

**LONG TERM MONITORING OF SUB-ADULT
AND ADULT LARGE-BODIED FISHES IN
THE SAN JUAN RIVER: 2013**

Interim Progress Report
(Final Report)
7/2/2014

Funded by the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation
Salt Lake City Projects Office
Agreement # R13PG40052
Previous Agreement # R10PG40021, 08-AA-40-2715

Submitted by:

Benjamin J. Schleicher
Fish Biologist

U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Colorado River Fishery Project
445 West Gunnison Ave, Suite 140
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

General Information

- A total of 7,392 fishes were collected during 2013 Adult Monitoring
 - Native fishes accounted for 94.6% of the total catch in 2013

Native Species:

- Colorado pikeminnow
 - Likely no wild Colorado pikeminnow were collected in 2013
 - 149 Colorado pikeminnow were collected in 2013
 - Sixth most abundant species collected
 - Scaled CPUE of Colorado pikeminnow in the river for 1+ overwinter periods post-stocking was significantly higher in 2013 than 7 of the previous 10 years
 - Due to the collection of 70 age-1 and 50 age-2 fish (stocked as age-0 fish in fall 2011 and 2012 respectively)
 - Sizes in 2013 ranged from 150-665 mm TL (age-1 to age-9+)
 - 7 adult fish (>450 mm TL) collected in 2013
 - 3 sub-adult fish (400-449 mm TL) collected in 2013
 - 38 large juvenile fish (300-399 mm TL) collected in 2013
 - Captures ranged from RM 172.0-77.0
 - 24 in Reach 6, 43 in Reach 5, 52 in Reach 4, and 30 in Reach 3
 - 70 (47.6%) of the 149 were in the river \leq 365 days post-stocking
 - All 149 Colorado pikeminnow collected were in the river for at least one overwinter period
- Razorback Sucker
 - No wild Razorback Sucker were collected in 2013
 - 196 stocked Razorback Sucker were collected in 2013
 - Fifth most abundant species collected
 - Third most Razorback Sucker ever collected during an Adult Monitoring trip in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0)
 - Scaled CPUE of Razorback Sucker that had been in the river for 1+ overwinter periods in 2013 was significantly higher than 5 of the previous 10 years
 - Sizes ranged from 310-545 mm TL (age-1 to age-13)
 - Captures ranged from RM 178.0-77.0
 - 55 were collected in Reach 6, 88 in Reach 5, 41 in Reach 4, and 12 in Reach 3
 - Of 160 Razorback Sucker collected with PIT tags and known stocking histories in 2013, 18 (11.3%) were in the river \leq 365 days post-stocking
 - One fish was in the river $<$ 1 overwinter period when they were collected
 - The others were in the river from 1-12 overwinter periods
 - Razorback Sucker that have been in the river \geq 6 overwinter periods have been collected every year since 2001
- Flannemouth Sucker
 - Most abundant species in 2013 in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0)
 - Flannemouth Sucker was the numerically dominant species in Adult Monitoring collections in the common sampled area in all of the last 15 years
 - Accounted for 57.8% of the total catch (n = 4,271 fish)

- Had the widest distribution of any species, being collected in all 134 electrofishing samples (RM 180.0-77.0)
- Bluehead Sucker
 - Among the three most-commonly collected species in each of the last 15 years in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0)
 - Second most common species collected in 2013
 - Accounted for 25.8% of the total catch (n = 1,910 fish)
 - Collected in 123 of 134 (91.8%) electrofishing samples (RM 180.0-77.0)

Nonnative Species:

- Channel Catfish
 - First time not among the three most commonly-collected species (Flannelmouth Sucker, Bluehead Sucker, and Speckled Dace) in each of the last 15 years in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0)
 - Fourth most abundant species collected in 2013
 - Accounted for 4.7% of the total catch (n = 351 fish)
 - Collected in 63.4% of electrofishing samples (RM 180.0-77.0)
 - In 2013 the majority of Channel Ccatfish were collected in the middle nonnative fish removal section
 - Numbers considerably reduced downstream of Hogback diversion dam
 - Adult CPUE shows a declining trend in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) from 1999-2013
 - Juvenile CPUE showed an increasing trend in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) in the face of intensive nonnative fish removal efforts from 1999-2013
- Common Carp
 - Percent of total catch accounted for by this species has decreased steadily over the last 15 years (to 0.3% in 2013) in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0)
 - Was the fourth most commonly-collected species in 1999
 - The seventh most commonly-collected species in 2013
 - Only 23 common carp collected from RM 180.0-77.0 in 2013
 - 9 (39.1%) were adult fish (i.e., ≥ 250 mm TL)
 - 14 (60.9%) were juvenile fish (i.e., ≤ 249 mm TL)
 - Collected in 14.2% of electrofishing samples (RM 180.0-77.0)
 - Less abundant than both endangered Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker during 2013 Adult Monitoring collections

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	v
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Objectives.....	1
Relationship to the Recovery Program.....	2
Study Area.....	2
METHODS.....	2
Field Sampling.....	2
Common Sampled Area Versus Riverwide Sampling.....	3
Data Analysis.....	3
Rare Native Fishes.....	3
Common Large-Bodied Fishes.....	5
RESULTS.....	5
Rare Native Fishes.....	9
Colorado Pikeminnow.....	9
Razorback Sucker.....	15
Common Native Fishes.....	19
Flannelmouth Sucker.....	19
Catch Information.....	19
Length Information.....	19
Bluehead Sucker.....	23
Catch Information.....	23
Length Information.....	23
Common Nonnative Fishes.....	27
Channel Catfish.....	27
Catch Information.....	27
Length Information.....	32
Common Carp.....	33
Catch Information.....	33
Length Information.....	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sampling Upstream of the Animas River Confluence	37
Native Fishes.	38
Nonnative Fishes.	39
DISCUSSION.	40
Data Integration.	40
Rare Native Fishes.	41
Colorado Pikeminnow.	41
Razorback Sucker	44
Common Native Fishes.	47
Flannelmouth Sucker.	47
Bluehead Sucker	48
Common Nonnative Fishes.	49
Channel Catfish	49
Common Carp.	50
Sampling Upstream of the Animas River Confluence	50
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	51
LITERATURE CITED	51
APPENDIX A (How many Colorado pikeminnow and razorback sucker need to be collected on an Adult Monitoring trip to indicate that these populations are at or near numbers specified in their respective Recovery Goals documents). . .	55

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Summary of dates, river miles (RM) sampled, and mean flow during Adult Monitoring trips, 1999-2013.	6
2	Scientific and common names, status, and database codes for fish species collected during the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip	7
3	Total number of fishes collected during the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip. . .	8
4	General information on stocked Colorado Pikeminnow collected in 2013 . .	10
5	Information on stocked Colorado Pikeminnow collected from 2003-2013 that had been in the river for 1+ overwinter periods	15
6	General information on stocked Razorback Sucker collected in 2013.	16
7	Information on stocked Razorback Sucker collected from 2003-2013 that had been in the river for 1+ overwinter periods	17
8	Total number of fishes collected during sampling upstream of the Animas River on the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip.	38

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	A comparison of scaled CPUE at age among groups of Colorado Pikeminnow stocked as age-0 fish and captured during subsequent Adult Monitoring trips, 2003-2013	12
2	Year-to-year comparison of scaled CPUE for all Colorado Pikeminnow collected on Adult Monitoring trips that were in the river for one or more overwinter periods following stocking (regardless of age).	14

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
3	Year-to-year comparison of scaled CPUE for all Razorback Sucker collected on Adult Monitoring trips that were in the river for one or more overwinter periods following stocking (regardless of age)	18
4	A summary of Flannemouth Sucker relative abundance in the common sampled area during Adult Monitoring collections, 1999-2013.	20
5	Flannemouth Sucker CPUE in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips	21
6	Length-frequency histograms showing the size-class distribution of Flannemouth Sucker in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on Adult Monitoring trips, 2008-2013.	22
7	A summary of Bluehead Sucker relative abundance in the common sampled Area during Adult Monitoring collections, 1999-2013.	24
8	Bluehead Sucker CPUE in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips	25
9	Length-frequency histograms showing the size-class distribution of Bluehead Sucker in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on Adult Monitoring trips, 2008-2013.	26
10	A summary of Channel Catfish relative abundance in common sampled area during Adult Monitoring collections, 1999-2013	28
11	Channel Catfish CPUE in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips.	29
12	A comparison of the longitudinal distribution of Channel Catfish compared to the other rare and common species collected in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0).	30
13	A comparison of the longitudinal distribution of various life-stages of Channel Catfish in the common sampled area	31

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
14	Length-frequency histograms showing the size-class distribution of Channel Catfish in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on Adult Monitoring trips, 2008-2013.	32
15	A summary of Common Carp relative abundance in the common sampled Area during Adult Monitoring collections, 1999-2012	34
16	Common Carp CPUE in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips.	35
17	Length-frequency histograms showing size-class distribution of common carp in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on Adult Monitoring trips, 2008-2012.	36

INTRODUCTION

Research performed from 1991-1997 led to the initiation of several major management actions by the San Juan River Recovery Implementation Program (SJRIP) that are intended to have long-term positive impacts on the native fish community. These included development of flow recommendations for the reoperation of Navajo Reservoir, instituting the mechanical removal of nonnative fishes, modifying or removing three instream water diversion structures to provide fish passage and minimize entrainment, and augmentation efforts for both federally-listed endangered fish species (Colorado Pikeminnow, Ptychocheilus lucius and Razorback Sucker, Xyrauchen texanus). To assess the effects of management actions on the fish community over the duration of the SJRIP, a long-term monitoring program was initiated in 1999 (Propst et al. 2000). These standardized long-term monitoring protocols have been updated twice since 1999 (Propst et al. 2006, SJRIP 2012). Data collection following these long-term monitoring protocols began in 1999 and is scheduled to continue throughout the life of the SJRIP.

One component of long-term monitoring, ***Sub-Adult And Adult Large-Bodied Fish Community Monitoring*** (referred to hereafter as Adult Monitoring), is the primary responsibility of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Colorado River Fishery Project (CRFP) office in Grand Junction, CO. However, other state and federal agencies supply personnel, equipment, and logistical support.

Objectives

The objectives of Adult Monitoring (as stated in the FY-2013 workplan) are:

- 1) Annually, during autumn, document fish community structure, species abundance (presented as catch/effort, CPUE) and distribution, and size structure among populations of both native and nonnative large-bodied fishes in San Juan River. Specific emphasis shall be placed upon monitoring the population parameters among the rare San Juan River fish species -- Colorado Pikeminnow, Razorback Sucker, and Roundtail Chub (both wild and stocked fish).
- 2) Obtain data that will aid in the evaluation of the responses (e.g., year-to-year survival, reproduction, recruitment, growth, and condition factor) of both native and nonnative large-bodied fishes to management actions.
- 3) Continue to perform activities that support other studies and recovery actions being implemented by the SJRIP. For example:
 - a. Remove nonnative fish species which prey upon and may compete with native fish species in the San Juan River.
 - b. Collect GPS waypoints in habitats where endangered Colorado

Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker are collected.

- c. Collect tissue samples from various fish species for stable isotope, genetics, and contaminants studies.
- d. Document hybridization of endangered fishes with native fishes.
- e. When appropriate document any observed parasites, lesions, or abnormalities on collected fishes. Make these data available to appropriate studies when they occur.

Relationship to the Recovery Program

Adult Monitoring provides data for, or makes possible (at least in part), the following actions under element numbers 1-4 of the Long Range Plan (SJRIP 2013): 1.1.1.1, 1.1.1.2, 1.2.1.1, 1.2.1.2, 1.2.2.1, 3.1.1.1, 3.1.1.3, 3.1.1.4, 3.1.1.7, 4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.2, 4.1.1.3, 4.1.2.3, 4.1.2.4, 4.1.2.5, 4.1.3.1, 4.1.5.1, 4.1.5.2, 4.1.5.3, 4.1.6.1, 4.3.1.1, 4.3.2.2, 4.3.3.1, 4.3.4.1, 4.3.4.2, and 4.3.4.3. The Comprehensive Monitoring Plan is currently undergoing revision. However, the monitoring protocols discussed in the Methods section of this report reflect those that are currently included in the latest version of the Monitoring Plan and Protocols (SJRIP 2012).

Study Area

In 2013, the study area for Adult Monitoring began just downstream of the Bloomfield boat landing (RM 195) and continued downstream to the Sand Island boat landing, near Bluff, UT (RM 77.0). This study area encompassed five geomorphic reaches of the San Juan River between Navajo Reservoir and Lake Powell. These included the lower 15 miles of Reach 7, three complete reaches (Reaches 6, 5, and 4) and the majority of Reach 3, as defined by Bliesner and Lamarra (2000). The seven geomorphic reaches in their entireties are: Reach 7 (RM 214.0-180.0); Reach 6 (RM 180.0-155.0); Reach 5 (RM 155.0-131.0); Reach 4 (RM 131.0-106.0); Reach 3 (RM 106.0-68.0); Reach 2 (RM 68.0-17.0); and Reach 1 (RM 17.0-0.0).

METHODS

Field Sampling

Sampling conducted in 2013 followed the protocols for long-term monitoring set forth in the latest version of the Monitoring Plan and Protocols (SJRIP 2012). These sampling protocols were first used during the fall 1999 Adult Monitoring trip. Similar data collected prior to the inception of these sampling protocols (i.e., 1991-1998) are not included in comparative analyses for this report.

Common Sampled Area Versus Riverwide Sampling

From 1999-2010, Adult Monitoring sampled the large majority of geomorphic reaches 6-1 (RM 180.0-2.9). Although our study area ended 2.9 RM short of the end of Reach 1 (at Clay Hills boat landing) during those years, it was assumed during data analysis for those years that the data collected from the majority of Reach 1 (RM 17.0-2.9) were representative of the entirety of Reach 1 (RM 17.0-0.0). This approach to data analysis allowed year-to-year comparisons of data for the fish species we were interested in to be made on a “riverwide” basis (i.e., from RM 180.0-0.0).

However, as per modifications made to the long-term monitoring protocols in the latest version of the Monitoring Plan and Protocols (SJ RIP 2012), the study area for Adult Monitoring was reduced to sample just RM 180.0-77.0 in four out of five years, with the entirety of the previous study area (reaches 6-1) being sampled only every fifth year. Thus, 2011 was the first year of reduced sampling under the new sampling protocols and 2013 was the third year. The entire study area from RM 180.0-2.9 isn't scheduled to be sampled again until fall 2015.

This change in sampling protocol for 2011 necessitated a cropping of 1999-2010 data sets to a common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0). Therefore, all data comparisons in this report will be just for this common sampled area and will not include any data from the downstream, mostly canyon-bound areas of the San Juan River (RM 77.0-2.9) reported in 1999-2010 reports.

In 2012 and 2013 two river sections (totaling 15 RM) upstream of the confluence of the San Juan and Animas Rivers were sampled to see 1) if sampling in these areas of the river was feasible at this time of the year, and 2) to attempt to document range expansion of Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker upstream of the Animas river confluence. Low water levels prevented sampling the lower several miles of the Animas River in 2012, and flooding prevented sampling in 2013.

Since we only have two years of data from the two upstream San Juan River sections, 2013 will only be compared to 2012 data, and will not be used for comparative purposes in this report. A separate sub-section will be added at the end of the RESULTS section to describe the 2012 and 2013 findings. If sampling is continued in these upstream river sections, more year-to-year comparisons will be presented in future reports.

Data Analysis

Rare Native Fishes

Based on data collected over the last several years, it appears that essentially all of the endangered Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker being collected during Adult Monitoring are fishes that have been stocked during augmentation efforts. Large disparities exist in numbers of fish stocked between various calendar years, making year-to-year comparisons of CPUE problematic. To deal with this problem, endangered fishes collected during Adult

Monitoring were sorted by year of stocking as well as length of time (expressed in number of overwinter periods) that they had been in the river post-stocking. Additionally, since different age-classes of Colorado Pikeminnow were stocked in numerous years, they were further sorted by their age-class at stocking. Ages provided for fish were either determined using PIT tag information for known-age fish or were based on length frequency histograms and observed between-year growth rates. Emphasis in analyzing CPUE values was then placed on groups of fish that had been in the river for one or more overwinter periods post-stocking. Electrofishing data were pooled for all rafts to obtain total catch numbers by species for the entire sampling trip. Total catch numbers for endangered fishes were then scaled to account for the differences in numbers of fishes stocked between years (Golden and Holden 2005, Robertson and Holden 2007, R. Ryel pers. comm.).

The number of Colorado Pikeminnow collected during Adult Monitoring from any given stocking year and age-class at stocking was transformed to a theoretical annual stocking of 300,000 Colorado Pikeminnow. The transformation for Colorado Pikeminnow followed the formula:

$$SCPM = (300,000/N)CPM$$

where $SCPM$ = the scaled number of Colorado Pikeminnow, N = the total number of Colorado Pikeminnow of a given age-class stocked in a particular calendar year, and CPM = the number of Colorado Pikeminnow of that same age-class from that particular stocking year that were collected during Adult Monitoring. The scaled number of Colorado Pikeminnow was then divided by the number of seconds (converted to hours) fished by all rafts combined to obtain a scaled CPUE value (i.e., the scaled number of fish per hour of electrofishing). Scaled CPUE values were then log-transformed (i.e., $\ln\{\text{scaled CPUE} + 1\}$) prior to all analyses (Golden and Holden 2005, Robertson and Holden 2007, R. Ryel pers. comm.).

Analysis of Razorback Sucker data was slightly different. Since all Razorback Sucker being stocked tended to be older fish (i.e., age-1 to age-3) and since there was only one target stocking size (≥ 300 mm TL) for all Razorback Sucker, catch data for Razorback Sucker were pooled only by number of overwinter periods (i.e., regardless of age at stocking). CPUE for Razorback Sucker was also scaled, to a theoretical annual stocking of 11,400 individuals. The transformation for Razorback Sucker followed the formula:

$$SCRZ = (11,400/N)RZ$$

where $SCRZ$ = the scaled number of Razorback Sucker, N = the total number of Razorback Sucker stocked in a particular calendar year, and RZ = the number of Razorback Sucker from that particular stocking year that were collected during Adult Monitoring. Scaled CPUE for Razorback Sucker was calculated, transformed, and analyzed (ANOVA, Tukey's HSD, $p < 0.10$) as described for Colorado Pikeminnow.

Common Large-Bodied Fishes

The four “common” large-bodied fishes encountered during Adult Monitoring sampling are Flannemouth Sucker (Catostomus latipinnis), Bluehead Sucker (Catostomus discobolus), Channel Catfish (Ictalurus punctatus), and Common Carp (Cyprinus carpio). These were the only wild, large-bodied fish species present in the San Juan River in large enough numbers to yield sufficient sample sizes from which statistically valid conclusions could be drawn (on a common sampled area basis, i.e., RM 180.0-77.0) across years. Electrofishing data were pooled for all rafts to obtain total catch by species for the entire sampling trip. Total catch for each species was then divided by the number of seconds (converted to hours) fished by all rafts combined to obtain CPUE values (i.e., number of fish per hour of electrofishing) for juvenile and adult life stages and for all life stages combined (i.e., juvenile + adult; referred to hereafter as "total CPUE"). CPUE values for each common large-bodied fish species were then compared to previous years' common sampled area electrofishing data to evaluate long-term trends. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (Tukey's HSD) multiple-comparison post-hoc tests was then used to determine whether significant differences in CPUE values occurred between years. Significance was determined at $p < 0.10$ (following Ryden 2000a). Linear regression analysis was used to determine if the long-term CPUE trends among common native species were increasing or decreasing and whether those increases or decreases were significant at $p < 0.10$ (following Ryden 2000a). Length data obtained from fish measured at designated miles (DMs) were used to develop common sampled area length frequency histograms for wild populations of the four common large-bodied fish species.

RESULTS

The mean river flow (at the Shiprock USGS gage #09368000) during the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip was 2626 CFS (Table 1). Overall, the mean river flow during the entire 15-year period (1999-2012) of Adult Monitoring sampling was 1101 CFS. The mean river flow during sampling in 2013 was higher than any other mean river flow in this 15-year period. The high flows made the water turbid and difficult for sampling, out of 14 days of sampling, only three days had a turbidity reading higher than zero, two of which being the first two days.

Eighteen fish species and hybrids were collected during the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip (Table 2). This included 5 native species, 2 native sucker X native sucker hybrids, 2 native sucker X nonnative sucker hybrid, and 9 nonnative species (Tables 2 and 3). Eight species (Flannemouth Sucker, Bluehead Sucker, Channel Catfish, Speckled Dace, Razorback Sucker, Colorado Pikeminnow, Common Carp, and Brown Trout) accounted for 99.7% (7,375 fish) of the total catch. The other six species and four hybrids contributed only 0.3% (17 fishes) to the total catch in 2013 (Table 3). Native fishes accounted for the majority (94.6%) of fishes collected in 2013 (Table 3). Native Flannemouth Sucker were once again the most abundant species collected during Adult Monitoring, accounting for 57.8% of all fish collected in our common sampled area.

In general fishes collected during Adult Monitoring appeared to be in good health. Any noticeable instances of abnormalities, parasites, or deformities were noted in the field notes, but the rate of occurrence was low. Currently there are no studies being conducted to explore these phenomena, but the data are available to the program if a study is initiated.

Table 1. Summary of dates, river miles (RM) sampled, and mean flow during riverwide Adult Monitoring trips in the San Juan River in New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah, 1999-2013.

Beginning Date Of Sampling	Ending Date Of Sampling	River Miles Sampled	Mean Trip Flow At The Shiprock, NM USGS Gage (#09368000) In CFS And (Cubic Meters/Second)
20 September 1999	7 October 1999	RM 180.0-2.9	2,177 CFS (61.6 m ³ /sec)
18 September 2000	10 October 2000	RM 180.0-2.9	657 CFS (18.6 m ³ /sec)
25 September 2001	19 October 2001	RM 180.0-2.9	611 CFS (17.3 m ³ /sec)
20 September 2002	7 October 2002	RM 180.0-2.9	458 CFS (12.9 m ³ /sec)
22 September 2003	14 October 2003	RM 180.0-2.9	450 CFS (12.7 m ³ /sec)
20 September 2004	13 October 2004	RM 180.0-2.9	1,432 CFS (40.5 m ³ /sec)
19 September 2005	12 October 2005	RM 180.0-2.9	1,072 CFS (30.3 m ³ /sec)
18 September 2006	9 October 2006	RM 180.0-2.9	2,479 CFS (70.1 m ³ /sec)
17 September 2007	11 October 2007	RM 180.0-2.9	1,262 CFS (35.7 m ³ /sec)
22 September 2008	15 October 2008	RM 180.0-2.9	638 CFS (18.1 m ³ /sec)
21 September 2009	14 October 2009	RM 180.0-2.9	532 CFS (15.0 m ³ /sec)
20 September 2010	12 October 2010	RM 180.0-2.9	762 CFS (21.5 m ³ /sec)
12 September 2011	29 September 2011	RM 180.0-52.9	615 CFS (17.4 m ³ /sec)
10 September 2012	28 September 2012	RM 195.0-52.9	804 CFS (22.7 m ³ /sec)
9 September 2013	27 September 2013	RM 195.0-52.9	2626 CFS (74.3 m ³ /sec)

15-year statistics: Mean = 1101 CFS 31.2 m³/sec)

Table 2. Scientific and common names (following Page et al. 2013), status, and database codes for fish species collected from the San Juan River during the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip.

Scientific Name	Common Name	Status	Database Code
Order Cypriniformes: Family Catostomidae – suckers			
<i>Catostomus discobolus</i>	Bluehead Sucker	Native	Catdis
<i>Catostomus commersonii</i>	White Sucker	Introduced	Catcom
<i>Catostomus latipinnis</i>	Flannelmouth Sucker	Native	Catlat
<i>Xyrauchen texanus</i>	Razorback Sucker	Native	Xyrtex
<i>X. texanus</i> X <i>C. latipinnis</i>	hybrid	Native	texXlat
<i>C. latipinnis</i> X <i>C. discobolus</i>	hybrid	Native	latXdis
<i>C. commersoni</i> X <i>C. latipinnis</i>	hybrid	Introduced	comXlat
<i>C. commersoni</i> X <i>C. discobolus</i>	Hybrid	Introduced	comXdis
Order Cypriniformes: Family Cyprinidae - carps and minnows			
<i>Cyprinella lutrensis</i>	Red Shiner	Introduced	Cyplut
<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	Common Carp	Introduced	Cypcar
<i>Ptychocheilus lucius</i>	Colorado Pikeminnow	Native	Ptyluc
<i>Pimephales promelas</i>	Fathead Minnow	Introduced	Pimpro
<i>Rhinichthys osculus</i>	Speckled Dace	Native	Rhiosc
Order Perciformes: Family Centrarchidae – sunfishes			
<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>	Green Sunfish	Introduced	Lepcya
<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>	Largemouth Bass	Introduced	Micsal
Order Salmoniformes: Family Salmonidae – trouts			
<i>Salmo trutta</i>	Brown Trout	Introduced	Saltru
Order Siluriformes: Family Ictaluridae - bullhead catfishes			
<i>Ameiurus natalis</i>	Yellow Bullhead	Introduced	Amenat
<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>	Channel Catfish	Introduced	Ictpun

Table 3. Total number of fishes collected during the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0).

Species (Status) ^a	Number Collected	Percent Of Total ^b	Number Of Samples Collected In
Flannelmouth Sucker (N)	4271	57.8	134
Bluehead Sucker (N)	1910	25.8	123
Speckled Dace (N)	460	6.2	66
Channel Catfish (I)	351	4.7	85
Razorback Sucker (N)	199	2.7	74
Colorado Pikeminnow (N)	149	2.0	79
Common Carp (I)	23	0.3	19
Brown Trout (I)	12	0.2	9
Green Sunfish (I)	3	-----	2
Fathead Minnow (I)	2	-----	1
Largemouth Bass (I)	2	-----	2
Bluehead Sucker X White Sucker (H, I)	2	-----	2
Flannelmouth Sucker X White Sucker (H, I)	2	-----	2
Yellow Bullhead (I)	2	-----	2
Flannelmouth Sucker X Bluehead Sucker (H, N)	1	-----	1
Red Shiner (I)	1	-----	1
Razorback Sucker X Flannelmouth Sucker (H, N)	1	-----	1
White Sucker (I)	1	-----	1
GRAND TOTAL	7392		
Total Electrofishing Collections In 2013 = 134			
Total Electrofishing Effort In 2013 = 43.95 Hours			
2013 Native Fishes = 6,991 (94.6% Of The Total Catch)			
2013 Introduced Fishes = 401 (5.4% Of The Total Catch)			
2013 Native To Introduced Fishes Ratio = 17.4:1			
a: (N) = Native species; (I) = Introduced species; (H, N) = A hybrid of two native fish species, considered to be a native fish; (H, I) = A hybrid of a native and a nonnative fish species, considered to be an introduced fish			
b: ----- = less than 0.1%			

Rare Native Fishes

Colorado Pikeminnow

In 2013, 149 Colorado Pikeminnow were captured from RM 180-77 (Table 3), all presumably stocked. All but two could be traced back to a stocking event. This marked the eighth consecutive year that > 100 Colorado Pikeminnow were collected during an Adult Monitoring trip from this common sampled area (2006 = 250; 2007 = 140; 2008 = 197; 2009 = 300; 2010 = 371; 2011 = 386; 2012 = 272). Colorado Pikeminnow captures ranged from RM 172.0-77.0 (Table 4), with 24 being collected in Reach 6, 43 in Reach 5, 52 in Reach 4, and 30 being collected in the portion of Reach 3 (RM 106-77) that was sampled in 2013. This was the second consecutive year that every Colorado Pikeminnow collected during Adult Monitoring had been in the river for one or more overwinter periods.

Sixteen (10.7%) Colorado Pikeminnow were collected upstream of the Hogback Diversion (RM 158.6) in 2013. Four of these collections occurred upstream of PNM Weir (RM 166.6), and 3 of the 16 had PIT tags. Two of these fish were stocked as age-0 fish in the fall of 2011 at RM 166.6, just downstream of the PNM Weir, or at Boyd Park (Animas RM 1.0), one was tagged in the river in April 2013 at RM 118 and the other in September 2012 at RM 146. The third PIT-tagged fish was stocked as an age-0 fish in the fall of 2008 at RM 166.6, just downstream of the PNM Weir and tagged in the river at RM 18 in April of 2010. Like many stocked fish, these fish showed a pattern of initial downstream displacement (Ryden 2000b), followed by upstream movements as they grew and matured (Osmundson et al., 1997a, 1998).

Three Colorado Pikeminnow without PIT tags were also collected upstream of PNM Weir. Of these, two (257 & 292 mm TL) were age-2 fish, assumed to have been stocked as age-0 fish in November 2011 (Furr 2013a). The other Colorado Pikeminnow captured without a PIT tag was an age-1 fish stocked at age-0 in November 2012 (Furr 2013a).

Table 4. General information on 147 known-origin stocked Colorado Pikeminnow collected in 2013.

Age At Capture & (Number Captured)	Size Range At Capture (TL in mm)	Range of Capture RM's	Days In River Post-Stocking (Number Of Overwinter Periods)	Stocking Dates	Age At Stocking & (Year-Class Of Fish)	Source ^a
Age-1 (70)	150-265	170.0-77.0	300-316 (1)	11/13/2012	Age-0 (2012)	Dexter
Age-2 (50)	241-371	172.0-80.0	677-692 (2)	11/2/2011	Age-0 (2011)	Dexter
Age-3 (22)	345-435	164.0-77.0	845-862 (2)	5/17/2011 5/18/2011	Age-1 2010	Dexter
Age-4 (1)	462.0	158.0	1400 (4)	11/9/2009	Age-0 (2009)	Dexter
Age-5 (2)	482-595	163.0-133.0	1770-1779 (5)	11/6/2008	Age-0 (2008)	Dexter
Age-7 (1)	540	100.0	1650 (4)	3/17/2009	Age-3 (2006)	Dexter
Age-9 (1)	585	145.0	3256-3249 (5)	10/21/2004 10/28/2004	Age-0 (2004)	Dexter
a: Dexter = Southwestern Native Aquatic Resources & Recovery Center (SNARC) formerly known as U. S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Dexter National Fish Hatchery & Technology Center, Dexter NM.						

Stocking history (and length of time in the river) could not be determined for two Colorado Pikeminnow in 2013. These two fish (569 & 665 mm TL), collected from RM 153-133, were large, adult sized, potentially wild, fish when captured and tagged for the first time in the river. This left 147 Colorado Pikeminnow of known origin (Table 4).

Half (n = 70; 47.6%) of the 147 known-origin Colorado Pikeminnow collected in 2013 were in the river \leq 365 days post-stocking, but still had one overwinter period in the river (i.e., they were stocked in November 2012). The other half, 77 (52.4%) of the 147 known-origin Colorado Pikeminnow collected in 2013 were in the river $>$ 365 days post-stocking and more than one overwinter period. Of those 77 fish, 54 (70.1%) were stocked as age-0 fish. In fall 2010, a Largemouth Bass Virus (LMBV) quarantine at Dexter National Fish Hatchery and Technology Center (NFH&TC) caused that hatchery to hold back approximately 214,000 age-0 Colorado

Pikeminnow and 3,700 age-1 fish, that were scheduled to be stocked that fall. These fish were instead stocked in May of 2011 as age-1, or age-2, fish after the hatchery cleared quarantine (Furr 2013a). Twenty-two of the Colorado Pikeminnow collected on the fall 2013 Adult monitoring trip came from these stockings of age-1 and age-2 fish.

Numerous larger Colorado Pikeminnow were collected during 2013 Adult Monitoring. These included 38 fish from 300-399 mm TL (age-2 to age-3 fish), 3 fish from 400-449 mm TL (age-3 fish), and 7 fish \geq 450 mm TL (age-4+). Thus, the Colorado Pikeminnow collected in 2013 met the Recovery Goal demographic size criteria, not age, for Downlisting (USFWS 2002a). However, these larger size-class fish were likely all stocked fish. They were stocked at larger sizes than is normal for wild fish of the same age-class and are reaching the target size-class thresholds for both sub-adult and adult fish faster than would be true for wild fish (Osmundson et al. 1996, 1997b; D. Ryden, unpublished data). The use of the Recovery Goal demographic criteria for Downlisting in this context is simply a convenient way to judge progress of this species towards recovery (i.e., by comparing Adult Monitoring collections against a published target number or size). As a point of clarification:

*Where stocked fish are involved, a self-sustaining population must consist of young produced in the wild and recruited to the adult population at the required rates; stocked fish are included in the count of adults **after** their progeny are recruited to adults (USFWS 2002b).*

Comparisons of scaled CPUE among groups of Colorado Pikeminnow stocked as age-0 fish showed that at age-1, recapture rates were highly variable (indicating either highly variable survival or highly variable recapture probabilities) between years (Figure 1). However, between 2003 and 2012, there was a general upward trend in scaled CPUE for fish stocked at age-0 and recaptured at age-1. This might indicate that stocking fish higher in the system and implementing more rigorous handling, transport, and stocking protocols is helping to increase short-term retention of Colorado Pikeminnow. Data collected from 2004-2009 indicated that by age-2, differences in scaled CPUE among stocking years tended to essentially disappear, with few significant differences being present (Figure 1). Age-2 fish collected in 2010 through 2013 were an exception to this trend, with scaled CPUE for age-2 fish in 2010, 2011 and 2013 being significantly higher than the previous six years values (Figure 1). Again, this may be indicative of the handling, transport, and stocking protocols implemented in the last couple of years. No age-3 fish stocked as age-0 fish were captured in 2013 due to the quarantine for the LMBV at Dexter NFH&TC in 2012. However, by age-3, few significant differences existed in scaled CPUE among any of the groups of Colorado Pikeminnow stocked as age-0 fish (Figure 1).




Figure 1. A comparison of scaled CPUE at age among groups of Colorado Pikeminnow stocked as age-0 fish and captured during subsequent Adult Monitoring trips, 2003-2013, in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0). The black dashed line shows the mean scaled CPUE values for each year-class of fish during a given calendar year. Red error bars are ± 2 SE. The black lines show a linear regression from year to year for each year-class.

There were three years (2006, 2008, and 2009) in which an age-4 Colorado Pikeminnow that had been stocked as an age-0 fish were collected from RM 180.0-77.0 (Table 4, Figure 1). Two Colorado Pikeminnow stocked as an age-0 fish were collected in 2013 at age-5 during Adult Monitoring. These are the first age-5 fish stocked at age-0 ever collected during Adult Monitoring. One age-9 Colorado Pikeminnow stocked as an age-0 fish was captured in 2013.

Of the 147 known-origin Colorado Pikeminnow collected in 2013, 23 (15.6%) were fish stocked as age-1+ fish (Table 4). All 23 fish stocked at age-1+ were recaptured after 2 or more overwinter periods post-stocking (Table 4).

Between-year comparisons of scaled CPUE for all Colorado Pikeminnow that were in the river 1+ overwinter periods showed that from 2004-2008 scaled CPUE changed very little (Figure 2). However, in 2009, 2010, 2012 and again in 2013, this metric showed significant increases over previous years (Figure 2). In most years (2003-2009), the magnitude of this metric has really been driven by (i.e., reflective of) fish stocked at age-0 that survived into their age-1 year-class (Figure 1). This is because the largest majority of Colorado Pikeminnow that are available for capture in any given year are fish that were stocked as age-0 fish the previous fall. Thus, almost all Colorado Pikeminnow that we encounter during Adult Monitoring (which are usually numerically dominated by age-1 fish stocked the previous fall) have already experienced at least one 1 overwinter period (Table 5) and are thus used in this calculation. In 2010 this changed somewhat (Table 5). Significantly higher numbers of age-2 fish (stocked at age-0 in fall 2008) combined with large numbers of age-1 fish (stocked at age-0 in fall 2009) helped drive the significant increase observed in 2010 (Figure 1). In 2011, scaled CPUE for fish stocked at age-0 that survived into their age-2 year-class was once again high, although not as high as in 2010 (Figure 1). However, there were no age-0 Colorado Pikeminnow stocked in fall 2010 (Furr 2013a), thus there were no age-1 fish available to be recaptured as age-1 fish during the fall 2011 Adult Monitoring trip. Thus, the decrease observed between 2010 and 2011 in scaled CPUE for all Colorado Pikeminnow that were in the river 1+ overwinter periods (Figure 4) was really driven by (i.e., reflective of) this lack of age-1 fish in the system. These 2010 and 2009 year-class fish were present in the 2013 Adult Monitoring catch as both age-3 and age-4 fish (Figure 4). The 2013 scaled CPUE value for Colorado Pikeminnow that had been in the river 1+ overwinter periods also increased significantly from the catch rate in 2011 (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Year-to-year comparison of scaled CPUE for all Colorado Pikeminnow collected on Adult Monitoring trips in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) that were in the river for one or more overwinter periods following stocking (regardless of age). The black bars show the mean scaled CPUE values for each year. Red error bars are +/- 2 SE. The solid black line shows a linear regression between years. Letters are between-year comparisons using Tukey's HSD post-hoc test). The letter S is significantly similar to 2013 and the letter D is significantly different.

Table 5. Information on stocked Colorado Pikeminnow collected from 2003-2013 that had been in the river for 1+ overwinter periods.

Information For Fish Collected During Adult Monitoring Trips (RM 180-77):			Information For Fish That Were In The River For 1+ Overwinter Periods At Time Of Capture:		
Year	Effort (Total Hours Electrofished)	Total Number Collected	Number Of Fish Collected That Were In River 1+ Overwinter Periods	Oldest Year-Class Captured	Number Of Overwinter Periods
2003	51.98	8	8	2002	1
2004	50.25	102	91	2002	1-2
2005	47.31	84	62	2002	1-3
2006	51.19	250	146	2002	1-4
2007	50.64	140	117	2004	1-3
2008	58.77	197	162	2006	1-2
2009	58.34	300	257	2006	1-3
2010	54.96	371	351	1996	1-14
2011	48.68	386	75	2006	1-5
2012	54.51	272	272	2006	1-6
2013	43.95	149	149	2004	1-9

Razorback Sucker

A total of 196 Razorback Sucker were collected in 2013, all of which were assumed to be stocked fish (Table 6). This marks the eighth consecutive year during which > 50 Razorback Sucker were collected during an Adult Monitoring trip from this common sampled area (2006 = 121; 2007 = 171; 2008 = 73; 2009 = 77; 2010 = 149; 2011 = 197; 2012 = 321). Razorback Sucker captures ranged from RM 178.0-77.0 (Table 6), with 55 being collected in Reach 6, 88 in Reach 5, 41 in Reach 4, and 12 being collected in the portion of Reach 3 (RM 106-77) that was sampled in 2013.

Eight Razorback Sucker (4.1%) were collected upstream of the PNM Weir and fish passage facility (RM 166.6). In contrast, there were no collections of Razorback Sucker upstream of PNM Weir during our 2010 sampling. However, the large majority (n= 157; 80.1%) of Razorback Sucker collections in 2013 still occurred downstream of Hogback Diversion (RM 158.6).

A total of 36 Razorback Sucker were collected for which either the stocking history or the exact length of the time the fish had been in the river could not be determined (Table 6). Personnel error (e.g., not recording the correct number of digits for the PIT tag number) led to usable PIT tag numbers not being obtained for one Razorback Sucker. Seventeen Razorback Suckers were fish that had been collected without a PIT tag on previous sampling trips; these fish were PIT tagged prior to being released. Eighteen Razorback Sucker had no detectable PIT tag upon capture during the 2013 Adult monitoring trip, these fish (likely from the 2006-2007 clean-out of the NAPI grow-out ponds) were implanted with a new 134 kHz PIT tag prior to being released. The last Razorback Sucker was recorded in field notes as having a 134 kHz PIT when collected. However, the original stocking/tagging history for this fish could not be found in the combined PIT tag database.

Of the 160 Razorback Sucker recaptured with PIT tags and known stocking histories in 2013, 18 (11.3%) were in the river ≤ 365 days post-stocking and 1 was in the river < 1 overwinter period when they were collected. The other 142 (88.7%) were in the river > 365 days post-stocking and had been in the river from 1-12 overwinter periods (Table 6).

Table 6. General information on stocked Razorback Suckers collected in 2013.

Days In River Post-Stocking (Number Of Overwinter Periods)	Age At Capture & (Number Captured)	Size Range At Capture (TL in mm)	Range of Capture RM's	Stocking Year	Age At Stocking & (Year-Class Of Fish)
Information on the 160 Razorback Sucker with known stocking histories:					
8 (0)	Age-3 (1)	310	138	2013	Age-3 (2010)
329-532 (1)	Age-5 (30)	354-494	178.0-121.0	2012	Age-4 (2008)
693-763 (2)	Age-4 (47)	392-504	172.0-77.0	2009	Age-2 (2009)
1040-1113 (3)	Age-4 & Age-5 (52)	420-519	166.0-88.3	2010	Age-1 & Age-2 (2008 & 2009)
1400-1450 (4)	Age-2 (11)	420-530	161.0-101.0	2009	Age-2 (2007)
1764-1861 (5)	Age-6 & Age-7 (5)	469-522	164.0-109.0	2008	Age-1 & Age-2 (2006 & 2007)
2250-2349 (6)	Age-7 - Age-11 (6)	462-541	155.0-119.0	2007	Age-1 - Age-5 (2002 - 2006)
2963 (8)	Age-11 (1)	466	124.0	2005	Age-3 (2002)
3304-3436 (9)	Age-11 & Age-12 (5)	466-520	151.0-92.0	2004	Age-2 & Age-3 (2001 & 2002)
4346 (12)	Age-13 (1)	485	109.0	2001	Age-1 (2000)
Information on the 36 Razorback Sucker captured without known stocking histories:					
Unknown	Unknown (36)	399-545	163.7-80.0	Unknown	Unknown

Comparisons of capture data for Razorback Suckers with known stocking histories that were in the river for 1+ overwinter periods and collected during Adult Monitoring trips changed little from 2003-2009 (range = 18-36; Table 7). However, in 2010, this number rose to 70 fish, double the value observed in any previous year. In 2011, this number rose again to 118 fish, and in 2012 nearly doubled again with 231. In 2013, numbers dropped to 175, the second highest catch of Razorback Suckers that had been in the river 1+ overwinter periods (Table 7). Razorback Sucker collected after 1+ overwinter periods also continue to demonstrate a much longer post-stocking persistence (up to 18 overwinter periods or 6,520 days post-stocking) than Colorado Pikeminnow (Table 7). On every Adult Monitoring trip since 2003, Razorback Sucker were collected that had been in river for at least six overwinter periods post-stocking (Table 7). The two 1992 year-class Razorback Suckers collected on the 2007 and 2010 Adult Monitoring trips (both stocked in 1995), and a 1992 year-class fish stocked in 1994 and captured 2012, indicate that older Razorback Suckers continue to persist in the San Juan River, albeit in low numbers. The 2013 scaled CPUE value for Razorback Suckers that were in the river 1+ overwinter periods was not significantly higher than three previous years; however, it was significantly higher than five of the seven previous years from 2003-2009 (Figure 3).

Table 7. Information on stocked Razorback Sucker collected from 2003-2013 that had been in the river for 1+ overwinter periods.

Information For Fish Collected During Adult Monitoring Trips (RM 180-77):			Information For Fish That Were In The River For 1+ Overwinter Periods At Time Of Capture:		
Year	Effort (Total Hours Electrofished)	Total Number Collected	Number Of Fish Collected That Were In River 1+ Overwinter Periods	Oldest Year-Class Captured	Number Of Overwinter Periods
2003	51.98	17	17	1992 (1 wild juvenile collected)	1-9 (wild fish; 249 mm TL = age-1 or age--2)
2004	50.25	108	18	1992	1-10
2005	47.31	46	30	1998	1-6
2006	51.19	121	23	1997	1-8
2007	50.64	171	22	1992	1-12
2008	58.77	73	36	2000	1-7
2009	58.34	77	35	1999	1-9
2010	54.96	149	70	1992	1-15
2011	48.68	197	118	1999	1-11
2012	54.51	321	231	1992	1-18
2013	43.95	196	175	2000	1-12

Source of origin could be determined for 175 Razorback Sucker. Of these, 135 (77.14%) were reared in the Navajo Agricultural Products Industry (NAPI) grow-out ponds, southwest of Farmington, NM. Twelve (6.86%) were reared at the USFWS' Dexter NFH&TC, near Roswell, NM. Eleven (6.29%) were reared at the USFWS' Uvalde National Fish Hatchery, in Uvalde, TX. One (0.57%) was reared in Wahweap Warmwater Hatchery, Big Water, UT. Of the 135 fish reared at the NAPI ponds, 57 were from Hidden Pond, 40 from West Avocet Pond, 33 from East Avocet Pond, and five from the now-defunct 6-Pack Ponds.




Figure 3. Year-to-year comparison of scaled CPUE for all Razorback Sucker collected on Adult Monitoring trips in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) that were in the river for one or more overwinter periods following stocking (regardless of age). The black dash marks the mean scaled CPUE values for each year. Red error bars are +/- 2 SE. The solid black line shows a linear regression between years of capture. Letters are between-year comparisons using Tukey's HSD post-hoc test). The letter S is significantly similar to 2013 and the letter D is significantly different.

Common Native Fishes

Flannemouth Sucker

Catch Information

Flannemouth Sucker was once again the most common large-bodied fish species collected in the common sampled area during the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip (Table 3, Figure 4), being collected in all 134 electrofishing samples (Table 3, Figure 4).

In the common sampled area, Flannemouth Sucker juvenile CPUE has shown far more variation over the last 15 years than has adult CPUE (Figure 5). Although year-to-year juvenile CPUE values showed a comparatively high degree of variation, the long-term trend indicated no significant change. If you compare the 1999 with 2013 adult CPUE values, there is a significant decline between those two data points. However, the 2013 adult CPUE value was not significantly lower than any of the previous 13 years. Therefore, this particular declining trend is really being driven by the 1999 data point for adult Flannemouth Sucker. Despite the significant long-term decline in adult Flannemouth Sucker CPUE, the combined adult and juvenile CPUE showed no significant change over the last 15 years (Figure 5).

Length Information

Flannemouth Sucker sampled in 2013 ranged in size from 61-584 mm TL (mean TL = 362 mm). The 2013 length-frequency histogram was bimodal, with one peak centered around age-1 and age-2 fish (151-225 mm TL). The second, larger mode showed a cohort of fish (351-475 mm TL) that were just beginning to recruit into adulthood (Figure 6).




Figure 4. A summary of Flannelmouth Sucker relative abundance in Adult Monitoring collections, 1999-2013. The solid blue line at the top of the graph represents the percentage of all electrofishing samples on a given Adult Monitoring trip in which this species occurred (i.e., percent occurrence). The solid red bars represent the percent of the total catch that this species composed in a given year. Numbers in parentheses indicate the numeric rank for this species in a given year relative to all other fish species collected in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0).





Figure 5.

Flannemouth Sucker CPUE (blue line) in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips, for juvenile fish (< 410 mm TL; top), adult fish (\geq 410 mm TL; middle), and for all life stages combined (juveniles + adults; bottom). Error bars are \pm 2 SE. Bold black letters are between-year comparisons. The letter “S” means the value is not significantly different from the 2013 value. The letter “D” means the value is significantly different from the 2013 value. The solid, black sloping line is a linear regression analysis of the mean CPUE values. The statistics are for these regression lines.

PERCENT BY SIZE-CLASS



YEAR

Figure 6. Length-frequency histograms showing the size-class distribution of flannemouth sucker in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips in the San Juan River, 2008-2013. Solid blue bars represent juvenile fish. Solid red bars represent recruiting sub-adult fish. Solid green represent adult fish.

Bluehead Sucker

Catch Information

Bluehead Sucker were the second most commonly-collected large-bodied fish species during 2013 Adult Monitoring (Table 3, Figure 7). The percentage of the total catch composed of Bluehead Sucker in 2013 (25.8%) was the fourth highest catch rate values observed for this species over the last 15 years (Figure 7). Bluehead Sucker were collected in Reaches 6-3 in 2013 (from RM 180.0-77.0) and were collected in 91.8% of the samples (Figure 7).

Long-term trends for Bluehead Sucker juvenile, adult, and total CPUE riverwide have shown no significant change in abundance indices over the last 14 years (Figure 8). The 2013 Bluehead Sucker adult CPUE value was significantly higher than 10 of the previous 14 years (Figure 8). Despite what looks like marked year-to-year fluctuations, the 2013 Bluehead Sucker juvenile CPUE value was significantly different from only two of the previous 14 years (Figure 8). Likewise, the 2013 Bluehead Sucker total CPUE value also wasn't different than any of the previous 14 years. Juvenile CPUE among both Bluehead and Flannelmouth Sucker has shown noticeable year-to-year fluctuations that appear to be cyclical events.

Length Information

Bluehead Sucker ranging from 90-486 mm TL (mean TL = 306 mm) were collected during 2013 Adult Monitoring. In 2013, the largest mode of the Bluehead Sucker length-frequency histogram was centered around a group of young, sub-adult fish from 301-350 mm TL (Figure 9). These fish have been evident in the yearly length-frequency histograms since 2010 (Figure 9).




Figure 7. A summary of Bluehead Sucker relative abundance in Adult Monitoring collections, 1999-2013. The solid blue line at the top of the graph represents the percentage of all electrofishing samples on a given Adult Monitoring trip in which this species occurred (i.e., percent occurrence). The solid red bars represent the percent of the total catch that this species composed in a given year. Numbers in parentheses indicate the numeric rank for this species in a given year relative to all other fish species collected in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0).




Figure 8. Bluehead Sucker CPUE (blue line) in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips, for juvenile fish (< 300 mm TL; top), adult fish (≥ 300 mm TL; middle), and for all life stages combined (juveniles + adults; bottom). Error bars are ± 2 SE. Bold black letters are between-year comparisons. The letter “S” means the value is not significantly different from the 2013 value. The letter “D” means the value is significantly different from the 2013 value. The solid, black sloping line is a linear regression analysis of the mean CPUE values. The statistics are for these regression lines.




Figure 9. Length-frequency histograms showing the size-class distribution of Bluehead Sucker in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips in the San Juan River, 2008-2013. Solid blue bars vertical lines are juvenile fish. Solid red bars represent recruiting sub-adult fish. Solid green bars represent adult fish.

Common Nonnative Fishes

Channel Catfish

Catch Information

In 2013, Channel Catfish were the fourth most abundant species, 4.7% of total catch (Table 3, Figure 10), the lowest total catch value in the common sampled area since 1999. Channel Catfish were collected in 63.4% of all electrofishing samples in 2013 and occurred in all four geomorphic reaches (from RM 180.0-77.0; Figure 10).

There has been no change overall in the juvenile Channel Catfish CPUE value in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) from 1999-2013 shown by the trend line with a p-value of 0.271 (Figure 11). Prior to 2009, the riverwide CPUE value for juvenile Channel Catfish had not changed significantly for five years (2004-2008). Since 2009, every year has been significantly different than the year before and the year after. In 2013, the juvenile CPUE value was significantly lower than 12 of the previous 14 years (Figure 11).

The 2013 adult Channel Catfish CPUE value was not significantly different than four of the previous 14 values (2003, 2004, 2010, and 2011). Even with the low CPUE in 2013, there has not been a significant decline in the adult catch rate from 1999-2013 (Figure 11).




Figure 10. A summary of Channel Catfish relative abundance in Adult Monitoring collections, 1999-2013. The solid blue line at the top of the graph represents the percentage of all electrofishing samples on a given Adult Monitoring trip in which this species occurred (i.e., percent occurrence). The solid red bars represent the percent of the total catch that this species composed in a given year. Numbers in parentheses indicate the numeric rank for this species in a given year relative to all other fish species collected in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0).




Figure 11. Channel Catfish CPUE (blue line) in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips, for juvenile fish (< 300 mm TL; top), adult fish (\geq 300 mm TL; middle), and for all life stages combined (juveniles + adults; bottom). Error bars are +/- 2 SE. Bold black letters are between-year comparisons. The letter "S" means the value is not significantly different from the 2013 value. The letter "D" means the value is significantly different from the 2013 value. The solid, black sloping line is a linear regression analysis of the mean CPUE values. The statistics are for these regression lines.

In 2013, numbers of Channel Catfish collected did not surpass numbers of Bluehead Suckers until downstream of RM 110.0 through RM 100.0, and then again at RM 90.0 until the completion of the Adult Monitoring study at RM 77.0 (Figure 12). These locations occur between Aneth, UT and Bluff, UT. So, it appears that nonnative fish removal efforts have been successful in suppressing numbers of Channel Catfish in the most upstream sections of the river in which they occur.




Figure 12. A comparison of the longitudinal distribution by 10-RM section of Channel Catfish (expressed as total CPUE) compared to the other rare and common species collected in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) in 2013.




Figure 13. A comparison of the longitudinal distribution by 10-RM section of the various life-stages of Channel Catfish (expressed as total CPUE) compared to one another in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) in 2013. YOY = young-of-the-year (< 60 mm TL); SUBJUV = sub-juvenile fish (61-199 mm TL); JUV = juvenile fish (200-299 mm TL); ADULT = adult fish (\geq 300 mm TL).

A longitudinal comparison of distribution of various life-stages of Channel Catfish shows that adult Channel Catfish catch rates spike below PNM weir, more specifically below Hogback Diversion, and decrease around the Mancos River. Juvenile Channel Catfish become more abundant around RM 140 and maintain a low catch rate until the completion of the Adult Monitoring study at RM 77.0. Sub juvenile Channel Catfish become more abundant below the Mancos River and become the dominant catch for catfish by RM 77.0. Young of year Channel Catfish are the dominant catfish catch between the Mancos River and Aneth, UT, and then the CPUE is greatly reduced (Figure 13).

With the discontinuation of Adult Monitoring sampling at RM 77.0 in the last two years, the ability to use the Adult Monitoring data set to measure the effectiveness of nonnative fish removal efforts downstream of this point has been limited to once every five years..

Length Information

Channel Catfish ranging from 46-560 mm TL (mean TL = 294 mm) were collected during 2013 Adult Monitoring. In the 2013 length-frequency histogram, the largest groups of Channel Catfish were fish from 376-400 mm TL (likely age-3) and young of year fish from 51-75 mm TL (Figure 14). These distinct influxes of young cohorts of Channel Catfish continue to be very pronounced in length-frequency histograms over the years.




Figure 14. Length-frequency histograms showing the size-class distribution of channel catfish in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips in the San Juan River, 2008-2013. Solid blue bars represent juvenile fish. Solid red bars represent recruiting sub-adult fish. Solid green bars represent adult fish.

Common Carp

Catch Information

Common Carp were the seventh most commonly-collected fish during 2013 Adult Monitoring (Table 3, Figure 15). This marks the ninth consecutive year the species has not been among the four most commonly-collected fish species (Figure 15). Only 23 Common Carp were collected in the common sampled area in 2013 (Table 3), of which 9 (39.1%) were adults (i.e., ≥ 250 mm TL) and 14 (60.9%) were juveniles. Common Carp were collected from Reaches 6-3 in 2013 (from RM 180.0-77.0), with 7 being collected from Reach 6, 7 from Reach 5, 6 from Reach 4, and 3 from Reach 3.

In 2013, Common Carp accounted for only 0.3% of the total catch and were collected in just 14.2% ($n = 19$) of electrofishing samples in the common sampled area (Table 3, Figure 15). Of the 19 electrofishing samples that had Common Carp, 16 contained a single fish, 2 had two fish, and 1 sample had three fish. Common Carp juvenile CPUE was not significantly different than 11 of the previous 14 years and was significantly lower than the pulses of juvenile Common Carp observed in 2000, 2002, and 2004 (Figure 16). These pulses of juvenile fish didn't last more than one year and didn't ultimately increase numbers of adult fish in the river. Common Carp adult CPUE hasn't changed significantly over the last seven years and has continued to remain significantly lower than the 1999-2006 period (Figure 16).

Length Information

Common Carp ranging from 115-610 mm TL (mean TL = 282 mm) were collected during 2013 Adult Monitoring. The numerically dominant cohorts of juvenile Common Carp observed in 2008, 2009, and 2011 were evident in the 2013 length-frequency histogram (Figure 17).




Figure 15. A summary of Common Carp relative abundance in Adult Monitoring collections, 1999-2013. The solid blue line at the top of the graph represents the percentage of all electrofishing samples on a given Adult Monitoring trip in which this species occurred (i.e., percent occurrence). The solid red bars represent the percent of the total catch that this species composed in a given year. Numbers in parentheses indicate the numeric rank for this species in a given year relative to all other fish species collected in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0).




Figure 16. Common Carp CPUE (blue line) in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips, for juvenile fish (< 250 mm TL; top), adult fish (≥ 250 mm TL; middle), and for all life stages combined (juveniles + adults; bottom). Error bars are +/- 2 SE. Bold black letters are between-year comparisons. The letter “S” means the value is not significantly different from the 2013 value. The letter “D” means the value is significantly different from the 2013 value. The solid, black sloping line is a linear regression analysis of the mean CPUE values. The statistics are for these regression lines.

PERCENT BY SIZE-CLASS




Figure 17. Length-frequency histograms showing the size-class distribution of Common Carp in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) on fall Adult Monitoring trips in the San Juan River, 2008-2013. Solid blue bars represent juvenile fish. Solid red bars represent adult fish.

Sampling Upstream of the Animas River Confluence

On 12 and 13 September 2013, a 15-RM section of the San Juan River upstream of the Animas River confluence was sampled. The purpose of this sampling was to expand Adult Monitoring upstream to document possible range expansion by Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker into these upstream areas, as well as documenting the overall makeup of the fish community. The lower 7-10 miles of the Animas River were also scheduled to be sampled on this trip. However, very high and fluctuating water levels in the lower Animas River, along with washed out boat launches, prevented sampling.

Ten fish species (854 total fish) were collected during upstream sampling. This included five native, four nonnative species, and one native hybrid (Table 8). The five native species in descending order of abundance were Flannemouth Sucker (510 fish), Bluehead Sucker (179 fish), Speckled Dace (86 fish), Razorback Sucker (5 fish) and Mottled Sculpin (1 fish). No Colorado Pikeminnow were collected. The four native species (782 total fish) accounted for 91.6% of the total catch during upstream sampling. The four nonnative species in descending order of abundance were Common Carp (53 fish), Brown Trout (16 fish), Largemouth Bass (2 fish), and White Sucker (1 fish). The single hybrid captured was Flannemouth Sucker X Bluehead Sucker hybrid.

Table 8. Total number of fishes collected during sampling upstream in the San Juan River of the confluence with the Animas River on the 2013 Adult Monitoring trip.

Species (Status) ^a	Number Collected	Percent Of Total	Number Of Samples Collected In
Flannelmouth Sucker (N)	510	59.72	18
Bluehead Sucker (N)	179	20.96	18
Speckled Dace (N)	86	10.07	18
Common Carp (I)	53	6.21	11
Brown Trout (I)	16	1.87	11
Razorback Sucker (N)	5	0.59	4
Largemouth Bass (I)	2	0.23	1
Flannelmouth Sucker X Bluehead Sucker (H,N)	1	0.12	1
Mottled Sculpin (N)	1	0.12	1
White Sucker (I)	1	0.12	1
GRAND TOTAL	854		
Total Electrofishing Collections In 2013 = 18			
Total Electrofishing Effort In 2013 = 6.81 Hours			
2013 Native Fishes = 782 (91.6% Of The Total Catch)			
2013 Introduced Fishes = 72 (8.4% Of The Total Catch)			
2013 Native To Introduced Fishes Ratio = 10.86:1			
a: (N) = Native species; (I) = Introduced species; (H, N) = A hybrid of two native fish species, considered to be a native fish; (H, I) = A hybrid of a native and a nonnative fish species, considered to be an introduced fish			

Native Fishes

Sampling upstream of the Animas River confluence documented the presence of Razorback Sucker as far upstream as RM 191.0 (approximately 10.4 RM upstream of the Animas River confluence). Five individual Razorback Sucker were collected during upstream sampling. The first fish (425 mm TL) was collected from RM 191.7-191.0 on 13 September. It was a 2009 year-class from Uvalde National Fish Hatchery and stocked on 17 October 2012 at San Juan RM 196.1 (390 mm TL). The second fish (425 mm TL) was collected from RM 186.0-185.0 on 13 September. It was a 2009 year-class fish harvested from Hidden Pond (NAPI ponds) and stocked on 14 October 2011 at Animas RM 5.0 (368 mm TL). The third and fourth fish (418 and 413 mm TL) were collected on September 12 from RM 182.0-181.0 and RM 186.0-185.0 respectively, and were Avocet East (NAPI) pond 2008 year class (405 and 390 mm TL respectively), and stocked on 16 October 2012 at the confluence of the San Juan River and Animas River. The final Razorback Sucker (393 mm TL) was collected at RM 182 on September 12. It was a 2009 year class from Uvalde National Fish Hatcher and was stocked on 17 October 2012 at RM 196.1 (375 mm TL).

Razorback Sucker accounted for considerably less of the total catch upstream of the Animas (0.59%) when compared to the common sampled area downstream (2.7%). In addition, razorback sucker total CPUE was considerably lower upstream of the Animas confluence (0.73 fish/hr) than in the common sampled area downstream (4.53 fish/hr). In fact this same trend in total CPUE held true for all native species, with the exception of Speckled Dace, collected in this upstream section of river.

As in the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) downstream, native Flannelmouth Sucker were the most abundant large-bodied fish species collected (Tables 3 and 8), they accounted for 59.72% of the total catch upstream of the Animas, and 57.8% downstream. However, their total CPUE was higher in the downstream area (97.2 fish/hr) than it was upstream (74.9 fish/hr). Unlike downstream collections however, adult Flannelmouth Sucker were more abundant (74.1% of all Flannelmouth Sucker collected) upstream of the Animas River than were juvenile fish (25.3% of all Flannelmouth Sucker collected).

Native Bluehead Sucker were the second most abundant large-bodied species collected in upstream sampling (Tables 3 and 8). They accounted for almost identical percentages of the total catch upstream of the Animas (21.0%) as in the downstream common sampled area (25.8%). However, their total CPUE was higher in the downstream common sampled area (43.5 fish/hr) than it was upstream (26.3 fish/hr). The Bluehead Sucker age class structure was different above the Animas River confluence than below. Above the confluence, 53% of the Bluehead Suckers we caught were juvenile and 46% were adult, while below the confluence adult predominated (63%).

Speckled Dace was the third most abundant species caught above the confluence in 2013, making up 10.07% of the number of fish caught. This percentage more than doubled when compared to 4.1% in 2012. Speckled Dace were present in all 18 samples upstream of the confluence but were only present in 85 of the 134 (63.4%) downstream.

Speckled Dace CPUE (fish/hour) in the upstream section above the confluence tripled from 2012 (4.1 fish/hr) to 2013 (12.6 fish/hour). Unlike 2012, when Speckled Dace CPUE was higher downstream of the confluence, in 2013 CPUE upstream was higher (10.5 fish/hr).

Nonnative Fishes

Common Carp accounted for 6.21% of the total catch in upstream sampling, versus 0.3% in the common sampled area downstream (Tables 3 and 8). Common Carp total CPUE was substantially higher in the short upstream section (7.78 fish/hr of electrofishing) than in the downstream common sampled area (0.52 fish/hr).

Brown Trout became much more abundant upstream of the Animas river confluence. A total of 16 fish (2.3 fish/hr) were collected, making them the fifth most abundant species collected (Table 8). In contrast, only 12 Brown Trout (0.20 fish/hr) were collected in the common sampled area from RM 180.0-77.0 (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Data Integration

Adult Monitoring gives the San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program a once-a-year snapshot of the entire large-bodied fish community as these fishes prepare to head into winter. This study has a long-term, statistically-powerful data set associated with it that provides an effective tool to help assess the success or failure of several ongoing management actions, including retention, survival, and growth of stocked endangered fish, attempts to increase occupied range by endangered fish, and the effects of nonnative fish removal on the large-bodied fish community. Adult Monitoring also contributes data to assess the issue of PIT tag retention/loss and how that effects the SJRIP's determination of recruitment and overall population size among endangered fish species. It also provides information on recaptured FLOY-tagged fish movement from other studies as well as fin clips from both common and endangered fishes for stable isotope analysis (diet overlap) work.

Adult Monitoring has been used to help assess progress towards recovery by making comparisons between numbers of endangered fishes actually being collected during fall monitoring and numbers of these same species that would be expected if the SJRIP were at or near the numbers specified in the Recovery Goals. This relative status of the two endangered fish species in the San Juan River can be used to make comparisons to the status of these same species in other sections of the upper Colorado River basin.

From 1996 to 2010, Adult Monitoring was able to provide a "riverwide" (Reaches 6-1) look at population trends and concentrations among not only the endangered fishes, but also wild Roundtail Chub, and the common large-bodied fish species (Flannelmouth Sucker, Bluehead Sucker, Channel Catfish, and Common Carp). The truncating of Adult Monitoring, in 2011, to sampling just RM 180.0-77.0 has limited our ability to make "riverwide" statements about the trends among various fish species. Sampling riverwide will occur once every five years to include the lower canyon starting in 2015. It is obvious that the lower San Juan River still plays a vital role in telling the story of certain fish species populations (particularly Channel Catfish) and their interactions with one another. Unfortunately with the adoption of this restriction in sampling, we no longer have population data for common native fish species in this section of the river (RM 77.0-0.0) or comparative population data for Channel Catfish and Common Carp at the time of year we are using Adult Monitoring to "measure" the success or failure of our management actions. In addition, Adult Monitoring data has been used to bolster other data sets and to undertake independent analyses, such as those done for the 1999 Flow recommendations for the San Juan River (Holden 1999), contributing data to the population model, providing data to help determine the effects of nonnative fish removal of native fish populations (N. Franssen 2013 presentation the Biology and Coordination committees and peer Review Panel), and nonnative fish populations (Duran et al. 2013), to name a few.

Rare Native Fishes

Colorado Pikeminnow

Wild Colorado Pikeminnow likely continue to be absent from our fall Adult Monitoring collections. However, over the last several years, it has become relatively common to collect several hundred stocked Colorado Pikeminnow of varying size-classes during Adult Monitoring. While the 149 stocked Colorado Pikeminnow collected during 2013 weren't the most Colorado Pikeminnow ever collected, 2013 marked the eighth consecutive year that > 100 Colorado Pikeminnow were collected during our study.

The collection of 49 Colorado Pikeminnow ≥ 300 mm TL, suggests that there may be close to 1,000 fish of this size riverwide (see Appendix A for details). The 1,000 number is the Demographic Delist Criteria for Colorado Pikeminnow in the San Juan River (USFWS 2002a). The collection of seven adult fish (> 450 mm TL) and three fish in the recruiting sub-adult size-class (400-449 mm TL) proves that recruitment into the adult population from younger stocked fish is indeed taking place. In all, more individual adult Colorado Pikeminnow were collected during all 2013 sampling ($n = 29$ individuals), than were collected in the period from June 1991 to October 1994 ($n = 17$ individuals) when wild adult Colorado Pikeminnow were still present and being collected via electrofishing (S. Durst pers. comm., Ryden and Ahlm 1996). The Colorado Pikeminnow we collected during Adult Monitoring at ≥ 300 mm TL (including sub-adult and adult size-class categories as defined in USFWS 2002a) tended to be larger than wild fish would have been at these same ages (Osmundson et al. 1997b).

Once again in 2013, the large majority of the 147 known-origin Colorado Pikeminnow collections (124 of $147 = 84.4\%$) were fish that had been stocked as age-0 fish. In the past 3-4 years, it appears that better handling, transport, tempering, and acclimation protocols have helped increase scaled CPUE (i.e., post-stocking survival) of young Colorado Pikeminnow through the age-2 year-class. This still hasn't translated into a significant increase of young fish into the age-3 year-class. However, despite this lack of an observable significant increase in scaled CPUE at age-3, numbers of both recruiting sub-adult and adult size Colorado Pikeminnow fish seem to be slowly increasing, not only in Adult Monitoring collections, but also in collections for other studies (e.g., Duran et al. 2013). This begs the question, since Colorado Pikeminnow are a top predator, is this bottleneck at around age-3 a natural phenomenon? In other words, can the San Juan River only support a certain number of fish passing into adulthood in a given period of time, with the others dying off for some unknown reason (e.g., competition, lack of forage at a certain size-class)? Based on the number of adult Speckled Dace and juvenile native suckers encountered during sampling, it would not seem intuitive that this is a bottleneck based on lack of forage at this size-class. However, there may be other factors that are not as evident that are causing such a bottleneck to occur. If such a bottleneck does exist, would stocking more young Colorado Pikeminnow make any difference when it comes to trying to increase the rate of recruitment? Perhaps exploring this issue further with the use of the population model will help provide new insight into this issue.

Colorado Pikeminnow were collected throughout the common sampled area (RM 180.0-77.0) in 2013 with the largest number being collected in Reach 4. During 2013 Adult Monitoring, a small percentage of Colorado Pikeminnow collections (10.7%, n = 16) occurred upstream of Hogback Diversion (RM 158.6). Four of those collections occurred between RM 180.0 and the PNM Weir (RM 166.6). These fish (165-595 mm TL) had all been in the river at least 11 months prior to our sampling, which indicates that stocked Colorado Pikeminnow are now retaining in the river upstream of that barrier. Expanding the range of Colorado Pikeminnow to sections of the San Juan River upstream of PNM Weir was identified as being important to recovery for this species (U. S. Bureau of Reclamation 2001). To date, this range expansion has been accomplished by stocking hatchery-reared fish directly into this river section, as well as providing upstream passage of fish at the PNM Fish Passage. Long-term (multi-year) retention of stocked Colorado Pikeminnow between PNM Weir and the Animas River confluence (RM 180.6) has not been documented yet. However, this is a very short river section – only 14 RM in length. In past years, large downstream displacements have been documented among stocked Colorado Pikeminnow of all age-classes, often within the first few days to first two weeks post-stocking. To offset this, recent stockings have been moved to more upstream locations and have used longer tempering and holding times to help acclimate fish to the river prior to release (e.g., Furr 2013a). Short-term results seem to indicate that this approach has helped stocked Colorado Pikeminnow retain in higher numbers upstream of PNM Weir.

Adult Monitoring data, combined with data from other San Juan studies, indicates that range expansion appears to be occurring in other areas of the San Juan River Basin as well. Eleven Colorado Pikeminnow were collected from Yellowjacket Canyon, a tributary of McElmo Creek from 2007-2010 (Fresques 2007, 2008, 2009, and 2010). McElmo Creek enters the San Juan River at RM 100.5. Only one of these fish (425 mm TL) was documented to have a PIT tag upon capture. This individual had been stocked with a PIT tag at RM 134.9 on 16 April 2008 and recaptured at RM 125.0 on 4 September 2008 (250 mm TL). The other ten fish (ranging from 168-307 mm TL) collected from the Yellowjacket Canyon site were almost certainly fish that were stocked into the San Juan River that had moved up McElmo Creek to Yellowjacket Canyon. In April 2011, a Colorado Division of Wildlife crew sampling McElmo Creek about a mile upstream of the Yellowjacket Canyon confluence recaptured one of the Colorado Pikeminnow (298 mm TL) that had been captured and tagged in Yellowjacket Canyon on 29 September 2010 (296 mm TL: J. White, pers. comm.). In the spring and summer of 2011, 24 individual Colorado Pikeminnow (range = 225-519 mm TL) were collected from the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell, from the waterfall at Piute Farms boat launch to Neskahi Canyon (Francis et al. 2013). One additional individual was collected in the summer 2012 (Francis et al. 2014 In Prep.).

While the numbers of larvae collected are small, they document that successful reproduction has occurred in five of the previous seven years (2007-2013). Twelve larval Colorado Pikeminnow were collected in 2013 (M. Farrington, pers. comm), none in 2012 (Farrington et al. 2013), 34 larval Colorado Pikeminnow were collected during 2011 larval sampling (Brandenburg and Farrington 2012), 5 in 2010 (Brandenburg and Farrington 2011), and 1 in 2009 (Brandenburg and Farrington 2010). Three more larval Colorado Pikeminnow were collected during 2007 larval sampling (Brandenburg and Farrington 2008). Although these larvae could have been

produced by some heretofore uncollected extant wild fish, it is likely that these larvae are the progeny of stocked Colorado Pikeminnow.

Despite low numbers of larval Colorado Pikeminnow being collected in five of the last seven years, there has been no detectable recruitment of these young fish to adulthood. However, it may be extremely hard to detect young, wild-produced Colorado Pikeminnow in the presence of hundreds of thousands of stocked fish. One way to get at that, which has been undertaken by the American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers (ASIR), is to collect scales and fin rays from untagged Razorback Suckers for analysis using laser ablation to determine natal origin. The only way we may ever be able to tell for sure if natural reproduction and recruitment is occurring with this species is stop stocking altogether for some period of time. However, we would not advise this course of action until numbers of both adult and wild-produced larval fish have increased greatly over the numbers now being observed.

Using Program MARK, riverwide population estimates were generated for Colorado Pikeminnow in 2010, using three complete riverwide nonnative fish removal passes (Duran et al. 2011). Two separate models yielded the following population estimates: Model $M(t) = 5,418$ (CI = 4,049-7,549); Model $M(o) = 5,466$ (CI = 4,082-7,614). Only age 2+ Colorado Pikeminnow that had been in the river for one over-winter period were used in this estimate. Thus, these estimates give numbers just for older fish that have survived through a full set of yearly conditions. However, since younger fish are not accounted for in these estimates, the number of Colorado Pikeminnow in all age groups in the river at any given time would actually be higher than these estimates indicate. These population estimates haven't been repeated since that time.

On the down side, we know that Colorado Pikeminnow can be lost from the San Juan system in a number of ways. Stocked Colorado Pikeminnow have been documented becoming entrained in two different canals (Trammell 2000, Renfro et al. 2006). In the case of the Hogback canal, 201 Colorado Pikeminnow were documented as being entrained in 2004 ($n = 140$) and 2005 ($n = 61$). Colorado Pikeminnow have moved into and now occupy the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell (Francis et al. 2013). However, a large (approximately 10 meter high) waterfall prevents their moving back upstream and into the San Juan River, unless inundated in which case Razorback Sucker have been documented moving past the waterfall upstream (Francis et al. 2013). In April of 2007 a Pikeminnow was captured by the UDWR-Moab crew below the water fall at RM -0.5 and released above the water fall, this fish has been recaptured five times since then. This method may be labor intensive but does provide passage over the water fall for native fish. Lastly, a number of studies in the San Juan River have documented negative interactions between Colorado Pikeminnow and nonnative Channel Catfish. These include both predation upon stocked Colorado Pikeminnow by Channel Catfish (e.g., Jackson 2005) as well as Colorado Pikeminnow choking on Channel Catfish and Black Bullhead after attempting to ingest them (e.g., Ryden and Smith 2002, A. Lapahie unpublished data).

Despite various sources of loss, a wide spectrum of size-classes of Colorado Pikeminnow were collected in 2013, up to and including sub-adult and adult fish. Documented reproduction of Colorado Pikeminnow in five of the last seven years indicates that stocked fish that have

recruited into adulthood are now successfully spawning. In addition, Colorado Pikeminnow have been documented using areas of the San Juan River basin where they have never before been seen. Caution must be taken when interpreting these data, because the San Juan River Colorado Pikeminnow population is essentially still a population of stocked fish. However, given that just ten years ago, Colorado Pikeminnow were all but nonexistent in Adult Monitoring collections, their current status (i.e., having thousands of these fish in the river) is encouraging.

Razorback Sucker

We believe that no wild Razorback Sucker were collected in 2013. The 196 stocked Razorback Sucker collected in 2013 marked the eighth consecutive year during which > 50 Razorback Sucker were collected during an Adult Monitoring trip. Like Colorado Pikeminnow, the numbers of Razorback Sucker collected during any given Adult monitoring trip have tended to fluctuate based on the number of fish that were recently stocked into the river (i.e., in that year and the previous year). For example, the previous highest numbers of Razorback Sucker collected during any Adult Monitoring trips occurred in 2006 and 2007 (n = 121 and 171, respectively), when the NAPI grow-out ponds were being drained and large numbers of Razorback Sucker were being salvaged and stocked prior to Adult monitoring taking place. In 2013, 196 Razorback Sucker were captured during the Adult Monitoring trip. This is a decrease from the number caught on the 2012 Adult Monitoring trip (n = 321). However, 89% of the Razorback Suckers caught on the 2013 trip had been in the river for one or more overwinter periods, whereas only 72% of the Razorback suckers in 2012 had been. This was the third consecutive year that >100 Razorback Sucker were captured that had been in the river for one or more overwinter periods. Unlike Colorado Pikeminnow, some Razorback Sucker are retaining in the San Juan River for as long as 15 overwinter periods post-stocking (Ryden 2012). In addition, larval Razorback Sucker were collected for the 16th consecutive year (M. Farrington, pers. comm). The continued collection of larval Razorback Sucker, paired with the presence of older fish indicate that stocked Razorback Sucker are able to retain, find one another, and spawn successfully in the wild. The presence of a few small untagged Razorback Sucker collected by various studies in 2003 and 2004, when no fish of that size were being stocked indicates that at least some of these larvae had recruited to the age-1 and age-2 year-classes during those particular years (e.g., Jackson 2004, Ryden 2004, Golden and Holden 2005, Jackson 2005). Unfortunately, Razorback Sucker of these age-classes have not been documented in the San Juan River since that time and there is no evidence at this time that the age-1 and age-2 fish collected in 2003 and 2004 recruited into adulthood.

Razorback Sucker were collected throughout the common sampled area in 2013 (RM 178.0-77.0). However, most of those were collected in Reaches 6 and 5. Like Colorado Pikeminnow, Razorback Sucker appear to be expanding their range upstream beyond PNM Weir, both via stocking and upstream passage through the PNM Fish Passage facility. Forty-one Razorback Sucker collected in the common sampled area in 2013 (20.9%) were collected upstream of Hogback Diversion. Razorback Sucker from the NAPI grow-out ponds were stocked both immediately downstream, as well as upstream of the PNM Weir in 2012 (Furr 2013b), which explains the presence of most of the collections of this species between the Animas River confluence and Hogback Diversion. The collection of five additional adult Razorback Sucker

upstream of the Animas River confluence in fall 2013, two in 2012, was also very encouraging.

Seventy-five Razorback Sucker were collected in the San Juan river arm of Lake Powell in 2011 and another 72 in 2012 (Francis et al. 2012, Francis et al. In Prep.). Five of these fish are known to have moved upstream (from 147-144 RM) when the waterfall at the old Piute Farms Marina almost disappeared due to rising lake levels in late July 2011 (Francis et al. 2013). In addition, database searches have indicated that at least three Razorback Sucker stocked into the San Juan River in 2004 (n = 1; 360 mm TL) and 2006 (n = 2; 167 and 253 mm TL) moved downstream out of the San Juan River, through Lake Powell and back upstream into the Colorado River, a movement of 477 RM in the most extreme case (T. Francis, pers. comm.). Two Razorback Suckers with sonic tags were detected by two submersible ultrasonic receivers (SURs) placed in Lake Powell, one fish had moved down the San Juan arm and continued down lake past the confluence of the San Juan and Colorado arms of the lake, the other moved down the San Juan arm and headed up the Colorado arm. Additionally, Razorback Sucker have been detected over remote PIT tag antennas in upstream locations of both Chaco Wash (RM 153.0) and McElmo Creek (RM 100.5). Thus like Colorado Pikeminnow, Razorback Sucker seem to be moving into and exploiting more habitats peripheral to the mainstem San Juan River. The detection of fish moving between river basins also shows that habitats once thought to be a barrier to this species may indeed be acting more like a highway.

A total of 979 larval Razorback Sucker were collected during 2013 larval sampling (M. Farrington, pers. comm). This marks the 16th consecutive year (1998-2013) that reproduction of Razorback Sucker has been documented in the San Juan River. The number of larvae has been increasing since 1998 however, the last three years' numbers have been similar to 2013 (M. Farrington, pers. comm).

Between 2001 and 2012 there were 23 capture events with Razorback Sucker X Flannelmouth Sucker hybrids during Adult Monitoring trips. These fish were collected from near the APS Weir, downstream to just above Lake Powell (RM 163.0-13.0). Four of these captures were juvenile fish (240-360 mm TL). The other 19 captures were adult fish (410-510 mm TL). One was captured in 2001, 2 in 2003, 1 in 2004, 1 in 2005, 6 in 2006, 1 in 2007, 1 in 2008, 4 in 2009, 3 in 2010, 2 in 2011, and 1 in 2012. In addition, two Razorback Sucker X Flannelmouth Sucker hybrids were collected in the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell in 2011 (Francis et al. 2013). The presence of these juvenile and adult fish over numerous years points to a low level of successful spawning, survival, retention, and recruitment among this hybrid form. If these Razorback Sucker X Flannelmouth Sucker hybrids are surviving, retaining, and recruiting to adulthood in numbers large enough to document via Adult Monitoring, why then aren't pure Razorback Sucker able to do the same?

It has been assumed that it will take the consistent collection of small, unmarked Razorback Sucker by an intensive, seining-based study such as the small-bodied fish monitoring study to prove that recruitment of wild-produced Razorback Sucker is indeed taking place. It has long been known among Colorado River basin endangered fish researchers that it is extremely difficult to collect early life-stage Razorback Sucker in any of the Upper Colorado rivers, not just the San Juan River. In 2012 investigators from UDWR-Moab reported capturing and releasing

two YOY Razorback Sucker during fall seine surveys in the lower Colorado River downstream of Moab, UT (J. Howard, pers. comm.). Unfortunately, they didn't take any pictures and some wondered whether they had identified these fish correctly, given the rarity with which young Razorback Sucker are encountered.

However, in spring 2013, at least 32 age-1 and age-2 Razorback Sucker (<200 mm TL) have been collected in the Colorado River around and downstream of Moab, UT (T. Francis, pers. comm.). Unlike the fall 2012 captures, these fish were all collected with boat-mounted electrofishing units performing shoreline electrofishing – essentially identical to the sampling we are doing during Adult Monitoring. These young Razorback Sucker were collected across a range of flows (from low to high water), mostly from slackwater habitats along shorelines, although some were collected over low-velocity point sand bars. They also seemed to be associated with instream structure (brush piles, tamarisk root wads, and boulders/rocks). In many cases, these young Razorback Sucker were collected in groups and often those groups were in the same places where young Colorado Pikeminnow were also being collected. In most cases, these young Razorback Sucker were described as being “easy to recognize” as they came into the electrofishing field. The Principal Investigator described it as these fish just reacting “differently” to the electrofishing field than did Flannelmouth Sucker or Bluehead Sucker, swimming vigorously towards the electrofishing boat once they were in the electrofishing field, just like larger Razorback Sucker do and were easy to recognize as being razorbacks because of that fact (T. Francis, pers. comm.). The Principal Investigator who has sampled these areas for years (as well as performing Adult Monitoring in the San Juan River) felt sure that his crews were not doing anything different or special to collect these fish this year. He also stated that he felt Adult Monitoring is sampling in an effective manner to document the presence of these fish in the San Juan River, if and when they are present in large enough numbers to be documented.

Using Program MARK, riverwide population estimates were generated for Razorback Sucker in 2010, using three complete riverwide nonnative fish removal passes (Duran et al. 2011). Two separate models yielded the following population estimates: Model $M(t) = 2,928$ (CI = 1,952-4,796); Model $M(o) = 3,021$ (CI = 2,007-4,940). All Razorback Sucker, regardless of age that had been in the river for one over-winter period were used in this estimate. Thus, these estimates give numbers just for fish that have survived through a full set of yearly conditions. However, the number of Razorback Sucker in the river at any given time would actually be higher than these estimates indicate. These population estimates haven't been repeated since that time.

On the down side, we know that Razorback Sucker, like Colorado Pikeminnow can be lost from the San Juan system in a couple of ways. To date, stocked Razorback Sucker have not been documented being entrained in canals -- although data from two canals in Grand Junction, CO indicates that they do become entrained in canals (D. Ryden, pers. obs.). However, Razorback Sucker have moved into and now occupy the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell. Until summer 2011 it was assumed that the presence of the waterfall prevented any movement of Razorback Sucker back upstream and into the San Juan River. We now know that at least some of these fish will return upstream if the opportunity presents itself. Lastly, a number of studies in the San Juan River have documented predation upon stocked Razorback Sucker by Channel Catfish (e.g., Jackson 2005).

Despite various sources of loss, and the far lesser numbers of fish that have been stocked over the years in comparison to Colorado Pikeminnow (Furr 2013a and 2013b), Razorback Sucker continue to persist and spawn in the San Juan River, producing far greater numbers of larval fish annually than do Colorado Pikeminnow (Farrington et al. 2013). Population estimates indicate that several thousand of the fish now occupy the San Juan River, mostly upstream of the canyon-bound reaches, which begin at RM 68.0. As with Colorado Pikeminnow, caution must be taken when interpreting these data, because the San Juan River Razorback Sucker population is essentially still a population of stocked fish. Like Colorado Pikeminnow, Razorback Sucker were all but nonexistent in Adult Monitoring collections just 15 years ago. Looking at these data through that lens, their current status (i.e., having numbers of adult fish that we know are consistently reproducing) is encouraging.

Common Native Fishes

Flannelmouth Sucker

Flannelmouth Sucker remain the most abundant species collected in the common sampled area, as well as in the 15 RM upstream of the Animas River confluence. Flannelmouth Sucker were the only species to be collected in every single electrofishing sample in 2013. Flannelmouth Sucker are ubiquitous, occupying a multitude of habitat types. In addition, Flannelmouth Sucker of all life stages continue to be collected with regularity, showing that reproduction and recruitment are still occurring. The long-term trend line for juvenile Flannelmouth Sucker CPUE riverwide has shown great fluctuations, but no significant long-term change over the last 15 years. The long-term trend line for adult Flannelmouth Sucker CPUE riverwide has shown a significant decline in this abundance index over the last 15 years. However, the first three data points on that line (1999-2001) are the three that drive that relationship. In fact, those three data points are the three highest CPUE values for adult Flannelmouth Sucker seen since 1996, when CPUE values for adult Flannelmouth Sucker were about the same as what they were in 2012 (Ryden 2004). The CPUE in 2012 was statistically similar to that of 2013. If those three data points are excluded, the long-term trend line for adult Flannelmouth Sucker CPUE is flat over the last 12 years. The exact reason for the marked decline in adult Flannelmouth Sucker CPUE from 1999-2001 is unknown. There has been some speculation that the stocking of large numbers of large juvenile and adult Razorback Sucker (a competitor of Flannelmouth Sucker) could be to blame. However, a small number of Razorback Sucker were stocked prior to 1999 (only 5,100 of the 130,402 stocked to date = 3.91%) when the downward trend began, and most of those were relatively small fish, which PIT tag data shows were not recaptured in high numbers (Furr 2013b, Durst 2013). However, this trend does bear close examination in future years. As a whole (juvenile and adult fish combined), the San Juan River Flannelmouth Sucker population has remained relatively stable and widespread in the common sampled area over the last 15 years. This is the case despite: 1) the stocking of over > 3.5 million Colorado Pikeminnow (potential predators) from 2002-2012 and > 130,473 Razorback Sucker (potential competitors) from 1994-2012; and, 2) repeated intensive electrofishing efforts that are ongoing in the San Juan River.

There are populations of Flannelmouth Sucker in the San Juan River upstream of the Adult Monitoring study area, in the Animas River, Chaco Wash, the Mancos River, and in McElmo Creek and its tributaries (including Yellowjacket Canyon). Flannelmouth Sucker have also been documented in the San Juan River arm of Lake Powell in both 2011 and 2012 (Francis et al. 2013, Francis et al. In Prep.). Based on recaptures of Flannelmouth Sucker FLOY-tagged in the mid-1990s (SJRIP database), we know that Flannelmouth Sucker move upstream at least into the Animas River from the San Juan River. This exchange of fish probably also occurs between the mainstem San Juan and the other tributary streams mentioned above. It could be that mainstem San Juan population is just the downstream end of a larger functional unit and that the fluctuating trends in CPUE (especially juvenile CPUE, but possibly also the long-term decline in adult CPUE values) that we've observed over time are reflective of changes within this larger metapopulation.

Bluehead Sucker

Bluehead Sucker were the second most common large-bodied fish species collected in the common sampled area and the second most abundant in the 15 RM upstream of the Animas River confluence in 2013. Bluehead Sucker were collected in almost every (91.8%) electrofishing sample in the common sampled area and in all samples upstream of the Animas. The Bluehead Sucker population is strongly associated with cobble-dominated habitats in upstream reaches of the San Juan River (i.e., upstream of Reach 4). Riverwide, the Bluehead Sucker population has remained relatively stable over the last 15 years. The long-term trend line for juvenile Bluehead Sucker CPUE riverwide has shown that despite some relatively large year-to-year fluctuations, there has been no significant change in this abundance index over the last 15 years. The two highest CPUE data points for adult Bluehead Sucker were in 1999 and 2013. Unlike Flannelmouth Sucker, the long-term trend line for adult Bluehead Sucker CPUE riverwide has shown no significant change over the last 15 years. To date, the San Juan River Bluehead Sucker population has remained relatively stable and widespread in the common sampled area. This is the case despite: 1) the stocking of over > 3.5 million Colorado Pikeminnow (potential predators) from 2002-2012 and > 130,473 Razorback Sucker (potential competitors) from 1994-2012; and, 2) repeated intensive electrofishing efforts that are ongoing in the San Juan River.

Like Flannelmouth Sucker, there are also populations of Bluehead Sucker in the San Juan River upstream of the Adult Monitoring study area, in the Animas River, Chaco Wash, the Mancos River, and in McElmo Creek and its tributaries (including Yellowjacket Canyon). Bluehead Sucker have also been documented in Lake Powell, as far downstream as Neskahi Canyon (Francis et al. In Prep.). Recaptures of Bluehead Sucker FLOY-tagged in the mid-1990s (SJRIP database), showed that at least some of these fish had moved upstream into the Animas River from the San Juan River. An exchange of fish probably also occurs between the mainstem San Juan and the other tributary stream populations of Bluehead Sucker, as mentioned above. It could be that mainstem San Juan population of Bluehead Sucker is just the downstream end of a larger functional unit and that the fluctuating trends in CPUE that we've observed over time are reflective of changes within this larger metapopulation.

Common Nonnative Fishes

Channel Catfish

Channel Catfish were the fourth most abundant species collected in 2013 in the common sampled area. Channel Catfish continue to be collected throughout our study area (RM 180.0-77.0), being present in > 63.4% of all electrofishing samples. Discouragingly, numbers of adult and juvenile Channel Catfish have shown no significant long-term decline in the face of intensive nonnative fish removal efforts in the common sampled area.

In 2001 (the year intensive nonnative fish removal efforts began), the largest numbers of Channel Catfish were collected in the upper nonnative fish removal section, from RM 166.6-147.9 (Ryden 2012). In 2013, the Channel Catfish population was most abundant in the portion of the middle nonnative fish removal section (RM 147.9-77.0) that we sampled. Large numbers of both juvenile and young adult Channel Catfish were common in samples downstream of Shiprock, NM. Sizeable numbers of YOY Channel Catfish also began to be collected from RM 120.0 downstream to RM 100.0, indicating the presence of large numbers of these small size-class fish (since raft-mounted electrofishing isn't really set up to collect these fish unless they are present in very large numbers).

Strong year-classes of young Channel Catfish continue to be observed in length-frequency histograms in the common sampled area. This points to the resilience of the Channel Catfish population in the San Juan River. Channel Catfish have demonstrated an impressive capacity for reproduction and recolonization that has, so far, managed to offset many of the impacts made by intensive nonnative fish removal efforts in both the middle and lower nonnative fish removal sections.

While the population trends would seem to indicate that nonnative fish removal efforts are ineffective in reducing numbers of this species in the common sampled area, it should be remembered that in the upper nonnative fish removal sections it took several years of hard work in a much shorter area of river to bring numbers of Channel Catfish down significantly. It is anticipated that with the repetition of multiple-pass, intensive nonnative fish removal efforts being applied in all sections of the San Juan River (i.e., enough pressure over a long enough period of time), will make it possible to effectively reduce the number of Channel Catfish in the section of river from Shiprock, NM downstream to Mexican Hat, UT.

Common Carp

Common Carp were the seventh most commonly-collected species during 2013 Adult Monitoring. A total of only 23 Common Carp were collected in 134 electrofishing samples in the common sampled area in 2013. Over the last 15 years, Common Carp numbers have been much reduced. While the exact causes of the large-scale decline of Common Carp are unknown (N. Franssen, pers. comm.), nonnative fish removal could be a heavily contributing factor. Common Carp were numerically less abundant in 2013 than both endangered Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker. Common Carp accounted for only 0.3% of the total catch and were collected in only 14.2% of all electrofishing samples of the common sampled areas in 2013. Of the 23 Common Carp collected this year, 9 were adult and 14 were juvenile. In comparison, during 1998 Adult Monitoring, 77 adult Common Carp were collected in just one electrofishing sample (RM 163-162). If there has been a success story associated with the nonnative removal efforts in the San Juan River to date, it would be the marked reduction in numbers of Common Carp in the common sampled area.

Sampling Upstream of the Animas River Confluence

Sampling occurred upstream of the Animas and San Juan River confluence (RM 195-181) for the second consecutive year in 2013. In both years the two most abundant species were native fishes (Flannelmouth Suckers and Bluehead Suckers). In 2013, the top three most abundant species were native, with Speckled Dace being the third most abundant fish species.

In both 2012 and 2013, Razorback Sucker were caught in this section. In 2013 four of the five Razorback Sucker were adult size fish that had been in the river for one or more over winter periods. Additionally, one of the five Razorback Sucker had been in the river for two over winter periods, stocked in the Animas River at RM 5.0 in October of 2011, the other four were stocked in the Animas River or Bloomsfield, NM (RM 196.1) in October of 2012 (Furr. 2013b). Unfortunately no Colorado Pikeminnow were collected in this river section, although we know they have been stocked both up and downstream of here (Furr 2013).

Common Carp were more common in this 15 mile section of river than what was seen in the common sampled area (RM 180-77). A total of 53 Common Carp were captured in this section, 46 of which came from a four river mile section. When comparing numbers, there were twice as many Common Carp captured in the four river miles, than in the 103 river miles ($n = 46$) downstream of the confluence of the San Juan and Animas River. This could be a possible source of Common Carp contributing to the common sampled area. High water spikes in 2013 could have led to escapement of Common Carp from ponds within the flood plain. Future years' sampling should help to bring clarity to the fish community structure in this upper reach and show how it is relating to Reach 6, immediately downstream.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the many individuals that participated in the field portions of this study from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Region 6, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Region 2, and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources - Moab. Invaluable logistical support was provided by: Ernest Teller, Sr. (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service – Region 2); and Paul Thompson (U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs - NIIP). Permission to use boat take-outs on private land were graciously granted Mr. Buck Wheeler (Waterflow, NM) and the good folks at Hatch Trading Post (Fruitland, NM). Mr. Scott Durst, Dr. Stephen Ross, Dr. Tom Wesche, and Dr. Nathan Franssen provided comments on an earlier draft of this report. The author would like to thank these individuals for their time and efforts in reviewing and helping improve the quality of this report.

This study was approved by the Biology and Coordination committees of the San Juan River Recovery Implementation Program. It was funded under agreement # R13PG40052, (previously R10PG40021, 08-AA-40-2715) administered by Mark McKinstry of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation's Salt Lake City Projects Office. Fish collections were authorized under collecting permits issued by the Colorado Division of Wildlife, National Park Service – Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Navajo Nation Department of Fish and Wildlife, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, and the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bliesner, R., and V. Lamarra. 2000. Hydrology, geomorphology, and habitat studies. Keller-Bliesner Engineering and Ecosystems Research Institute, Logan, UT.
- Brandenburg, W. H., and M. A. Farrington. 2008. Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker larval fish survey in the San Juan River during 2007. American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers LLC, Albuquerque, NM. 51 pp.
- Brandenburg, W. H., and M. A. Farrington. 2010. Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker larval fish survey in the San Juan River during 2009. American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers LLC, Albuquerque, NM. 61 pp.
- Brandenburg, W. H., and M. A. Farrington. 2011. Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker larval fish survey in the San Juan River during 2010. American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers LLC, Albuquerque, NM. 55 pp.
- Brandenburg, W. H., M. A. Farrington, and E. I. Gilbert. 2012. Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker larval fish survey in the San Juan River during 2011. American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers LLC, Albuquerque, NM and New Mexico Department of Game and Fish, Santa Fe, NM. 51 pp.
- Davis, J. E., B. R. Duran, and E. Teller, Sr. Nonnative species monitoring and control in the upper/middle San Juan River: 2010. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 46 pp.

- Duran, B., J. E. Davis, and E. Teller, Sr. 2011. Nonnative species monitoring and control in the upper/middle San Juan River: 2010. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 37 pp.
- Duran, B., J. E. Davis, and E. Teller, Sr. 2013. Nonnative species monitoring and control in the upper/middle San Juan River: 2010. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 37 pp.
- Durst, S. 2012 Integrated PIT tag database summary of Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker in the San Juan River. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program, Albuquerque, NM. 29 pp.
- Farrington, M. A., W. H. Brandenburg, and S. P. Platania. 2013. Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker larval fish survey in the San Juan River during 2012. 2012 Draft Annual Report. American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers, Albuquerque, NM. 51 pp.
- Francis, T. A., D. W. Ryden, and B. J. Schleicher. 2013. San Juan River Arm of Lake Powell Razorback Sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*) Survey: 2011. 44 pp.
- Fresques, T. 2007. Dolores Public Lands Office stream surveys: August 2007. Yellowjacket Canyon – Water Code #38442. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Glenwood Springs, CO. 8 pp.
- Fresques, T. 2008. Dolores Public Lands Office/CANM stream surveys: September 2008. Yellowjacket Canyon – Water Code #38442. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Glenwood Springs, CO. 7 pp.
- Fresques, T. 2009. Dolores Public Lands Office stream surveys: September 2009. Yellowjacket Canyon – Water Code #38442. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Glenwood Springs, CO. 6 pp.
- Fresques, T. 2010. Canyon of the Ancients National Monument/Dolores Public Lands Office stream surveys: September 2010. Yellowjacket Canyon – Water Code #38442. U.S. Bureau of Land Management, Glenwood Springs, CO. 8 pp.
- Furr, D. W. 2013a. Augmentation of Colorado Pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*) in the San Juan River: 2012. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 12 pp.
- Furr, D. W. 2013b. San Juan River Razorback Sucker (*Xyrauchen texanus*) population augmentation: 2012. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 16 pp. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 17 pp.
- Gilbert, E. I. 2013. Small Bodied Fishes Monitoring; San Juan River; September 2012. 2012 Draft Annual Report. New Mexico Department of Game and Fish. 45 pp.
- Golden, M. E., and P. B. Holden. 2005. Retention, growth, and habitat use of stocked Colorado Pikeminnow in the San Juan River: 2003-2004 Annual Report. BIO-WEST, Inc., Logan, UT. 77 pp.
- Holden, P. B. (Ed.). 1999. Flow recommendations for the San Juan River. San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM.
- Jackson, J. A. 2004. Nonnative control in the lower San Juan River: 2003. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Moab. 28 pp.
- Jackson, J. A. 2005. Nonnative control in the lower San Juan River: 2003. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Moab. 28 pp.

- Osmundson, D. B., R. J. Ryel, and T. E. Mourning. 1996. Growth and survival of Colorado squawfish in the upper Colorado River. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO. 22 pp.
- Osmundson, D. B., M. E. Tucker, B. D. Burdick, W. R. Elmlad, and T. E. Chart. 1997a. Non-spawning movements of sub-adult and adult Colorado squawfish in the upper Colorado River. Final Report. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO. 29 pp.
- Osmundson, D. B., R. J. Ryel, and T. E. Mourning. 1997b. Growth and survival of Colorado squawfish in the upper Colorado River. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 126:687-698.
- Osmundson, D. B. R. J. Ryel, M. E. Tucker, B. D. Burdick, W. R. Elmlad, and T. E. Chart. 1998. Dispersal patterns of subadult and adult Colorado squawfish in the upper Colorado River. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 127:943-956.
- Page, L. M., Espinosa-Pérez, H., Findley, L. T., Gilbert, C. R., Lea, R. N., Mandrak, N. E., Mayden, R. L. and Nelson, J. S. 2013. Common and scientific names of fishes from the United States, Canada, and Mexico, Bethesda, Maryland: American Fisheries Society. 7th edition., Special Publication 34
- Propst, D. L., S. P. Platania, D. W. Ryden, and R. L. Bliesner. 2000. San Juan River Monitoring Plan and Protocols. San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 20 pp. + appendices.
- Propst, D. L., S. P. Platania, D. W. Ryden, and R. L. Bliesner. 2006. San Juan River Monitoring Plan and Protocols (Revised). San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 19 pp.
- Renfro, L. E., S. P. Platania, and R. K. Dudley. 2006. An assessment of fish entrainment in the Hogback diversion canal, San Juan River, New Mexico: 2004. American Southwest Ichthyological Researchers LLC, Albuquerque, NM. 61 pp.
- Robertson, M. S., and P. B. Holden. 2007. Retention, growth, and habitat use of Colorado Pikeminnow stocked as age-0 fish in the San Juan River: 2005-2006 Annual Report. BIO-WEST, Inc., Logan, UT. 57 pp. + appendices.
- Ryden, D. W. 2000a. Adult fish community monitoring on the San Juan River, 1991-1997. Final Report. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO. 269 pp.
- Ryden, D. W. 2000b. Monitoring of experimentally stocked Razorback Sucker in the San Juan River: March 1994 through October 1997. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO. 132 pp.
- Ryden, D. W. 2004. Long term monitoring of sub-adult and adult large-bodied fishes in the San Juan River, 2003: Interim Progress Report (Final). U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO. 67 pp. + appendices.
- Ryden, D. W. 2012. Long term monitoring of sub-adult and adult large-bodied fishes in the San Juan River, 2010: Interim Progress Report (Final). U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Grand Junction, CO. 66 pp.
- Ryden, D. W., and L. A. Ahlm. 1996. Observations on the distribution and movements of Colorado squawfish, *Ptychocheilus lucius*, in the San Juan River, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah. The Southwestern Naturalist 41(2):161-168.
- Ryden, D. W., and J. R. Smith. 2002. Colorado Pikeminnow with a Channel Catfish lodged in its throat in the San Juan River, Utah. The Southwestern Naturalist 47(1):92-94.

- San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program. 2012. Monitoring Plan and Protocols. San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico. 53 pp.
- San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program. 2013. Long-Range Plan (May 2, 2013 Draft). San Juan River Basin Recovery Implementation Program, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, NM. 87 pp.
- Trammell, M. 2000. Evaluation of reintroduction of young of year Colorado Pikeminnow in the San Juan River: 1999 Annual Report. Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, Moab, UT. 20 pp.
- U. S. Bureau of Reclamation. 2001. Positive Population Response Criteria for Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker in the San Juan River, Animas LaPlata Biological Opinion. Memorandum from Carol DeAngelis, Area Manager, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, Western Colorado Area Office, Grand Junction, CO to LeRoy Carlson, Colorado State Supervisor, Ecological Services, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 755 Parfet Street #361, Lakewood, CO 80215 (Memo dated 6 July 2001). 18 pp. + attachments.
- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002a. Colorado Pikeminnow (*Ptychocheilus lucius*) Recovery Goals: amendment and supplement to the Colorado Squawfish Recovery Plan. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region (6), Denver, Colorado. 71 pp. + appendices.
- U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002b. Response to public comments on draft Recovery Goals for the Colorado Pikeminnow, humpback chub, Razorback Sucker, and bonytail. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Mountain-Prairie Region (6), Denver, Colorado. 272 pp.

APPENDIX A

How many Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker need to be collected during a fall Adult Monitoring trip to indicate that numbers in the river are at or near the downlist and/or delist criteria for these two species as specified in their respective Recovery Goals documents?

INTRODUCTION

During spring 2009, a series of three workshops were held in Albuquerque, NM to assess the various monitoring studies that the SJRIP currently uses to monitor both fish populations (large-bodied, small-bodied, and larval fishes) and riverine habitats. During these workshops, it was noted that when populations of the two endangered fishes increased to certain levels, it would be appropriate to switch from doing relative abundance oriented studies (such as Adult Monitoring) which use CPUE as their main abundance index, to doing multiple-pass, mark-recapture population estimate studies to obtain precise point estimates. These precise point estimates (and associated confidence intervals) could then be used to tell when the SJRIP had reached the downlist and/or delist criteria specified in the Recovery Goals documents for these two species (USFWS 2002a, 2002b).

The question we were trying to answer was; at what point does the SJRIP make that switch? This topic was the subject of several slides presented during the Adult Monitoring data presentations at those workshops. The focus of those portions of the Adult Monitoring presentations was to identify how many adult and recruiting sub-adult Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker would need to be collected on a standardized fall Adult Monitoring trip (sampling from RM 180.0-2.9 and sampling 2 of every 3 RM) to indicate that populations were at or near the downlist or delist criteria for these two species, as specified in their respective Recovery Goals documents (USFWS 2002a, 2002b).

Our analysis used the age-class and size-class breakdowns specified in the Recovery Goals documents for the two endangered fishes. The original analysis, done in spring 2009 for the workshops, used a 20% capture probability for both Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker. This 20% capture probability came from a rule of thumb (generated by Bill Miller and Vince Lamarra) that stated that during the first electrofishing pass through a given RM, sampling crews will collect an average of 20% of all of the fish (regardless of species) that are actually present in that RM. This rule of thumb had been used for several years, when trying to relate relative abundance data to actual population numbers.

In 2009 and 2010, endangered fish capture data from several different nonnative fish removal trips that, as a group, sampled the entirety of the San Juan River in fairly close temporal proximity to one another was used to make preliminary riverwide population estimates for the two endangered fish species (Davis et al. 2010, Duran et al. 2011). The results of these preliminary riverwide population estimates indicated that the capture probability for Colorado Pikeminnow on any given electrofishing pass was 5% and for Razorback Sucker it was 4%. Thus, the calculations presented here use these newer (and likely more accurate) capture probabilities to answer the question of when do we switch from one study to another.

METHODS

An example, for Colorado Pikeminnow, to reach the delist criteria (USFWS 2002a):

To predict if there are 800 naturally-produced adult Colorado Pikeminnow in the San Juan River using our current Adult Monitoring sampling protocols, I used the following calculations.

- Recovery Goal = 800 adult Colorado Pikeminnow (> 450 mm TL; age-7+) riverwide (i.e., from Animas confluence to Lake Powell = 180 RM) to delist

{FYI: Downlist criteria = 1,000 fish > 300 mm TL; age -5+}

- Using a 5% capture probability (J. E. Davis, pers. comm.), if 800 adult Colorado Pikeminnow are present in 180 RM, then Adult Monitoring sampling (i.e. shoreline, raft-borne electrofishing) should catch 40 of them, if we sample every single RM

$$5\% = 0.05$$

$$800 \text{ fish} \times 0.05 = 40 \text{ fish collected per 180 RM sampled}$$

$$40 \text{ adult fish collected in 180 RM sampled} = 0.222 \text{ adult fish per RM}$$

- But, right now we only sample from the Animas confluence to just upstream of the Sand Island Boat Landing (103.0 total RM) and we only sample two out of every three of those RM

$$\text{RM } 180.0 - 77.0 = 103.0 \text{ total RM}$$

$$2/3 = 0.667$$

$$103.0 \text{ RM} \times 0.667 = 68.7 \text{ RM sampled}$$

- Therefore, with our current sampling regime, we would have to collect 15 adult Colorado Pikeminnow during a fall Adult monitoring trip to be reasonably sure that there were about 800 adult Colorado Pikeminnow riverwide

68.7 RM sampled X 0.222 fish per mile = 15.25 adult Colorado Pikeminnow

Also, the mean estimated recruitment of age-6 (400–449 mm TL) naturally-produced Colorado would need to equal or exceed the average annual adult mortality (estimated at 15% on page 21 of the Colorado Pikeminnow Recovery Goals document; USFWS 2002a).

15% of 800 = 120 naturally-produced age-6 fish (400-449 mm TL) each year in 180 RM.

- 120 age-6 Colorado Pikeminnow (400-449 mm TL) riverwide (i.e., from Animas confluence to Lake Powell = 180 RM)
- Using a 5% capture probability (J. E. Davis 2009), if 120 age-6 Colorado Pikeminnow are present in 180 RM, then Adult Monitoring sampling (i.e. shoreline, raft-borne electrofishing) should catch 6 of them, if we sample every single RM

5% = 0.05

120 fish X 0.05 = 6 fish collected per 180 RM sampled

6 age-6 fish collected in 180 RM sampled = 0.033 age-6 fish per RM

But, right now we only sample from the Animas confluence to just upstream of the Sand Island Boat Landing (103.0 total RM) and we only sample two out of every three of those RM

RM 180.0-77.0 = 103.0 total RM

2/3 = 0.667

103.0 RM X 0.667 = 68.7 RM sampled

- Therefore, with our current sampling regime, we would have to collect 2 age-6 (400-449 mm TL) Colorado Pikeminnow during a fall Adult monitoring trip to be reasonably sure that there were about 120 age-6 Colorado Pikeminnow riverwide

68.7 RM sampled X 0.033 fish per mile = 2.26 age-6 Colorado Pikeminnow

RESULTS

Performing these calculations for Colorado Pikeminnow (using a 5% capture probability) and for Razorback Sucker (using a 4% capture probability), for both the downlist and delist criteria, indicates that the following numbers of fish would need to be collected on a typical October Adult Monitoring trip (i.e., sampling 2 of every 3 river miles from RM 180.0-2.9):

For Colorado Pikeminnow:

To Downlist (Demographic Criteria only): Collecting 19 Colorado Pikeminnow (> 300 mm TL; age-5+) would indicate that there were close to 1,000 fish > 300 mm TL riverwide.

To Delist (Demographic Criteria only): Collecting 15 adult Colorado Pikeminnow (> 450 mm TL; age-7+) and 2 sub-adult Colorado Pikeminnow (400-449 mm TL; age-6) would indicate that there were close to 800 fish > 450 mm TL, with a 15% recruitment rate.

For Razorback Sucker:

To Downlist (Demographic Criteria only): Collecting 88 adult Razorback Sucker (> 400 mm TL; age-4+) and 26 sub-adult Razorback Sucker (300-399 mm TL; age-3) would indicate that there were close to 5,800 fish > 400 mm TL, with a 30% recruitment rate. This would need to occur over a consecutive 5-year period.

To Delist (Demographic Criteria only): Collecting 88 adult Razorback Sucker (> 400 mm TL; age-4+) and 26 sub-adult Razorback Sucker (300-399 mm TL; age-3) would indicate that there were close to 5,800 fish > 400 mm TL, with a 30% recruitment rate. This would need to occur over a consecutive 3-year period beyond downlisting.

Discussion

When should the SJRIP should begin a formal (riverwide, repeated-pass sampling) population estimates for the two endangered fishes has surfaced a few times, which is a tough one to address. In the upper Colorado River basin, specific studies to obtain population estimates (repeated periodically over an extended period of time) are being performed for both Colorado Pikeminnow and Humpback Chub. However, populations of both of these species are made up entirely of wild fish that are known to fulfill all aspects of their life cycle (natural reproduction through recruitment into adulthood) at some level in the wild. Preliminary efforts to generate population estimates for Razorback Sucker (populations that consist of both wild and stocked fish) in the upper basin are also underway. However, data for that effort is not being collected via a separate study, but rather being collected opportunistically during several other studies.

Switching to a population estimate approach in the San Juan River would help provide the SJRIP more precise numbers of fish by species and size-class. This information could be used in the population model to help make future management decisions. Additionally, at some point, the SJRIP will need to switch to the population estimate approach to provide the kind of data specified in the Recovery Goals (e.g., USFWS 2002a). The population estimate approach may help provide a better understanding of the size-structure of endangered fish populations, thus helping inform whether or not the SJRIP needs to stock more or less fish than what our current augmentation program is doing. Lastly, if the same approach is used in the SJRIP as is being used in the upper basin (three years of sampling, followed by two years off -- five years total for a cycle), then the SJRIP could anticipate doing slightly less than two full cycles of population estimates before the Recovery Program is scheduled to end in 2023.

On the down side, population estimate studies (as they are being performed in the upper basin) are really intended to be performed on populations of fish that are completing all aspects of their life cycle. Current research tells us that there are still “holes” in the life cycles of both Colorado Pikeminnow and Razorback Sucker in the San Juan River. For Colorado Pikeminnow, the hole occurs with producing large enough numbers of wild larvae every year that can then recruit into and through the juvenile life stages and back into adulthood. This may be a problem of not enough adult fish, or it may be a problem of survival of enough larvae post-spawning (e.g., egg viability, etc.). Current studies show that if enough age-0 Colorado Pikeminnow are present in the fall of the year during every year (i.e., as with our current stocking regime), some of them will eventually recruit to adulthood, although maybe not as quickly and in as large of numbers as we would like or anticipate. For Razorback Sucker, the hole occurs between early life stages and adulthood as well. Wild-produced, larval Razorback Sucker have been collected every year since 1998 and the numbers of larvae being collected appear to be increasing over time. We also know that some stocked Razorback Sucker are retaining and surviving in the river for long periods of time post-stocking and are contributing to the production of larval fish. There have even been occasional collections of age-1 and age-2 Razorback Sucker in the San Juan River. However, it doesn't appear that enough fish are surviving from age-0 through adulthood to fill in behind the larger juvenile and adult fish that are being stocked. So, if these life cycles aren't being completed, population estimate studies are just giving a more precise way of measuring groups of stocked fish.

The second consideration is that population estimate studies are very expensive to do and they are very resource intensive. In order to do accommodate population estimate studies like those being done in the upper basin (during which sampling occurs literally every day for three straight months – April through June), the SJRIP would need to do a major reorganization of not only how it spends its funding, but also how its available manpower and equipment are allocated. This could lead to the modification or elimination of numerous current study and management efforts, due to budgetary considerations and overlapping timing of sampling. While we feel that it still may be premature to expect population estimate studies to yield all of the information the SJRIP needs, beginning the process of developing workplans, sampling regimes, and a strategy whereby the SJRIP can fund such a large undertaking could be advantageous to the SJRIP in the long-term.