

Notes from Breakout Session #4: Piscicides and proposed legislation SB 1294 and HB 2114

Facilitator: Kirk Young

Question #1) What evidence based information exists in support of responsible use?

- AFS website.
 - Young says we have pulled pages from the website and have emailed them to interested parties.

Comment: Table salt LD50 is lower than rotenone.

- Scott Bonar says this is a good point and that there are hundreds of plants as chemicals and their traces are all over.
- Coleman says we all know that the information is out there but the issue isn't getting solved in the sense of public education. Do we really want to talk about it when it's not an issue?
 - Rob Clarkson says this could be a problem at the medical front when we can't talk as medical professionals.
 - It's impossible for rotenone to reach drinking supply through ground water based on movement.
 - We would need to put things in laymen's terms for the public to understand the issues and studies.

Comment: Rick Gerhart says we need to make sure that we don't overreact. This is one man and one group raising an issue. We need to know that we aren't dealing with a large public opposition/

- Kirk is worried about putting out NIH studies in newspaper for the public to see because they would jump to conclusions.
- Leslie Fitzpatrick says that we have using rotenone for decades. Example is the Virgin River and its treatments. Utah has conducted a series of treatments that went through St. George. This is the latest scare of the month. No one questions the actual risk level because the public view has been warped.
- Clarkson says that the route of human exposure that is being studied isn't feasible.

Comment: Kirk asks if we should try to find a medical personal to study the effects of rotenone?

- Desert Fly Caster says you that you could get your own expert.

Comment: Clarkson asks what underlies rotenone vs. no rotenone?

- Strawberry Reservoir in Utah and the primary water source treatment was successful and the public was trying to retrieve the dead fish for their own consumption. Ultimately the issue about putting chemicals into the water source was never brought up.
 - Brooks and Propst were able to use rotenone in specific areas but were also able to do water quality control at the same time.

Question #2) How can this evidence be distributed to the public agencies and legislature?

Bob Youtz is afraid that if we do this it will be turned around and used against us.

- Kirk wants to know if we would change anything from the Red Rock example?

- Red Rock public discussion.
- No one showed at the Pinaleño public meetings which leads to the question, does the public even care?

Question #3) If the legislation passes restricting use, what will be required to do stream restorations? There are chemicals out there but they aren't registered and it can take 10 years and a lot of money to register.

- Ammonia is not realistic.
- Clarkson referenced the "super chemical" that Dave Ward presented on. USGS says that is could come out in 5 years and ~\$4million to register

Kirk says that he would like to see a study committee and a moratorium on Sonoita Creek watershed while letting the rest of the state work. He also would like to see a more efficient mechanism that works to engage others. This may be as easy as making sure emails are updated and good key contacts are available on hand.

The workgroup ran out of time for the rest of the questions scheduled to be discussed.