatchery but that is off the table. The tribe surveyed to collect loach minnow to give to ARCC, but they chose not to because they were concerned about small numbers captured and didn't want to remove them. Tribe wants to visit Bubbling Ponds.
- *Eagle Creek stock*

Doug said there was a tribal lands survey conducted, but no detail of survey info.

San Pedro preserve update

- Bill said that the property is currently managed by TNC, but at end of February they are walking away from agreement. BOR is going to be maintaining it temporarily until they can find another entity to take over management.

2018 policy committee recommendations (All)

- Bill is going to follow up on this topic with each of the technical committee members and provide an official list for the technical committee to vote on and pass along to the policy committee.

2018 AZ Recommendations

- Tony handed out a recommendation of priority actions, suggested modifications, and potential new projects to consider adding the existing task list (Tables 8-10). These show AZGFD continuing everything they did last year except for the Fossil Creek project as that completed. There are some potential new Gila topminnow stockings, and a couple new nonnative control sites. Julie asked what happens to Fossil Creek in terms of long term monitoring. There is a need to establish a long term monitoring program once sites are considered established.
- Discussion went on to discuss budget for new projects and how to deal with increased costs on new and long term projects. Rob suggested there is a potential to include inflationary costs in the new opinion. Bill stated that in the last 2008 BO costs increased for the fund transfer program from 500K, then to 550K. Julie asked if MSCP account for inflation. Bill thought that they might or at least it's a reasonable thing to include into your project costs for longer term projects. Rob said Marsh and Associates build inflation into proposals. Bill mentioned that the San Juan program includes inflationary costs in their projects.
- Rob stated that extra money comes available from time to time like the extra money found for ARCC, Extra money exists when money from fish barriers are not built. Special projects can come up every year. Bill would like a set of "canned" projects identified by this program ready to go, so when extra money comes up in May can move forward. Doug added that we need to ensure wording in contracts is flexible. Tony stated that the needs are outlined in strategic plan
- We should continue to fund ASU for holding topminnow.

2018 NM Recommendations:

- Mike stated that NM Game and Fish would like to dial back amount of money in Gila West Fork removal, drop Turkey Creek and use the extra funds for surveys for Middle Fork Gila surveys (continuing what is layed out in the New Mexico Blurbs for 2017). There was a lot of discussion related to funding availability and what is actually available to do these projects. Bill is going to shore up budget and meet with each technical committee member to clear up

needs and then set up a conference call to discuss which to recommend to the policy committee. This includes work with BLM in New Mexico.

6. Information and Education Update

- This topic was postponed due to lack of time.

7. Program Evaluation/Proposal process

- Bill provided a survey and a presentation on the 2005 wildlife management institute evaluation of the Gila River Basin Native Fish Program and asked participants to fill out the survey as he went through each of the recommendations from this report. The categories for each recommendation were:
 1. Recommendation has been implemented
 2. Recommendation should be implemented
 3. Recommendation needs further investigation
 4. Recommendation not applicable to the program
 5. Don't know enough about the program

The intent of this survey is to provide Bill with information on the direction of this program. Bill is planning to host a workshop to evaluate the program since its inception and use the outcomes of the workshop to help guide the future of this program. The focus of this workshop will be to evaluate the 5 conservation measures, which will help feed into the next 5-year strategic plan. The intent is to get a facilitator/mediator to help host this workshop. Tony, Mike, and Brian offered to help organize. Additionally this workshop will provide information that will lead into the next FWS consultation for the two newly listed gartersnakes. Possible topics include: long-term monitoring, repatriation strategies, propagation techniques, and nonnative control.

8. Recap

ACTION ITEMS

BUDGET UPDATE

- Bill - follow up on service first initiative to see if that is something BOR currently uses.
- All agreement technical representatives - CC Bill on quarterly progress and financial reports.

FISH BARRIER UPDATE

- Doug and Bill - Set up a follow up with call with Steve and Sean to discuss O'Donnell Barrier.
- Mike - will look for and email with engineering memo regarding the Middle Fork barrier.
- Bill – set up meeting/call to go through barrier list.

GILA RIVER BASIN MONITORING

- Tony/Bill - Adjust list for monitoring contract status of streams

CONSERVATION AND NON-NATIVE CONTROL ACTIONS

- Mike – email group New Mexico’s fish management plan.
- Mike – will look to see if Gila Monitoring has been reported with annual reports.

2018 Policy committee recommendations

- Bill – needs shore up budget and task agreements. He will follow up with each person and set up a technical committee call to develop recommendations for the Policy Committee.
- Tony – After technical committee, call Tony to send out email setting up policy committee meeting.

WMI RECCOMENDATIONS

- Bill - will summarize survey results and provide that information to the group.

PROGRAM EVALUATION / PROPSAL PROCESS

- Bill – will follow up with Tony, Mike, and Brian to set up workshop dates.