1 Colorado River Flow and Biological Productivity in the Northern Gulf of California, Mexico

2
3 Richard C. Brusca¹, Saúl Álvarez-Borrego², Philip A. Hastings³ and Lloyd T. Findley⁴

4
5 1. University of Arizona and Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum, Tucson, AZ 85718 USA*

6 2. Centro de Investigación Científica y de Educación Superior de Ensenada (CICESE),
7 Ensenada, Baja California, México. ORCID ID:0000-0002-7586-8678

8 3. Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, CA USA 92093

9 4. Centro de Investigación en Alimentación y Desarrollo (CIAD)-Unidad Guaymas, Sonora,
10 México

11
12 * Corresponding author. rbrusca@desertmuseum.org. Department of Ecology & Evolutionary
13 Biology, BioSciences West, Rm. 310, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona USA 85721

14
15 KEYWORDS: Gulf of California, Biological Oceanography, Fisheries, Colorado River Delta,
16 vaquita, totoaba, Gulf corvina, shrimp

17
18 ABSTRACT. A review of published research indicates that the Northern Gulf of California is,
19 historically and currently, one of the most biologically productive marine regions on Earth. This
20 high productivity is driven by a unique mix of factors, including: coastal upwelling, wind-driven
21 mixing, extreme tidal mixing and turbulence, thermohaline circulation that moves intermediate
22 waters into the mixed layer, coastal-trapped waves, regular sediment resuspension, and, to a
23 lesser extent, agricultural runoff, released nutrients from erosion of ancient Colorado River Delta

sediments, and perhaps input from decomposing tidal-flat plant debris. It has been suggested that decreased Colorado River flow, due to anthropogenic water impoundments and diversions, has had a negative impact on the health of the Northern Gulf of California ecosystem, particularly by reducing primary productivity and/or stock production of finfish and shellfish. However, there is no evidence that surface flow from the Colorado River is now, nor has ever been an important driver of primary productivity in the Northern Gulf, and nutrient/chlorophyll studies show no relationship to Colorado River flow (or, if anything, reduced nutrient/chlorophyll levels occur during high river-flow periods). And, there is very limited and equivocal evidence to support the claim that reduced river flow has significantly impacted secondary productivity in the Northern Gulf. The marine ecosystem of the Northern Gulf remains rich in nutrients, high in biodiversity and productivity, and appears to continue to be healthy, except for the impacts of historical and current fisheries. Human extraction of shrimp, Gulf corvina, totoaba (largely illegally), and other marine resources, remain very high in this region. There also is no evidence that reduced Colorado River flow has negatively impacted the health of the critically endangered vaquita porpoise, and assertions that it has done so deflect attention from the actual cause of decline—bycatch in legal and illegal gillnet fisheries. A review of Colorado River Delta research confirms that, historically and perhaps as long as the river has reached the Gulf of California, there have been long periods of no flow, or greatly reduced flow to the sea. Thus, the ecosystem is historically adapted to broadly fluctuating river flows and elevated salinities. Although commonly used by recent researchers, measurements of Colorado River water crossing the border into Mexico do not provide a reliable proxy for how much water (if any) actually reaches the Upper Gulf because of the complex nature of internal basins and diversions in the region.

47	Contents
48	1. Introduction
49	2. An Overview of Northern Gulf of California Oceanography and Primary Productivity
50	3. Colorado River Flow and Fisheries Productivity in the Northern Gulf
51	4. The Colorado River Delta – A Highly Variable Environment
52	5. Conclusions and Future Research Directions
53	6. Acknowledgments
54	7. Literature Cited

55

56 1. INTRODUCTION

57

58 The ~60,000 km² Northern Gulf of California has long been recognized as a diverse and highly
 59 productive ecosystem supporting some of the most important fisheries in Mexico. Despite
 60 claims to the contrary, we argue that available evidence does not indicate that the overall level of
 61 productivity has diminished significantly due to anthropogenic-driven reduction of freshwater
 62 input from the Colorado River.

63 Ecologists commonly define the Upper Gulf of California as that part of the Northern
 64 Gulf north of a line drawn between Puerto Peñasco (Sonora) and San Felipe (Baja California)—
 65 corresponding to the Upper Gulf of California and Colorado River Delta Biosphere Reserve
 66 (Reserva de la Biósfera del Alto Golfo de California y Delta del Río Colorado) (Brusca et al.
 67 2005, Hendrickx et al. 2005, Brusca 2007, Hendrickx and Brusca 2007, Lluch-Cota et al. 2007;
 68 see Figure 1). Oceanographically, it has been suggested that the southern limit of the Upper Gulf
 69 can be defined as the region where the vertically well-mixed regime of the water column

transitions into stratified conditions; this occurs at ~30-m depth in summer and at ~60-m depth in winter. Or, it may be defined as the latitude of the deeper Wagner Basin (whose overlying waters are stratified year-round). Geographically, these delimitations differ little from one another. In addition to the biosphere reserve designation (which is also part of a UNESCO World Heritage Site that includes about 5% of the area of the Gulf), much of the lower Colorado River Delta is designated a Ramsar Site (Convention on Wetlands of International Importance), an Important Bird Conservation Area (Audubon Society), and a component of the Western Hemispheric Shorebird Reserve Network.

This review is divided into four principal parts. The first part provides an oceanographic overview of the Northern Gulf of California (Midriff Islands northward to the Colorado River Delta), which includes the Upper Gulf region (Figure 1). Hundreds of papers have been published on the oceanography of the Gulf of California, and evidence consistently indicates that primary productivity remains high and has not been significantly affected by changes in Colorado River flow and that it is instead driven primarily by nutrient input and mixing from a variety of other sources.

The next section of this paper critically reviews published work that has made a case for reduction in shrimp, finfish and vaquita (*Phocoena sinus*) population size and production due to diminished Colorado River flow. We find the interpretations and conclusions of that body of work frequently over-extend the actual data and that the underlying assumptions are often questionable. We conclude that there is no, or only equivocal, support for a hypothesis of significantly reduced secondary productivity in the Northern Gulf due to reduced river flow.

The next section provides a brief overview of water flow and distribution across the Colorado River Delta. We agree with many others that much of the Colorado River surface

water that historically reached the U.S.-Mexico border was diverted or impounded before ever reaching the Gulf of California, and that many assumptions of surface flow into the Northern Gulf based on measurements below Imperial Dam or at the Southerly International Boundary (SIB) gauging station have probably been far too high. Overall, the marine fauna of the Northern Gulf appears to be highly adapted to a long history of fluctuating (and even absent) Colorado River flows and elevated salinities, at least throughout the Holocene. The final section is a summary of our conclusions and suggestions for future research directions.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF NORTHERN GULF OF CALIFORNIA OCEANOGRAPHY AND PRIMARY PRODUCTIVITY

"Thus in both inner and outer regions of the Gulf the hydrographical features are conducive to high productivity. These two conditions, upwelling of the outer basin and convection in the inner basin [of the Northern Gulf of California], can fully account for the fertility of the Gulf without the necessity of considering the effect of the Colorado River."

J. Y. Gilbert and W. E. Allen (1943), based on the first comprehensive study of productivity in the Upper Gulf of California

The Gulf of California is the only semi-enclosed sea in the Eastern Pacific, and it maintains a high net evaporation rate. Bray (1988) estimated the total annual evaporation for the entire Gulf to be 0.95 m yr^{-1} , Lavín and Organista (1988) estimated the evaporation rate for the Northern Gulf at 0.9 m yr^{-1} , and Lavín et al. (1998) estimated an evaporation rate in the Upper Gulf of 1.1 m yr^{-1} . Annual net evaporation - precipitation - runoff has been estimated at 0.61 m yr^{-1} over the entire Gulf (Beron-Vera and Ripa 2002). Average annual rainfall in the Northern Gulf is only $\sim 68 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ and is highly variable (Miranda-Reyes et al. 1990). Unlike some other semi-enclosed seas (e.g., Mediterranean Sea, Red Sea) where tidal mixing is not significant, the Gulf gains heat on an annual average, and it has long been recognized as the only evaporative basin in the Pacific Ocean (Roden 1958, 1964, Bray 1988, Lluch et al. 2007, Paden et al. 1991). Because of heat gain and evaporation, salinities in the Gulf have always been higher than in the adjacent Pacific at the same latitude. In coastal wetlands (*esteros*, or negative estuaries) of the shallow Northern Gulf salinities are even higher. Thus the flora and fauna of the Gulf, particularly the Northern Gulf, have long been adapted to life at high salinities.

Surface salinity at the mouth of the Colorado River (around the large tidal mud/sand islands of Montague and Pelicano) averages about 38‰, and increases to the northwest, with a seasonal maximum of $\sim 39\text{‰}$ in August, and a minimum of $\sim 37\text{‰}$ in December-March (Álvarez-Borrego and Galindo-Bect 1974, Álvarez-Borrego et al. 1975, Bray and Robles 1991, Lavín et al. 1995, 1998, Lavín and Sánchez 1999, Álvarez-Borrego 2001, Lavín and Marinone 2003). Álvarez-Borrego and Schwartzlose (1979) used March 1973 data to describe a winter convection with high salinity and low temperature water moving close to the bottom from the Upper Gulf southward to near Ángel de la Guarda Island, reaching depths of $>200 \text{ m}$ and characterized by high dissolved oxygen. Cintra-Buenrostro et al. (2012) used oxygen isotopes in the shells of the

clam *Mulinia modesta* (cited as *Mulinia coloradoensis*, a junior synonym) to estimate salinities prior to the construction of dams on the Colorado River and found that it might have ranged from as low as 22-33‰ at the river's mouth (Montague Island) to 30-38‰ 40 km southward down the Baja California coast, suggesting at least a periodic, localized river dilution effect.

Surface waters in the Gulf change in response to seasonal (i.e., monsoonal) and long-term (i.e., El Niño-Southern Oscillation, ENSO) climatic events (Kahru et al. 2004, Lluch-Cota et al. 2007). Predominately northerly winter winds are replaced at the onset of the summer monsoon season (variously called the “Mexican monsoon,” “North American monsoon,” and “Southwest monsoon”) with southerly winds that, in the Northern Gulf, create an along-Gulf flow (Bordoni and Stevens 2006). The winds are modulated by pulses or surges that originate in cyclonic disturbances over the eastern Pacific tropical warm pool off Central America and propagate northward into the Gulf (Bordoni and Stevens 2006). The monsoon climate of the Gulf thus leads to seasonally reversing winds that affect surface circulation and mixing (Thunnell 1998). From July to October, prevailing winds blow from the southeast. During winter/spring (December through May), prevailing winds blow from the northwest along the Gulf's axis, with speeds that can reach 8 to 12 m s⁻¹. These winds produce strong upwelling along the eastern coast of the Gulf, including in the Northern Gulf, and around all of its islands, although occasional shifts to westerlies tend to dampen upwelling along the Sonoran coast (Roden 1964, Álvarez-Borrego and Lara-Lara 1991, Bray and Robles 1991). Winter winds create the strongest upwelling, whereas strong water-column stratification reduces upwelling during the hottest summer months (Santamaría-del-Ángel et al. 1999).

The winter/spring northwesterlies bring cold dry air from the western continental U.S., causing local cooling of the shallow Upper Gulf. During the rest of the year, the shallow regions

of the Upper Gulf are warmer than the offshore waters. This sea surface temperature pattern corresponds to the ground-level air temperature pattern. Winter/spring upwelling brings cooler waters to the surface, and this is seen around all of the islands in the Gulf, including in the Northern Gulf where these upwelled waters mix horizontally to lower sea surface temperatures over the region. Year-round strong tidal mixing and turbulence causes an effect similar to constant upwelling around the larger islands in the Gulf (Hidalgo-González et al. 1997, Lluch-Belda et al. 2003). Thus, like many other subtropical coastal regions of the world, the Northern Gulf is highly seasonal, with sea surface temperatures reaching 31°-32° C in August and September, and dropping to 15°-17° C in January and February (Lavín et al. 1998, Ramírez-León et al. 2015). Coastal and shallow onshore temperatures typically exceed these extremes. These more recent temperature observations do not differ from those made in the 1970s (e.g., Thomson and Lehner 1976).

Many of the broad oceanographic features of the Gulf are imposed by the Pacific Ocean (Lavín and Marinone 2003) that the Gulf communicates with through a ~200 km wide and ~2700 m deep entrance. And, much of the general circulation of the Gulf can be modeled as Kelvin-like internal waves of annual period forced by the Pacific (Beier 1997, Ripa 1997). Surface drifter studies have confirmed the presence, for most of the year, of a northward coastal current on the shelf and slope of the mainland side of the Gulf (Lavín et al. 2014). For much of the year the mean speed of this coastal current is ~0.30 m/s. In contrast, on the western side of the Gulf recirculating currents dominate surface circulation due to mesoscale eddies. For three to four weeks, in June-July, the mainland coastal current is enhanced to a mean speed of ~0.60 m/s, with maximum speeds of ~0.80 m/s (Lavín et al. 2014). In the study by Lavín et al. (2014), one drifter moved from the mouth of the Gulf ~1000 km to the delta in this current in just 20 days.

Surface flows in the Midriff Islands Region (Figure 1) are intense, due to large tidal flows through narrow passages and the exchange of water between the northern and southern regions, and consequently this region is distinguished by intense tidal mixing (Argote et al. 1995, Beier 1997, Lluch-Cota and Arias-Archiga 2000, Mateos et al. 2006). A deep, cold, branching flow typically moves north in the Midriff Island Region, with one branch flowing toward the Canal de Ballenas-Salsipuedes Channel over the San Lorenzo Sill, and the other flowing over the San Esteban Sill. The latter surrounds Isla ngel de la Guarda and converges with the other branch in the Canal de Ballenas-Salsipuedes Channel, thus producing a persistent upwelling in the channel (Lpez et al. 2006, 2008, Marinone 2007, 2008). Marinone (2007, 2008) showed that deep inflows at both ends of the channel result in persistent upwelling that creates the coldest sea surface temperatures in the Gulf.

The principal surface circulation of the Northern Gulf consists of a cyclonic (counterclockwise) gyre in the summer (June to September), and a weaker anticyclonic (clockwise) gyre from November to March (Beier 1997, Lavn et al. 1997, Beier and Ripa 1999, Martnez-Daz-de-Len 2001, Palacios Hernndez et al. 2002, Carrillo et al. 2002). As a result, Colorado River deltaic sediments are transported to accumulate in deeper waters to the south of the delta, and also to the west where they create a gently sloping coastline north of San Felipe, Baja California. On the Sonoran side of the Northern Gulf, a submarine channel extends to the 200 m-deep Wagner Basin where many deltaic sediments ultimately end up. At a larger scale, the strong winter-spring northwesterlies result in a net transport of surface waters out of the Gulf and into the open Pacific, whereas the generally weaker summer-fall southeasterlies allow Equatorial Pacific surface waters to penetrate into the Gulf all the way to its uppermost reaches (Bray and Robles 1991, Thunnell 1998, Lavn et al. 2014).

207 The long, narrow shape of the Gulf of California creates a “bathtub effect.” The tidal
208 range (amplitude) is very small at the center “nodal point” (near Guaymas), and increases
209 northward and southward from the center, like water sloshing back and forth in an elongate
210 trough. The tidal range is greatest in the narrow, shallow Upper Gulf where water from each
211 tidal flow piles up higher, like in a fjord. The Upper Gulf is thus a highly tidal region, with a
212 maximum tidal range (lowest low to highest high) of approximately 10 m (33 ft) (Matthews
213 1969, Grijalva-Ortiz 1972, Stock 1976).

214 The earliest Spanish explorers in the Upper Gulf (e.g., Ulloa, Alarcón, Nuño de
215 Guzmán, Consag, Ugarte) commented on the Gulf’s frequent reddish-colored waters
216 which, in the central and southern regions were later shown to be due to large
217 phytoplankton blooms that spoke to its high productivity (Streets 1878, U.S.
218 Hydrographic Office 1887, Sykes 1937). And even though the muddy reddish waters of
219 the Colorado River Delta (the source of the name “Vermillion Sea”) visibly mask such
220 blooms, studies have shown that large plankton blooms also occur in the Upper Gulf, and
221 intense outbreaks of dinoflagellates have been recorded there since at least the 1960s
222 (Brinton et al. 1986). Most of the red silt of the Colorado River Delta originated in the
223 Little Colorado and San Juan River tributaries, which are notable for their red silt load
224 that, prior to the construction of Hoover Dam, was carried all the way to the Gulf (Sykes
225 1937).

226 Since the first oceanographic research accomplished in the Gulf of California, in
227 the 1920s and 1930s, it has been recognized as one of the most productive marine
228 ecosystems in the world (Gilbert and Allen 1943). In fact, today it is ranked as a Class I
229 “highly productive ecosystem ($>300 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$)” based on global SeaWiFS primary

productivity estimates, and one of the five marine ecosystems with the highest productivity in the world (Enríquez-Andrade et al. 2005). It is a eutrophic sea with phytoplankton production on the order of $>1 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ day}^{-1}$ to $>4 \text{ g C m}^{-2} \text{ day}^{-1}$ (Álvarez-Borrego and Lara-Lara 1991, Santamaría-del-Ángel et al. 1994a,b, Gaxiola-Castro et al. 1995, Thunnell 1998).

The high productivity of the Gulf generates 40% to 50% of Mexico's total fisheries production and supports over 50,000 jobs (Cisneros-Mata et al. 1995, 2010, Cinti et al. 2010, Erisman et al. 2011, 2015, Lluch-Belda et al. 2014), the largest producer in the country being the state of Sonora (Lluch-Belda et al. 2014). And the Northern Gulf is the most important region in all of Mexico in terms of fisheries production, where 77% of the inhabitants are involved in fishing activities and thousands of small, artisanal-fishing boats (*pangas*) use gillnets to harvest blue shrimp (*Litopenaeus stylirostris*), Gulf corvina (*Cynoscion othonopterus*), Gulf (or bigeye) croaker (*Micropogonias megalops*), Spanish mackerel (*Scomberomorus concolor*), and smaller volumes of sharks, rays, and shellfish (INEGI 2000, Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2010, Erisman et al. 2015). The three finfish species are all spring spawners in the Northern Gulf and fishing targets their spawning season (Erisman et al. 2015). The average, annual, reported fish catch in the Northern Gulf, 2001-2005, was 18,326 metric tons, targeting an estimated 80 primary species (Erisman et al. 2011, Munguía-Vega et al. 2014). However, it is estimated that Mexico's reported fisheries catch is only about half the actual catch, due to unreported numbers (e.g., illegal catch, bycatch, etc.) (Cisneros-Montemayor et al. 2013). As of 2010, the Gulf corvina catch far exceeded all others in weight, but shrimp exceed all others in dollar value (Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2010). Virtually all of the Northern Gulf

panga fishers target Gulf corvina, and 93% of them also target shrimp (Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2010).

There have been several attempts to model the ecosystem of the Northern Gulf, mainly using the Ecopath modeling software (Morales-Zárate et al. 2004, Lercari 2006, Lercari et al. 2007, Lercari and Arreguín-Sánchez 2009). These have concluded that reducing fishing pressure would increase fisheries stocks and reduce the risk to endangered species such as totoaba (*Totoaba macdonaldi*) and vaquita porpoise (*Phocoena sinus*). Lercari and Arreguín-Sánchez (2009) built an ecosystem model for the Northern Gulf that suggested a viable fishing strategy to protect totoaba and vaquita required a decrease in the industrial shrimp fleet (35-65%), a decrease in the gillnet fleet (52-57%), and an increase of the artisanal shrimp fishery (63-222%) if appropriate fishing methods were to be employed. Morales- Zárate et al. (2004) compared their Northern Gulf model to five other coastal models in Mexico, suggesting a “higher energy use” in the Northern Gulf ecosystem, and that the region has a “highly dynamic, more complex, and probably a more mature ecosystem” than the others.

Álvarez-Borrego (2001) noted that, “Since the times of early explorers the Gulf of California has been described as an area of high fertility, owing mainly to tidal mixing and upwelling processes.” Cummings (1977) reported zooplankton volumes in the Gulf of California exceeded by a factor of two the values reported by Cushing (1969 in Cummings *op. cit.*) for upwelling regions such as Costa Rica or Peru. Although shelf seas are globally a sink for atmospheric CO₂ (Páez-Osuna et al. 2016), productivity is so high in the Gulf of California that Rodriguez-Ibañez et al. (2013) estimated it is likely a net source of carbon, in the form of CO₂, to the atmosphere. Zeitzschel (1969) recorded rates of primary productivity that were two to three times greater in the Northern Gulf

than rates in the open Atlantic or open Pacific at similar latitudes. Hernández-Ayón et al. (1993) and Cupul-Magaña (1994), using data since 1989, reported higher nutrient concentrations (NO_2^- , NO_3^- , PO_4^{3-} , SiO_2) in the delta region than reported for most estuarine and non-estuarine marine environments around the world. Prehistorically high primary productivity in the Gulf of California is recorded in biogenic sediments from throughout the Holocene, and productivity rates have remained high for the past 2500 years (Douglas et al. 2007, Staines-Urías et al. 2009).

Increased primary productivity in the Central and Southern Gulf has frequently been shown to be associated with ENSO events, however, this effect is not seen uniformly throughout the Gulf (Santamaría-del-Ángel et al. 1994b, Thunnell 1998, Kahru et al. 2004). It appears that the ENSO signal can be masked in the Central and Northern Gulf by strong tidal mixing and upwelling (Álvarez-Borrego and Lara-Lara 1991, Santamaría-del-Ángel et al. 1994a, Herrera-Cervantes et al. 2010, Páez-Osuna et al. 2016).

Numerous studies in the Gulf have examined primary productivity in the Northern and Upper Gulf, and *all* have shown the region to be highly productive for as far back as published records exist and continuing into the present (e.g., Allen 1923, 1937, 1938; Gilbert and Allen 1943; Zeitzschel 1969; Cummings 1977; Hernández-Ayón et al. (1993); Cupul-Magaña (1994); Millán-Núñez et al 1999; Lluch-Cota and Arias-Aréchiga 2000; Pérez-Arvizu et al. 2013; Rodríguez-Ibañez et al. 2013). Zeitzschel (1969) noted that productivity in the Gulf is comparable to such areas as the Bay of Bengal and the upwelling areas off North Africa and the western coast of the Baja California Peninsula.

The shallow waters of the Northern Gulf are constantly churned by extreme tides, strong winds, and upwellings to create the most productive region in the entire Gulf. In the Northern Gulf, tidal mixing and turbulence occur year round, advecting nutrients into the mixed layer and generating high productivity (Douglas et al. 2007). Surface nutrient concentrations in the Northern Gulf may be as high as 1.0 μM PO_4 , 4.0 μM NO_3 , and 18 μM H_4SiO_4 (Álvarez-Borrego et al. 1978). Chlorophyll concentration and phytoplankton productivity peak in March and April, and decline to their minima in August and September (Álvarez-Borrego et al. 1978, Hernández-Ayón et al. 1993). The most abundant phytoplankton of the Northern Gulf are diatoms (*Thalassiosira*, *Nitzschia*, *Coscinodiscus*, *Thalassionema*) and dinoflagellates (*Gymnodinium*, *Prorocentrum*) (Millán-Núñez et al. 1999). The main mechanisms and sources of fertilization in the Northern Gulf are: water exchange with the open Pacific (most influx from the Pacific is nutrient-rich deeper waters), upwelling along coastlines and around islands, mixing by tidal currents and turbulence, thermohaline circulation that moves intermediate waters into the mixed layer, coastal-trapped waves, input of anthropogenically derived nitrates and silicates from farming on the Colorado River Delta, and erosion of ancient Colorado River sediments (Cupul-Magaña 1994, Argote et al. 1995, Lavín et al. 1995, Gaxiola-Castro et al. 1999). Decomposition of plant matter from halophytes growing on the vast region of the lower delta (visible in Figure 2 as the brown region below the bright-green agricultural fields of the upper delta) no doubt also contributes to high nutrient levels in the Upper Gulf, although there are no estimates of the magnitude of this contribution.

The Upper Gulf has some of the highest nutrient and chlorophyll-*a* concentrations of any of the world's seas (e.g., Álvarez-Borrego et al. 1978, Hernández-Ayón et al. 1993), and the Upper Gulf and Midriff Islands region (Islas Ángel de la Guarda and Tiburón, and their

associated smaller islands, Figures 1 and 2) consistently show the highest productivity levels of the entire Gulf of California (e.g., Álvarez-Molina et al. 2013, Pérez-Arvizu et al. 2013, Ulate et al. 2016). Cortés-Lara et al. (1999) found chlorophyll maxima in the Midriff Islands region an order of magnitude larger than in surface waters at the mouth of the Gulf. High primary productivity in the Upper Gulf is shown by chlorophyll-*a* concentrations reaching 18.2 mg m⁻³ and averaging 1.8 mg m⁻³ (1997-2007; Pérez-Arvizu et al. 2013). Ulate et al. (2016) showed the Northern Gulf to consistently have higher productivity than the Central or Southern Gulf (annual average 1.7 mg m⁻³, 1998-2010). As shown by Millán-Núñez et al. (1999) and Morales-Zárate et al. (2004), chlorophyll and primary productivity values in the Upper Gulf indicate that it is an area with high autotrophic productive potential, able to maintain a large food chain where there is no freshwater input. There also appear to be no records of severe hypoxia in the Northern Gulf (Lluch-Cota et al. 2010), which is consistent with the high level of mixing in the region.

In addition to having high nutrient levels and primary productivity, the Gulf is also biologically diverse, harboring about 6000 described animal species, over 2800 of which (including over 130 endemic species) inhabit the Northern Gulf (Brusca et al. 2005, Brusca 2007, 2010, Herrera-Valdivia et al. 2015, Brusca and Hendrickx 2015).

We are not aware of any published work providing evidence that a decrease in Colorado River inflow has reduced primary productivity in the Upper Gulf. One direct way to test this hypothesis is to track productivity and river flow over multiple-year time periods, to see if there is a correlation. At least two studies have done this. Nieto-García (1998) compared nutrient levels in the Upper Gulf during one of the largest known post-dam high-river excess flow periods (spring 1993) and a zero-flow period (spring 1996) and found that NO₃ and PO₄ concentrations were actually lower in the flow year (1993). And, when she compared

chlorophyll (from in-situ sampling) between the two periods there were no significant differences (Table 1). A 26-year study (Ramírez-León et al. 2015) of satellite-measured chlorophyll in the Northern Gulf also found no statistical relationship between Colorado River inflow and productivity, and found no increase in productivity during the wettest years. In fact, Ramírez-León et al. (2015) found chlorophyll levels actually dropped in the Northern Gulf during the blockbuster El Niño winters of 1983-1984 and 1997-1998, in comparison to those of 1981-1982 and 1999-2000, respectively, suggesting this drop in primary production could have been due to depressed salinities resulting from higher Colorado River flows during those ENSO years.

Seasonal productivity of the Gulf was documented by Thunnell (1998) using sediment traps in the Guaymas Basin. He found late fall-spring sediment deposits dominated by plankton (biogenic sediments) and summer-early fall sediments dominated by lithogenic material (a mix of eolian transport and river runoff, the former being the main contributor). Measureable river runoff is largely due to the summer monsoon rains, which concentrate on the western flanks of the Sierra Madre Occidental ranges to the east, bringing limited fluvial sedimentation to the Gulf (Douglas et al. 2007). Thunnell (1998) characterized this pattern as a direct response to the seasonally reversing monsoon climate, and Thunnell et al. (1994) noted that the diatom production of the Gulf is one of the highest in the world. In the Central Gulf, diatom skeletons can account for 75% or more of the total flux to the benthos (Thunnell 1998). The summer monsoon rains are the main source of water in northwest Mexico, providing 70% of the annual rainfall and 80% of the surface runoff (Douglas 1995, Anderson et al. 2000, Páez-Osuna et al. 2016). Summer monsoon conditions in the Gulf were probably established at least 6000 years before present (González-Yajimovich et al. 2007).

Currently, with lack of direct Colorado River flow to the Gulf of California (and overall high evaporation rates), the Upper Gulf is the equivalent of an inverse (negative) estuary. Like all inverse estuaries, salinity increases toward the head throughout the year. North of the Midriff Islands the Gulf is shallow (mostly <150 m depth) and well mixed vertically throughout most of the year. As with other inverse estuaries in arid regions of the world, the increasing salinity, and thus density, toward the head leads to pressure gradients, water-mass formation, and sporadic gravity currents in both winter and summer (Lavín et al. 1998). Thus, evaporation and increased salinity throughout the Gulf lead to the formation of dense “Gulf Water” which sinks and flows southward (Bray 1988). Gravity currents tend to occur when the tides and winds are at their weakest. Water is most dense from December to February when the high-salinity water sinks beyond 200-m depth, whereas in summer it reaches depths of only 20-30 m (Carriquiry et al. 2001). The high-salinity water found in winter at the bottom of the Northern Gulf’s Wagner Basin comes from the Upper Gulf, including the large Bahía Adair, having reached there by gravity currents. Indirect evidence suggests that the most extensive gravity currents form in October and November, and this is likely when the relatively hypersaline surface waters of the Upper Gulf move into mid-depth layers as the water cools (Bray 1988, Lavín et al. 1998).

Lavín and Sánchez (1999) observed oceanographic conditions in the Upper Gulf during a controlled March-April 1993 river water release to the Colorado River Delta. The delta region and uppermost Gulf switched from a negative (inverse) estuary condition to a positive estuary, with salinity and density decreasing toward the head and dilution detectable up to 70 km seaward from the river’s mouth, in the westernmost Upper Gulf. Rodríguez et al. (2001) estimated about the same distance for historical (pre-dam) freshwater penetration based on an oxygen isotope analysis of shells of the clam *Mulinia modesta* (in contrast to Cintra-Buenrostro et al.’s 2012 40-

km estimate). Thus, the dilution effect, when it occurs, extends to about the latitude of San Felipe, a relatively small distance into the Northern Gulf and only about 6% the length of the entire Gulf.

Key studies on Northern Gulf oceanography, since 1974, include: Álvarez-Borrego and Galindo-Bect 1974; Álvarez-Borrego et al. 1975; Álvarez-Borrego and Schwartzlose 1979; Bray 1988; Álvarez-Borrego and Lara-Lara 1991; Lavín et al. 1995, 1997a,b, 1998; Nieto-García (1998), Lavín and Sánchez 1999; Soto-Mardones et al. 1999; Martinez-Diaz-de-León 2001; Álvarez-Borrego 2001, 2002; Álvarez and Jones 2002; Carrillo et al. 2002; Palacios-Hernández et al. 2002; Lluch-Cota et al. 2007; and Ramírez-León et al. 2015.

3. COLORADO RIVER FLOW AND FISHERIES PRODUCTIVITY IN THE NORTHERN GULF

“The problems related to depletion of fish stocks and endangered species (such as the totoaba and the vaquita) in this area are the result of inadequate fisheries management, not the lack of freshwater or nutrient input.” D. L. Alles, 2011

3.1 Introduction

Prior to construction of Hoover (Boulder) Dam, large runoffs of Colorado River water frequently (but episodically) discharged into the Upper Gulf of California. The largest river flows were

associated with snowmelts and rains in the Upper Colorado River Basin and occurred May to August, peaking in June (Sykes 1937, Harding et al. 1995, Pontius 1997, Lavín and Sánchez 1999, Dettman et al. 2004, Pérez-Arvizu et al. 2009). Today, however, due to excessive damming and diversion of the Colorado River (beginning with Hoover Dam) almost none of the river flow reaches the Gulf of California except in extremely wet years (e.g., El Niño years). The filling of Lake Mead (which Hoover Dam impounds) continued into the 1940s. Reduced water flows across the U.S.-Mexico border occurred sporadically after Lake Mead filled until construction of Glen Canyon Dam and the filling of Lake Powell, which lasted from 1963 to 1981, during which time practically no water flowed to the Gulf of California. After that, from 1983 to 1988, and in 1993 and 1997-2000, excess water releases into Mexico, through the Morelos Diversion Dam (located in the Mexican border town of Algodones, Baja California) occurred due to flood-flow conditions and release protocols. However, there are no published data on how much of the “excess water” actually reached the Gulf of California. Unpublished surface salinity data from the Upper Gulf, from E. A. Aragón Noriega for June 2000 (pers. comm., Oct. 2016), showed daily mean salinities of ~38‰ – 40‰, implying no river water was reaching the Upper Gulf, even though this was a year of “excess flow” as recorded at the SIB.

The 1980s and 1990s were two of the wettest decades on record in the U.S. Southwest. Cohen et al. (2001) calculated that from 1992 to 1998 a mean of $18.6 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ Colorado River surface water crossed the border into Mexico, recognizing 1993, 1997 and 1998 as “flood years.” However, even in the wet years of the 1980s and 1990s, with increased border releases, much of the surface water entering Mexico did not reach the Gulf of California, but was diverted by a broad variety of canals, drainages, and sinks in the Mexicali Valley where most of it was used for agriculture or lost to evaporation.

The American Southwest has been warming and drying for decades, and at an accelerating pace (Diffenbaugh and Giorgi 2012, Hayhoe et al. 2004, CLIMAS 2012). Analysis of the recent 60-year continuous U.S. Weather Service data for Tucson (Arizona) shows that average annual precipitation has been on the decline since 1991 and has been below the 60-year average since 1997 (Brusca et al. 2013). Overall, since at least 1960, the most consistent source of water to the lower Colorado River Delta of Mexico has been agricultural and wastewater drainage, which has provided ~40% of the total inflows to the Colorado River-Río Hardy mainstem complex in non-flood years (Cohen et al. 2001, Orozco-Durán et al. 2015). Cohen et al. (2001) noted that, since 1960, agricultural drainage and returns from irrigation canals have provided greater discharge ($310 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) than median discharge from the mainstem of the Colorado River ($180 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$) (based on International Boundary and Water Commission [IBWC] data).

During non-flood years, most of the Colorado River channel south of the border is dry all the way to its junction with the delta's 24 km-long Río Hardy, at which point it usually regains surface water due to a combination of agricultural and wastewater drainage from the Río Hardy (and upstream inflow of seawater during high spring tides). The Río Hardy joins the mainstem of the Colorado River about 65 km north of the mouth of the river (near the tourist camp of *La Mosqueda*), creating a small, brackish, largely perennial flow to the sea (INEGI Maps, Mexicali and San Felipe quadrangles, 1993). During high amplitude spring tides (the large rise and fall of the tide at or close to the new and full moons), Gulf waters can often penetrate the river's channel almost to this junction. Thus, Glenn and Nagler (2007) considered the juncture of the Hardy and Colorado mainstem to be the beginning of the intertidal zone of the Upper Gulf. In contrast, Cohen et al. (2001) considered the final 19 km of the Colorado River to be the

beginning of the intertidal zone. The latter is the more accurate because near the junction of the Colorado River and Río Hardy riparian vegetation is dominated by non-native saltcedar (*Tamarix ramosissima*), indicating a fresh or brackish-water environment; whereas the final 19 km of the river is dominated by the endemic marine grass *Distichlis palmeri*, indicating true tidal-flat habitat. And, since the turn of this century, spring tides have rarely penetrated beyond ~25 miles up the river channel due to a large sand bar in the riverbed (see Section 4).

The Colorado River watershed has been in drought condition since 2000, and very little surface water (beyond the annual base allocation to Mexico) has crossed the international border (U.S. Department of the Interior 2013a,b). Climate models predict that the Southwest will continue to warm and dry over the coming decades, reducing the prospect of Colorado River surface water reaching the Gulf of California for the foreseeable future (Christensen et al. 2004, Hayhoe et al. 2004, CLIMAS 2012, Diffenbaugh and Giorgi 2012, U.S. Department of Interior 2013a). Brito-Castillo et al. (2003) estimated past winter stream flows into the Central and Southern Gulf as far back as 1712, extrapolating that low winter stream flows to the Gulf could be predicted for at least the next two decades.

There has been very little written regarding possible effects of climate change in the Gulf of California, and nothing on the effects of climate change on primary or secondary productivity in the Northern Gulf (Páez-Osuna et al. 2016). Notably climate-sensitive species, such as mangroves and hermatypic corals do not occur in the Northern Gulf. Lluch-Cota et al. (2010) modeled the physical and ecological components of the Gulf at three time scales (ENSO, decadal to interdecadal, and long-term trends). They found no significant sustained long-term trend in recent decades for any of the three time series considered. Instead, variability seemed to be fully dominated by the interaction of ENSO and the Pacific Decadal Oscillation. Morzaria-Luna et al.

(2013) assessed vulnerability of fishing communities in the Northern Gulf, attempting to estimate possible effects of anthropogenic threats and climate change, but their study presented no new ecological data related to these threats. Morzaria-Luna et al. (2014) discussed possible impacts of climate warming on coastal lagoons in the Upper Gulf, but their paper, while interesting, was purely speculative, presented no actual data, and concluded with a list of recommended monitoring suggestions. So little has been written on potential effects of climate change in the Gulf of California that even the GIWA (Global International Waters Assessment) Gulf of California assessment chose not to discuss the subject, stating “Due to the lack of data and references, the concern [about climate change] was omitted” (Arias et al 2004).

Climate-change-driven sea level rise will be one of the most important outcomes of global warming. Ruiz-Fernández et al. (2016) estimated sea level rise in the Southern Gulf (using sediment accretion rates in cores from Estero de Urias Lagoon, near Mazatlán) over the past 100 years. They documented increasing rates of sea level rise, from a minimum of $0.73 \pm 0.03 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ at the beginning of the 20th century, to $3.87 \pm 0.12 \text{ mm yr}^{-1}$ during the period 1990-2012. Their estimated trend between 1950 and 1970 was comparable to tide gauge records at Mazatlán. It has been projected that by the end of the 21st century global mean sea level will be 0.26 m to 0.98 m higher than today, with a rate of rise during the last 20 years of 8 to 16 mm yr⁻¹ (IPPC 2013). Based on time series from tide gauges and from satellite altimetry, Páez-Osuna et al. (2016) estimated sea level rise in the Northern Gulf, from 1993 to 2015, to be $2.0 \pm 0.4 \text{ mm}$ per year, which results in a projection of $0.17 \pm 0.03 \text{ m}$ rise by the end of the 21st century. This rate of rise is greater than that estimated for the Central and Southern Gulf (it is four times the rate of the Southern Gulf). The faster rise in the Northern Gulf is attributed largely to greater thermal expansion of the shallow, warm seas in the region. Continued sea level rise at the head

of the Gulf will lead to marine transgression across the lower delta. Low-lying areas will obviously be taken back by the sea first, including Laguna Salada, the Colorado and Hardy River channels, and topographic lows along the Cerro Prieto Fault Line (e.g., Ciénegas Santa Clara and El Doctor).

Mexico's annual 10% share of the Colorado River is delivered to the Morelos Dam at the U.S.-Mexico border. Although the river's mainstem channel continues 150 km to the sea, the river's entire flow is typically diverted at this dam, which is not a storage facility but a diversion and switching station, feeding a complex maze of irrigation canals on the delta. The quality of water entering Mexico from the U.S. was not a serious issue until the early 1960s. But throughout the 1950s, rapid population and agricultural growth in the Southwest fueled ever-increasing demands for Lower Colorado River Basin water. Excess water became scarce and Arizona began pumping saline agricultural waters (from the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation District) back into the Colorado River, increasing salinity and introducing agricultural byproducts. In November 1961, Mexico formally protested that the salty water it was receiving was not suitable for agricultural use, and thus the U.S. was in violation of the 1944 U.S.-Mexico Treaty on the Utilization of Waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande (the "water treaty"), which had committed 1.5 million acre-feet ($1.85 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3$) of the Colorado River's annual flow to Mexico. In fact, the salinity had climbed from 800 ppm (800 mg/l) to nearly 1500 ppm (1500 mg/l). It took more than 10 years for a proposed solution to this problem to be formally accepted.

In 1973, an agreement was signed (Minute 242 of the water treaty) specifying that the U.S. would meet standards of average water quality by building a desalination plant near Yuma, Arizona, to process the water from the Wellton-Mohawk diversion. The agreement stated that

the mean annual salinity of the water delivered to Mexico at the Northerly International Boundary would not exceed 115 ppm (~115 mg/l) greater than the salinity of the river upstream at Imperial Dam (which, in non-flood years, is around 784 ppm). In the meantime, while the plant was being constructed, the U.S. built the Main Outlet Drain Extension (MODE) canal, a bypass canal to carry the salinized Wellton-Mohawk drainage to Mexico's Ciénega de Santa Clara wetland in the southeastern section of the lower Colorado River Delta. The MODE canal began delivering wastewater to the ciénega in 1977, and the wetland grew from ~200 ha (2 km²) to ~10,000 ha (100 km²) (Nelson et al. 2013a). Situated in one of the depressions formed by the Cerro Prieto Fault, the ciénega is now the largest wetland on the delta and has had a relatively stable mean input flow of 4.74 m³ s⁻¹ since the MODE canal began operating (Greenberg and Schlatter 2012, Mexicano et al. 2013, Carrillo-Guerrero et al. 2013, Hinojosa-Huerta et al. 2013a,b, Gómez-Sapiens et al. 2013, Glenn et al. 2013a,b). This bypass, and selective pumping of the Wellton-Mohawk wells and drainage, led to a slight reduction in salinity of Mexico's water allotment to 1245 ppm (still well above the 1973 Minute 242 agreement). The desalination plant was finally completed and has had several test runs, but high operational costs and brine disposal issues have so far kept it from going into full operation. In 2007, Nagler et al. reported the salinity of the Colorado River at the international border to be nearly 1000 ppm (inadvertently reported as 1000 "ppt" in Nagler et al. 2007, Nagler, pers. comm.), also above the Minute 242 agreement. As expected, agriculture drainage returns further increase salinity of the river water south of the border, and Valdés-Casillas et al. (1998) found that at the confluence of the Colorado's mainstem with the Río Hardy it ranged from 1810 ppm to 560 ppm, the latter during a 1997 flood event.

It has been estimated that the Colorado River might have delivered an annual average of $16\text{--}18 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3$ (565–636 billion ft^3) of fresh water to the lower delta before dams on the river were built (Harding et al. 1995 estimated that pre-dam annual river discharge ranged between 8×10^9 and $30.8 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$). And, an estimated 50 to 500 million metric tons of sediment might have been delivered annually to the delta, although the amounts of 135, 160 and 180 million tons are most commonly cited (van Andel and Shor 1964, Milliman and Meade 1983, Minckley 1991, Morrison et al. 1996, Carriquiry and Sánchez 1999, Alles 2011). Montaña (2003), Montaña and Carbajal (2008), and Hernández-Azcúnaga et al. (2014) estimated that the river contributed more than 50% of the total sediment brought to the Northern Gulf, the remainder resulting from wave erosion of the low cliffs and alluvial shores along the coastline of Sonora beginning about five million years ago, when the Colorado River and Upper Gulf probably first encountered one another. Despite the decrease in Colorado River flow into the Northern Gulf, Baba et al. (1991) found no change in the mass accumulation rate of sediments, noting that these are supplied from other sources and from resuspension of ancient deltaic sediments of the Colorado River Delta.

Today, the Colorado River Delta is no longer receiving riverine sediments and instead is being slowly eroded by tides and currents. The main source of suspended sediments in the Northern Gulf today is thus from erosion or resuspension of ancient delta deposits (Carriquiry 1993, Carriquiry and Sánchez 1999, Carriquiry et al. 2001, 2011, Álvarez and Jones 2002, Alles 2011). Most of the seafloor of the Northern Gulf is carpeted with nonconsolidated deposits that originated from the delta, with the finer sediments occurring mainly on its western side and the coarser sediments on its eastern (Sonoran) side (Carriquiry and Sánchez 1999, Carriquiry et al. 2001, Hernández-Azcúnaga et al. 2014). During spring tides, when tidal currents are strong, the resulting turbulence in the water column resuspends and scatters these sediments to such an

573 extent that they become visible to satellite imagery, especially in the uppermost Gulf and Bahías
574 Adair and San Jorge on the northwest coast of Sonora (Lepley et al. 1975, Carabajal et al. 1997,
575 Souza et al. 2004, Hernández-Azcúnaga et al. 2014).

576 Beginning with the Colorado River Compact of 1922, and followed by the water treaty of
577 1944 and its pursuant acts, amendments, and agreements, seven western U.S. states and Mexico
578 have been allocated the delivery of a total annual water volume that exceeds typical flows in the
579 Colorado River. A total of $9.3 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3$ (7.5×10^6 acre-feet, $3.2 \times 10^{11} \text{ ft}^3$) is allotted to the
580 Upper Basin states (Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, New Mexico) and the same amount to the Lower
581 Basin states (California, Arizona, Nevada). The 1944 water treaty guarantees Mexico 1.85×10^9
582 m^3 ($6.53 \times 10^{10} \text{ ft}^3$) of water per year. In both Arizona and California, about 60% of the
583 allotment of Colorado River water is diverted for agriculture. Current U.S. agricultural water
584 prices for Colorado River water range from \$16 to \$32 per acre-foot, whereas municipal prices
585 range from \$300 to more than \$880 per acre-foot. A brief reflection on these statistics
586 illuminates the myriad conflicts that revolve around water usage and conservation in the
587 American Southwest today.

588 It is clear that the quantity and quality of Colorado River water reaching the Northern
589 Gulf of California has diminished, and it is perhaps not surprising that several researchers have
590 questioned the effects of this on the ecosystem health and productivity of the Gulf (see below).
591 It is well established that return of some measure of Colorado River surface flow to south of the
592 border is desperately needed for the delta's riparian wetlands (e.g., Glenn et al. 1992, 1995,
593 2001, 2008, 2013a,b, Luecke et al. 1999, Stromberg and Chew 2002, Glenn and Nagler 2007,
594 Zamora and Flessa 2009, Zamora et al. 2013). The main source of water currently supporting
595 those wetlands is the underlying aquifer, which today derives mainly from underflows from

irrigated fields in the U.S. and Mexico. However, surface flows are required to reduce soil salt levels and germinate new cohorts of native trees (Hinojosa-Huerta et al. 2013b).

The loss of riparian wetlands across the upper delta is well documented; it is an urgent crisis that needs to be addressed by cooperative measures between Mexico and the U.S. The 2000 Minute 306, 2010 Minutes 316 and 317, and 2012 Minutes 318 and 319 amendments to the U.S.-Mexico Water Treaty, which culminated in a one-time release of a pulse flow (105,392 acre-feet; $130 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$) into the delta between March 23 and May 18, 2014, were important steps in that direction (Pitt et al. 2000, Wheeler et al. 2007, Glenn et al. 2013a,b, Flessa et al. 2013, IBWC 2014, Witze 2014, Hodson 2014). However, it should be noted that those protocols are not meant to deliver surface water to the Gulf of California, but only along the riparian corridor of the upper delta (about 98% of the 2014 pulse-water release was absorbed into the water table over the first 60 km from its release at Morelos Dam; IBWC 2014, Zeilinski 2014, NASA 2015). The delta's riparian corridor should not be confused with the marine-dominated lower tidal delta (the intertidal zone) and the Upper Gulf of California, which is the subject of this review. Daesslé et al. (2016) assessed the sources and sinks of nutrients and carbon along the course of the Colorado River on the delta during the 2014 water pulse. They were unable to find evidence for nutrient input into the Upper Gulf from the river flow. In fact, dissolved inorganic nitrogen/nitrates were depleted quickly in the riverbed below Morelos Dam, suggesting a denitrification process and/or significant uptake of nitrogen by riparian and wetland vegetation as the water moved downstream.

Several researchers have suggested that reductions of freshwater surface flow from the Colorado River have negatively impacted biological productivity in the Upper Gulf—including production of wild shrimp (blue shrimp, *Litopenaeus stylirostris*, 65% to 90% of the total shrimp

catch in the Northern Gulf, and brown shrimp, *Farfantepenaeus californiensis*), the endemic sciaenid fishes, totoaba (*Totoaba macdonaldi*) and Gulf corvina (*Cynoscion othonopterus*), and the critically endangered endemic vaquita porpoise (*Phocoena sinus*). The published, empirical studies arguing for this hypothesis are reviewed below. Most of the published ecological work in this regard has relied on measurements of Colorado River surface flow at Morelos Dam (at the Southerly International Border, SIB) as a proxy for how much freshwater surface flow was thought to actually enter the Upper Gulf—almost certainly an erroneous assumption (see Cohen et al. 2001, All, 2006 and 2007, All and Yool 2008, and Section 4 below).

The principal published studies arguing that decreased finfish and shellfish productivity in the Upper Gulf might be due to decreased Colorado River flow are: Galindo-Bect et al. (2000), Aragón-Noriega and Calderón-Aguilera (2000), Aragón-Noriega and García-Juárez (2002), and Pérez-Arvizu et al. (2009) for penaeid shrimp; Lercari and Chávez (2007) and Rowell et al. (2008a,b) for totoaba; Rowell et al. (2005) for Gulf corvina; and Kowalewski et al. (2000) and Cintra-Buenrostro et al. (2012) for the clam *Mulinia modesta* (also see <http://www.geo.arizona.edu/ceam/Hecold/hecolcd.htm>). These studies are reviewed below.

3.2 Penaeid Shrimp

Penaeid shrimp are fished in the Gulf of California by two methods, industrial bottom trawlers (that have a very large bycatch, e.g., Pérez-Mellado and Findley 1985) and artisanal boats (*pangas*) that use small gillnets and have a small bycatch. In the Northern Gulf, over the past three decades, the number of shrimp trawlers has decreased while the number of artisanal boats has steadily increased (Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2009). In the Northern Gulf today, industrial

trawlers work out of San Felipe and Puerto Peñasco; artisanal shrimp fishers work out of those ports as well as El Golfo de Santa Clara.

Four studies have suggested a correlation between Colorado River flow across the U.S.-Mexico border and shrimp production in the Upper Gulf. Galindo-Bect et al. (2000) examined the industrial shrimp catch from trawlers operating out of San Felipe. Aragón-Noriega and Calderón-Aguilera (2000) and Aragón-Noriega and García-Juárez (2002) sampled blue shrimp postlarvae in the San Felipe area from 1993 to 1997 (the latter study also analyzed commercial catch data from San Felipe and El Golfo de Santa Clara during 1995-1998). Pérez-Arvizu et al. (2009) examined the artisanal shrimp catch out of El Golfo de Santa Clara. All four studies used measurements of Colorado River surface flow taken at the Southerly International Boundary (SIB) gauging station on the U.S.-Mexico border as a proxy for presumed flow reaching the Gulf. (Cohen, 2005, noted that the SIB flow gauge is highly inaccurate and has >15% error rate.) None of these studies measured actual river flow into the Gulf, nor did they report salinities in their study areas during the research time periods—critical variables needed to support the validity of their correlation analyses. Thus, there is no way of knowing how much Colorado River water, if any, was actually reaching the Gulf in the years included in these analyses, or if the sampled shrimp populations were actually exposed to fresh or brackish water. However, owing to the field research of Lavín and Sánchez (1999) we do know that in 1993 a large excess river water release reached the Upper Gulf (but it did not enhance primary productivity; see discussion of Nieto-García [1998] below). We also know that some surface freshwater reached the Upper Gulf in 1984 and 1997, but we do not know how much (Nelson et al. 2013a,b; Figure 3a).

The study by Galindo-Bect et al. (2000) used industrial shrimp trawler catch (landing) data from San Felipe and the number of licensed trawlers working out of that port from 1982 to 1996. They calculated catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) by dividing reported overall shrimp catch by the number of San Felipe trawlers licensed each year. They did not account for small boat, artisanal shrimp catch and its steady growth over their study period. They did not provide data on actual fishing (trawling) times, boat efforts, size frequency of the vessels, or locations of actual fishing activities. They did not account for the fact that fishers (both industrial and artisanal) from Puerto Peñasco and El Golfo de Santa Clara were also fishing for shrimp in the same areas (Upper Gulf Biosphere Reserve), and that these efforts changed from year to year. They did not consider probable multiple shrimp spawning events during the fishing season. All of these factors contribute in complex but unknown ways to the annual variation in shrimp catch reported for San Felipe.

Their overall annual shrimp catch data showed a statistical correlation to river flow at the SIB station, both for the same year and for flow during the previous year. However, CPUE showed no significant correlation to river flow, or to number of trawlers, nor to total catch. Galindo-Bect et al. (2000) concluded that the higher overall catches recorded in “flood years” during their study period might be due to brackish water improving the survival of early life stages of shrimp and that decreases in river discharges might have adversely affected shrimp production. While their correlation of border-water flows to overall catch by the San Felipe shrimp boat fleet is intriguing, there are several reasons to question their conclusions.

First, commercial shrimp trawlers in the Northern Gulf are highly variable in their fishing efforts. Some fish only one or two nights at a time, others will stay at sea for weeks. Some trawler owners (*patrones*) keep their boats at sea as much as possible during the season; others

allow their boats to remain in port for long periods of time. Boat and gear repairs, ability to fuel and provision the boat, and health of the crew also create highly variable fishing efforts among the boats. And because a shrimp boat is licensed in San Felipe does not mean it is always fishing in that region, perhaps not even in the Upper Gulf; it only means that the boat must return to San Felipe to offload and sell its catch. By using only the number of boats licensed to operate out of San Felipe, it is likely that Galindo-Bect et al. (2000) did not capture the true CPUE of the fishing fleet. And, the lack of correlations between CPUE and river flow, and CPUE to trawler number or total catch, argue that their method of estimating CPUE could easily have been inaccurate. Increased overall annual shrimp catch could have simply been the result of increased fishing effort and not increased freshwater inflow to the Upper Gulf. In fact, Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. (2010) showed that increased shrimp catch in the Upper Gulf from 1995-1997 was directly correlated to increased fishing effort, and most fishers believe that increased flow in the river argues favorably for potential catch and may therefore expend more effort fishing during wet years. Both overall catch and catch-per-unit-effort for shrimp in the Northern Gulf have fluctuated widely historically, and consistently since the year 2000, even with virtually no river water reaching the Northern Gulf (Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2009).

Accurate catch data for shrimp are notoriously difficult to acquire, and “production data” based on shrimp landings often do not represent actual “catch data” because shrimpers commonly do not offload or sell the smaller-sized shrimp (called *pacotilla*) to the processing plants, or the plants do not accurately classify them. Accurate estimates of catch (by weight or size) should be made on-board the trawlers themselves, where the modal length of shrimp caught may be 15-20 mm shorter than what is found in the processing plants (López-Martínez et al. 2003). Throughout the Gulf of California, interannual variations in shrimp catches are known to

vary broadly. For example, from 1950 to 1995, commercial trawler annual catch by the Guaymas fleet varied from a low of ~3000 metric tons to a high of ~7600 metric tons (López-Martínez et al. 2003), roughly tracking fishing effort. In addition, the prolonged ENSO event of 1991 to 1994 (during the period of the Galindo-Bect et al. 2000 study) led to winter sea surface temperatures in the Gulf that were 2°–3° C warmer than the previous two years due to increased northward transport of tropical surface waters and a concomitant decrease in the strength of the California Current (Bernal 1981, Thunnell 1998), and the effect of these warmer waters on shrimp production is unknown.

Another reason to question the Galindo-Bect et al. (2000) conclusion is their use of Colorado River water crossing the border as a proxy for water reaching the Upper Gulf. All (2006, 2007) pointed out that water measurements at the SIB gauging station, near the U.S.-Mexico border, do not reflect water actually reaching the Upper Gulf, and there probably have been no substantial Colorado River surface flows into the Upper Gulf since the 1960s (except for a few of the unusually wet years during the periods of 1980-1988, 1993, and 1997-1999). Cohen and Henges-Jeck (2001) and Cohen et al. (2001) came to the same conclusion in a very carefully calculated mass-balance assessment of surface water on the delta for the years 1992-1998. In fact, it is likely that there has been little substantial flow into the Gulf, except in the largest flood years, since the mid-1930s, beginning with the construction of Hoover and, subsequently, Glenn Canyon Dams. Subsequent to the filling of Lake Powell (behind Glenn Canyon Dam) during the early 1980s, limited and infrequent water flows reached the delta, and some riparian vegetation re-established (Stromberg 2001, Zamora et al. 2001). Although excess flow releases across the border were recorded in 1980-1981, 1983, 1988, and 1993, little river water could have reached the sea from 1980 to mid-1984 due to the presence of a large sand bar blocking the lower river

channel, which created up-channel floods on the delta (Nelson 2007, 2013a; Figure 3a). And most of the Colorado River Basin has been in a drought condition since at least 2000, and no Colorado River surface water has reached the Upper Gulf since then (IBWC 2014).

All (2006) stated, "...large influxes of freshwater from the Colorado River rarely reach the Gulf. Thus, other factors, such as overfishing in the shrimp habitat are responsible for the boom and bust cycles in the region's fishing industry." All (2006) argued that the water Galindo-Bect et al. (2000) had assumed flowed to the sea was actually impounded upstream by various diversions in Mexico, including the huge evaporative basin of Laguna Salada (which is at least 11 m below sea level at its lowest point), and most of it never reached the Gulf (see comments on Laguna Salada in Section 4 below). The view that Laguna Salada, and other low basins, have historically captured much or most of the water from the Colorado River Delta during flood years is corroborated by Sykes (1937), Luecke et al. (1999), Cohen and Henges-Jeck (2001), and Cohen et al. (2001), and is revealed in satellite imagery (e.g., Figure 3a). This may help explain why Galindo-Bect et al. (2000) found no correlation between river flow and catch-per-unit-effort during their study period. However, in at least one of the years of the Galindo-Bect (2000) study, 1993, substantial Colorado River flow did reach the Gulf (Lavín and Sánchez 1999, Nelson et al. 2013a,b).

Other than the detailed historic research by Godfrey Sykes from 1890 to 1935 (Sykes 1937; see below), no long-term or sustained records of Colorado River flow south of the border are available, so we have no way to reconstruct the actual history of that flow into the Gulf, other than indirectly, as All (2006) did. A flow gauging station once existed on the river channel south of the border, at El Marítimo, but it was destroyed by the 1983-84 El Niño floods, and Cohen et al. (2001) judged data from that station to be inaccurate anyway for multiple reasons anyway.

Glenn et al. (2007) published a rebuttal to the All (2006) paper, and All (2007) responded to it. All's response was thorough, but perhaps the most important point he addressed was the claim in the Glenn et al. (2007) rebuttal that Laguna Salada was simply too small to account for the capture of the volume of water crossing the border, and, therefore, the excess must have reached the Upper Gulf. But Glenn et al. (2007), based on an unpublished, undated, online report by Compeán-Jiménez et al. (ca. 1981), used a surface area of only $\sim 400 \text{ km}^2$ (40,700 ha) for Laguna Salada, which is far too small. Further, the Glenn et al. (2007) rebuttal to All's (2006) paper calculated the "evaporative capacity" of Laguna Salada based on a surface size of just 220 km^2 , suggesting that (in 1993) the lake would have lost $0.3 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3$ of water to evaporation (7% of the 1993 flow). However, based on a review of multiple sources of information, All's estimate for Laguna Salada's area of 1000 km^2 appears fundamentally accurate (see Section 4, below). Further complicating the story is Nelson's (2003a) estimate that flow into Laguna Salada might have ceased around 1986, which would suggest that the first 4 or 5 years of the Galindo-Bect (2000) study was during a period when the river could flow into Laguna Salada, while an unknown number of the remaining 10 years might have been a period when the river flow did not divert into the laguna. However, Cohen et al. (2001) found standing water in Laguna Salada in the years 1993, 1997 and 1998 (using LANDSAT satellite imagery). And, Valdés-Casillas et al. (1998) reported Laguna Salada holding water in 1997.

In the second study examining the relationship of Colorado River flow to shrimp productivity, Aragón-Noriega and Calderón-Aguilera (2000) took shallow-water samples of blue shrimp postlarvae in the San Felipe area for 5 years, 1993-1997. Two of those years had excess Colorado River flow past the SIB (1993, 1997); the other three did not. They reported a weak, but positive correlation between SIB release flow and postlarval abundance, which was highest

in the two flood years, 1993 and 1997. They suggested that this observation could indicate a preference by postlarvae for lower salinity water or, because shrimp use this same area as a nursery every year even when there is no freshwater flow, a preference for the “taste” of the river water (e.g., Mair et al. 1982). However, they did not report salinity values in their survey area for any of the years of their study.

Aragón-Noriega and García-Juárez (2002) reanalyzed those blue shrimp postlarvae data from the San Felipe area (1993 to 1997), plus they obtained commercial catch data for the ports of San Felipe and El Golfo de Santa Clara from 1995 to 1998. Only artisanal (*panga*) catch data were used, thus the shrimp catches were from areas near those two ports. They also used Colorado River flow data based on SIB release flow. Although they claimed to have taken salinity from the San Felipe area during their postlarvae sampling (the same sampling as the Aragón-Noriega and Calderón-Aguilera 2000 study), no salinity data were reported in their paper and none have been recoverable by Aragón-Noriega (pers. comm., October 2016). Thus, there is no way of knowing how much, if any, Morelos Dam release water reached the Gulf of California during their study period. The largest postlarval abundances found were in 1993 (43.6 larvae/m³) when river flow at SIB exceeded 300 m³ s⁻¹, and 1997 (47.7 larvae/m³) when that flow barely exceeded 100 m³ s⁻¹. Thus the 1993 flow was nearly three times the volume of the 1997 flow, yet 1997 showed higher postlarval abundance. This suggests no clear relationship between river flow (at Morelos Dam) and postlarval abundance in the Upper Gulf. The highest average catch-per-unit-effort (kilograms shrimp per fishing day) was in 1997 and 1998 (21.5 kilograms shrimp per fishing day in both cases), but 1997 had a river flow of only 116 m³ s⁻¹, whereas 1998 had a river flow of 208 m³ s⁻¹. This suggests that there is no clear relationship between river flow and catch. Their statistical support for a relationship between catch and SIB

river flow over the 5 years of the study was very low. Aragón-Noriega and García-Juárez (2002) concluded that their data suggest there is a “threshold” at which river flow enhanced reproduction in blue shrimp in the Upper Gulf, and speculated that threshold to be $100 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$. However, their data set is too limited to lend strong support for such a hypothesis, and their reliance on border water release and not river water actually reaching the Gulf, as well as the absence of salinity data for the Upper Gulf during their sampling period, renders this conclusion circumspect.

The Aragón-Noriega and Calderón-Aguilera (2000) and the Aragón-Noriega and García-Juárez (2002) papers used the same postlarvae sampling data (Aragón-Noriega, pers. comm., October 2016). However, this is not mentioned in either paper and neither paper cites the other. Furthermore, different conclusions were reached in the two papers, and neither study had strong statistical support. The data set analyzed for postlarval abundance, in both cases, comprised only 5 data points (total catch for each of 5 years), as they did not analyze monthly postlarvae abundance samples independently, but rather combined April through November, even though river flow would likely not have peaked until June, thus reducing the ability to identify a cause-effect relationship between flow and larval abundance.

Pérez-Arvizu et al. (2009) undertook a study similar to that of Galindo-Bect et al. (2000), but instead of using data gleaned from commercial shrimp trawlers from San Felipe they used artisanal (*panga*) catch data from El Golfo de Santa Clara (1995-2002) to estimate total catch and CPUE, the latter calculated on the basis of shrimp kg/day/panga . Artisanal fishers do not travel far from their home port and the Pérez-Arvizu et al. (2009) catch data are probably a more accurate estimate of regional catch than were the data used by Galindo-Bect et al. (2000). As with other studies, they used the SIB flow measurements as proxy for river flow entering the

Upper Gulf, although they acknowledged that the amount of water that actually reached the Gulf was unknown. During their study period, 97% of the catch from artisanal fishing consisted of blue shrimp. They also counted shrimp postlarvae in plankton samples (1993-1997) from the San Felipe and El Golfo de Santa Clara areas.

Pérez-Arvizu et al. (2009) concluded that “total catch apparently has a linear relationship with river outflow” and when flow increased there was an increase in shrimp catch during the following season, except for 2002 when CPUE increased but SIB flow did not. However, examination of their Figures 5 and 6 do not support this claim. For example, in addition to the 2002 anomaly (when flow was very low but CPUE high), river flow increased in 1997 and again in 1998, and while CPUE increased in 1997 it did not in 1998. In 1999 river flow decreased, but CPUE remained the same (at the 1998 level), and in 1996 there was no excess flow at all but in 1997 shrimp catches went up and CPUE was the highest in their dataset. Total catch showed similar anomalies in the pattern of flow versus catch (e.g., 1992 had almost no flow, but shrimp catch increased greatly in 1993). They found the highest postlarvae abundance during years when the average river outflow exceeded $80 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$, and the lowest abundance when the river flow was below this level. However, the relationship between postlarvae abundance and flow was not linear. For example, the flow in 1993 exceeded $300 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$, yet abundance was the same as in 1997 when the flow barely exceeded $80 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$. They concluded that a limit of $100 \text{ m}^3\text{s}^{-1}$ may be necessary to promote shrimp breeding conditions, and that this might be accomplished by an “increase in habitat volume” (although what this means is not explained).

It is well known that the highly productive wild-catch shrimp fishery, extending southward from the Upper Gulf along the coast of Sonora (the Northern and Central Gulf regions), does not rely on freshwater river inputs and true (positive, hyposaline) estuaries. No

stage of shrimp development in this area requires brackish water. In this region, shrimp postlarvae migrate into hypersaline lagoons (*lagunas*), negative estuaries (*esteros*), or simply coastal shallows; they generally leave these shallows as juveniles and migrate to offshore waters. In the Colorado River Delta region, shrimp use coastal shallows as nursery areas to pass through their postlarva-juvenile stages (Castillo-Moreno 1999, Aragón-Noriega and Calderón-Aguilera 2001, Ramírez-Royo and Aragón-Noriega 2006). In a thorough study of shrimp larvae/postlarvae in the Upper Gulf, Galindo-Bect et al. (2010) described spawning areas along the coast of Sonora (notably off Punta Borrascoso and in Bahía Adair), and nursery areas near the towns of El Golfo de Santa Clara and San Felipe. Aragón-Noriega et al. (1999) also found the Borrascoso-Adair corridor to be the most important spawning site for blue shrimp. Many commercially important fishes spawn there as well, including spotted sand bass (*Paralabrax maculatofasciatus*), bronzestriped grunt (*Orthopristis reddingi*), amarillo snapper (*Lutjanus argentiventris*), Gulf grouper or baya (*Mycteroperca jordani*), Cortez halibut (*Paralichthys aestuarius*), striped and white mullets (*Mugil cephalus*, *M. curema*), Gulf coney (*Hyporthodus acanthistius*), and totoaba (*Totoaba macdonaldi*) (Hastings and Findley 2007, Turk-Boyer et al. 2014).

There has been no appreciable perennial fresh water entering the Gulf from rivers in central-northern Sonora and Baja California (aside from the Colorado River) since the late Pleistocene, so Northern and Central Gulf of California shrimp are well adapted to using hypersaline lagoons, esteros, and coastal shallows as nursery areas (López 1968, García-Borbón et al. 1996, Leal-Gaxiola et al. 2001, Romero-Sedano et al. 2004, Ramírez-Royo and Aragón-Noriega 2006).

Like blue shrimp, brown (=yellowleg) shrimp in the Gulf also do not require coastal lagoons to complete their life cycle and they can be found in breeding condition in both the open

sea and in high-salinity esteros throughout the Gulf (Ramírez-Rojo and Aragón-Noriega 2006, Valenzuela-Quiñónez et al. 2006, Manzano-Sarabia et al. 2007). Morales-Bojórquez et al. (2013) showed that the life cycle of brown shrimp can be entirely completed in either hypersaline lagoons or in the open marine environment over the continental shelf. In hypersaline Laguna (Bahía) Agiabampo, on the Sonora-Sinaloa border, brown shrimp breeding peaks in summer, when water temperatures and salinities are at their maxima (Romero-Sedano et al. 2004, Valenzuela-Quiñónez et al. 2006). Valenzuela-Quiñónez et al. (2006) found no evidence of an offshore migration from Laguna Agiabampo when mature brown shrimp reached spawning length, and also showed that the species can complete its full life cycle in this hypersaline lagoon system. Salinity in the Northern Gulf's esteros is always high, and in summer it commonly exceeds 40‰. Penaeid shrimp in the Northern and Central Gulf are clearly adapted to high salinities. These and other studies (Snyder-Conn and Brusca 1977, Leal-Gaxiola et al. 2001, Calderón-Aguilera et al. 2003, Romero-Sedano et al. 2004, Valenzuela-Quiñónez et al. 2006) have also shown that both blue shrimp and brown shrimp breed throughout the year (in both Sinaloa and Sonora), usually with two seasonal peaks.

The orthodox life-cycle model of penaeid shrimp envisions them requiring fresh or brackish-water "nurseries" as they grow from postlarvae to juveniles. However, this model, developed in the 1970s, was based on areas other than the Gulf of California, and it is now well known that Northern and Central Gulf of California shrimp do not follow this model and do not require (and perhaps do not prefer) brackish water habitats for their nurseries. As Romero-Sedano et al. (2004) noted, "In arid lagoons with permanent connection to the sea and negative estuarine circulation, penaeid shrimp develop a particular life cycle that differs from that accepted for the general shrimp ecology." Leal-Gaxiola et al. (2001) came to the same

conclusion, their studies showing that brown shrimp in the Gulf do not depend on coastal lagoons and may not enter them at all during their early life history stages. In contrast, shrimp in the Southern Gulf do use brackish lagoons as nurseries when they are available, although the relationship of salinity gradients to their onshore migration is not strong (e.g., Mair 1980, Mair et al. 1982, Félix-Ortiz et al. 2014).

3.3 Sciaenid Fishes

Totoaba and Gulf corvina, both endemic to the Gulf of California, belong to the family Sciaenidae—the corvinas, drums and croakers—many of which are high-level predatory fishes. Several species are aggregate spawners, making them highly susceptible to overfishing (Erisman et al. 2010). Totoaba is the largest of more than 290 described species of sciaenids (Huddleston and Takeuchi 1980, Hastings et al. 2014). It ranges from the Colorado River Delta to the mouth of the Río Fuerte (Sinaloa) and at least to Bahía Concepción (Baja California Sur) (Findley 2010, Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. 2011, 2014, 2015, 2016). Totoaba spawns in the Upper Gulf from late winter to early spring. Juveniles spend 2-3 years in the Upper Gulf before migrating south in the fall. Both adults and subadults appear to spend summers in the cool, rich waters of the Midriff Islands region before moving on southward in the fall. In winter they migrate northward again. While adults migrate into the Upper Gulf for spawning, juveniles tend to linger in the Midriff Islands region (Jordan and Evermann 1898, Berdegúé 1955, Cisneros-Mata et al. 1995, Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. 2014, 2015). Sport and artisanal fishers still take totoaba from its southern range localities, though not commonly.

A commercial totoaba fishery started in the late 1920s, relying on take in the Upper Gulf during the species' spawning period. It was the first important commercial fishery in the Gulf and was the impetus for establishing fish camps that later evolved into the Upper Gulf towns of San Felipe and El Golfo de Santa Clara (Bahre et al. 2000, Hastings and Findley 2007). Before the 1930s, the totoaba fishery was almost solely directed to the export of their dried swim bladders (=gas bladders, *buche*) to China (Chute 1928, 1930). From 1935 to 1945, totoaba fishing expanded to become one of the most important sport and commercial fisheries in the Gulf, with total annual commercial landings, from a 4-month fishing season, peaking at 2300 metric tons (Rosales-Juárez and Ramírez-González 1987, Márquez-Farías and Rosales-Juárez 2013). The commercial fishery reached its maximum yield in the early 1940s, and between then and 1975 the species was thought to be greatly depleted due to overfishing (Márquez-Farías and Rosales-Juárez 2013, CITES 2015) although actual population size estimates did not exist. Commercial catch in 1975 was down to 52 tons (Valenzuela-Quíñoz et al. 2014). A complete moratorium (*veda permanente*) on totoaba fishing was enacted by the Mexican government in 1975, in 1976 the species was listed in Appendix II of CITES, and in 1979 it was added to the U.S. list of endangered species (Barrera-Guevara 1990, CITES 2015). Today, totoaba is nominally protected by Mexico's NOM-ECOL-059-94 and ranked as endangered (Findley 2010, Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al 2015).

Totoaba catch began to decline after the building of Hoover Dam, and an inference was thus made that the reduction of freshwater inflow from the Colorado River was perhaps damaging the population (Flanagan and Hendrickson 1976, Cisneros-Mata et al. 1995). However, the decline was also coincident with a large increase in fishing pressure in the Northern Gulf, mainly by dynamiting and extensive gill-netting of aggregating adults and

subadults (Bahre et al. 2000), and also bycatch of juveniles by the shrimp trawling industry. These factors confounded any strong conclusions regarding the underlying cause(s) of the decline (Barrera-Guevara 1990, Cisneros-Mata et al. 1995, García-Caudillo et al. 2000). Although exceptionally fecund, this species has low natural productivity and very low survival to maturity (Márquez-Farías and Rosales-Juárez 2013). It cannot withstand heavy fishing pressure. Márquez-Farías and Rosales-Juárez (2013) demonstrated that the rate of population rebound for totoaba is low, confirming its low resilience to overfishing.

Today, the major cause of mortality of totoaba is shrimp trawler bycatch and the gillnet fisheries of the Northern Gulf (García-Caudillo et al. 2000, Márquez-Farías and Rosales-Juárez 2013). Barrera-Guevara (1990) estimated that an astonishing 92% of young-of-the-year totoaba were killed in the commercial shrimp trawl fishery—perhaps enough to have kept the population suppressed in and of itself during the late 20th century. Totoaba continues to be taken illegally, mainly for its swim bladder, also known as “belly” or “fish maw.” The bladders are sold (overwhelmingly for the Chinese market) and the meat, if saved, may be distributed locally and sold as “*curvina*,” “*cabaicucho*” or even “*cabrilla*.” Although the CITES website (accessed May 2015) claims totoaba bladders wholesale for up to \$120/kg, fisheries biologists working in the Upper Gulf have informed us that the bladders were wholesaling for up to \$8000/kg in 2015, creating a multi-million dollar illegal fishing industry (in July 2016, the bladders were retailing for up to \$60,000/kg in China). Illegal take of totoaba is a highly economically motivated activity in the Upper Gulf, putting enormous pressure on the species (as well as the endangered vaquita porpoise, a common bycatch in gillnets set for totoaba). There is no current, reliable estimate of the population size of totoaba (Valenzuela-Quinonez et al. 2015, 2016). However, the size of the illegal take today, the sporadic sportfishing take throughout the Gulf, and

contemporary research all indicate this species is not “virtually extinct” as claimed by Pitt (2001).

Population recovery of totoaba has been inferred based on historical size-range structure, mortality rates, genetic diversity, and distribution (Rosales-Juárez and Ramírez-González 1987, Román-Rodríguez and Hammann 1997, Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. 2014, 2015, 2016). In 2014, a proposal was submitted to the Mexican government to allow totoaba fishing to re-enter the sport fishery (see García-De León et al. 2010, Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. 2011, 2014; García-De León 2013), and Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. (2014, 2015) suggested that the endangered status of the species should be re-evaluated given our growing understanding of the species. Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. (2014, 2016) showed that no measurable reduction in genetic diversity (based on analysis of DNA microsatellite loci and mitochondrial DNA markers) was experienced by totoaba in the 20th century, that their genetic diversity is high and comparable to that of related non-threatened sciaenid fish species, and that they are probably panmictic. The endangered listing of this species was not based on estimates of population size (which were unknown then, and remain unknown today), but rather on the size of the fisheries take and its decrease during the early 1970s. However, by the 1980s research was beginning to show that totoaba might not be as diminished as originally thought, and in 2014 and 2015 Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. showed that the present-day totoaba population structure indicates the species is not overexploited, that it has maintained (or possibly even expanded) its known historical distributional range, that its stock size structure has been stable for several decades, and that gillnet bycatch and the recent surge in poaching (for swim bladders) in the Northern Gulf is the main threat to the species. Furthermore, Valdez-Muñoz et al. (2010) and Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. (2011, 2014, 2015) showed that this species is not hyposaline-estuarine-dependent as

previously thought, and thus not dependent on Colorado River flow to the Upper Gulf. Valenzuela-Quiñonez et al. (2014, 2015) concluded that future conservation measures for totoaba must focus on elimination of illegal fishing and bycatch.

Rowell et al. (2008a) used oxygen isotope ($\delta^{18}\text{O}$) analyses of pre- and post-dam totoaba otoliths (ear bones) to infer that young fish lived in reduced salinity waters in the Upper Gulf before the construction of dams began on the river. The pre-dam otoliths were prehistoric (~1000–5000 ybp), recovered from aboriginally deposited shell middens on Northern Gulf shores. This is what would be expected because, to the best of our knowledge, totoaba have always spawned in that region and continue to do so today, whether or not the Colorado River reaches the sea and regardless of local salinity conditions. However, there were scant data in Rowell et al. (2008a) to support their assumption that survivorship of young was greater in low salinity waters, or to support their conclusion that “successful restoration of totoaba will likely require a seasonally appropriate influx of Colorado River water to the Colorado River estuary.”

Rowell et al. (2008b) compared totoaba otolith growth rings for the first three years of growth in pre- and post-dam fish. The five pre-dam, prehistoric (~1000–5000 ybp) otoliths they examined were recovered from aboriginally deposited shell middens on Northern Gulf shores. Their $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ data showed that ~1000–5000 ybp juvenile totoaba used the delta region whether it was brackish or not. Again, this is what would be expected, and totoaba continue to use these same waters today, regardless of river flow or salinity. They also found pre/post-dam otolith growth rate differences only in the first year of growth, not in years 2 or 3. Thus, their extrapolations of overall growth rate and age of maturity are based on estimated faster otolith growth only in young-of-the-year totoaba. Today, totoaba become sexually mature at ages 5 to 7 years and a length of around 1300 mm (Cisneros-Mata et al. 1995, Román-Rodríguez and

Hammann 1997). Rowell et al. (2008b) used a conversion formula (from Román-Rodríguez and Hammann 1997) to scale from otolith size to body size. On this basis, they concluded that, based on today's size-at-sexual-maturity (between ages 5 and 7), pre-dam fish may have reached sexual maturity 3-5 years earlier than post-dam fish, or at an age of 1 to 4 years. This finding is consistent with predictions of life history theory (Stearns 1992) and empirical data on other fishes (e.g., Morita and Morita 2002) that, in general, slow-growing individuals should initiate maturation at an older age and at a smaller size than fast-growing individuals. However, as acknowledged by Rowell et al. (2008b), this is complicated by the prediction that increased mortality of adults (clearly experienced by post-dam totoaba) selects instead for earlier maturation. Because growth rates and mortality rates interact in a complicated manner to affect the age and size at maturity, it remains unclear what the effects of decreased growth rate in the first year of life might have on adult productivity of totoaba. More importantly, even though totoaba growth rates and age at maturity may have changed in recent decades, this does not demonstrate a direct link to putative productivity/stock decline associated with decreased Colorado River flows.

Flanagan and Hendrickson (1976) found no significant relationship between totoaba catch and Colorado River flow and concluded that overfishing was the primary factor in depleting the stock—and the historical catch data provided by Lercari and Chávez (2007) support that view. (The claim by Lercari and Chávez 2007 that their “results confirm the important role of the Colorado River flow cessation on the decrement of the [totoaba] catch” over-extends the strength of their actual findings; see below).

Cisneros-Mata et al. (1995) and Pedrín-Osuna et al. (2001) also strongly suggested that poaching of adults and bycatch of juveniles by the shrimp fishery contribute to low abundance of

the totoaba stock. Cisneros-Mata et al. (1995), following Barrera-Guevara (1990), indicated that in the mid-1980s an estimated 120,000 totoaba juveniles died each year as bycatch in shrimp trawl nets, and 6,200 adults (average weight 26 kg) due to poaching. Lercari and Chávez (2007) also concluded that their multiple regression analyses showed catch to be correlated with two independent variables—Pacific Decadal Oscillation Index and Colorado River flow—suggesting these two factors explained up to 70% of the catch variability. However, Lercari and Chávez (2007) examined only abiotic variables and did not include fishing effort, even though the number of boats fishing for totoaba increased greatly from 1942 to 1965. Their source and measurement of river flow data also are unclear, and no evidence was given that they measured actual freshwater flow into the Upper Gulf. The Lercari and Chávez (2007) analysis, and otolith data suggesting that young-of-the-year totoaba may grow faster when lower salinity environments are available to them (Rowell et al. 2008b), are tantalizing hints that river flow to the delta might be beneficial to totoaba growth. However, no data show that river flow is necessary to the life history of this species or that it would increase its population numbers. And there is no published evidence that we are aware of showing a correlation between salinity and the distribution of larval or juvenile totoaba. In fact, Valdez-Muñoz et al. (2010) sampled totoaba juveniles in Upper Gulf and Delta waters with salinities between 35.3‰ and 39.5‰ and reported that captures of juveniles and salinity had no significant correlation. Even the CITES listing for totoaba notes that the negative impacts on this species by reduction of Colorado River flow is questionable (CITES 2015).

The Gulf corvina (*Cynoscion othonopterus*) currently comprises the most important finfish fishery in the Northern Gulf, indeed, in the entire Gulf (Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2010). Most gillnet fishers in the region target both corvina and shrimp and alter their efforts seasonally

and in relation to market demands (Aragón-Noriega 2014). Rowell et al. (2005) used $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ isotope analyses to estimate spawning habitat salinity for Gulf corvina during Colorado River flow and non-flow years, concluding that “successful restoration of the Gulf corvina fishery in the Upper Gulf requires influx of Colorado River water to nursery grounds in the river’s estuary.” This assumption has since proven decidedly incorrect. Despite an absence of significant influxes of Colorado River surface water to the Gulf of California since the turn of this century, the Gulf corvina fishery has become the largest finfish fishery in the Gulf. Reported annual landings range from 2,200 to 5,900 tons per year over the past decade (Paredes et al. 2010, Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2010), with a staggering number of 1.5-1.8 million fish harvested over the 21-25 days of fishing during the annual spawning aggregation (Erisman et al. 2010, 2012). Today, Gulf corvina fishing brings in about U.S. \$20 million annually to fishing communities in the Northern Gulf (CIRVA 2016). Reported catches of this species have never been higher than in the most recent decade, although it is estimated to be overfished (Ruelas-Peña et al. 2013).

The principal finding of Rowell et al. (2005) was that when there is freshwater flow into the Upper Gulf, decreasing salinity, Gulf corvina record these brackish-water years in their growing otoliths. This is what would be expected for a species that aggregate-spawns in the Upper Gulf, where changes in river flow can result in a fluctuating salinity environment. However, they found “nursery ground” $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ signatures for the otoliths they examined corresponding to salinities ranging from 26 to 38‰—thus the young fish were living in the area when river flow was present and when it was completely absent. Rowell et al. (2005) did not offer data to show that freshwater pulses lead to enhanced recruitment or increased survival. This species aggregate-spawns/breeds annually and is clearly highly successful regardless of

whether or not there is any freshwater inflow from the Colorado River. The increased catch of Gulf corvina that Rowell et al. (2005) noted for 1996 could have simply been due to increased fishing effort, rather than increased production becoming evident three years after a 1993 river water release. In fact, for the El Golfo de Santa Clara port, the annual catch grew from 3.2 tons to 1,278 tons between 1993 and 1996 as fishing efforts expanded, and since then it has been as high 5,900 tons (CONAPESCA 2010, Gherard et al. 2013).

The peak Colorado River flows that once entered the Upper Gulf occurred subsequent to the snowmelt in the Rocky Mountains, from May to July (Sykes 1937, Harding et al. 1995, Pontius 1997, Lavín and Sánchez 1999, Pitt 2001). The Gulf corvina spawning/breeding aggregations (and associated fishing effort) take place from late February to late May (Erisman et al. 2012, 2015; Sadovy and Erisman 2010). Thus it seems likely that the environmental stimulus for the spawning aggregations is not a decrease in salinity in the Northern Gulf due to Colorado River inflow, but some other factor, such as rising temperatures of Gulf waters in the spring. Warming seawater temperatures are known to be a spawning cue for totoaba (Cisneros-Mata et al. 1995) and Gulf bairdiella (*Bairdiella icistia*) in the Gulf (R. C. May 1975), as well as other sciaenids elsewhere in the world (e.g., Vizziano et al. 2002, Aalbers 2008). It is also notable that Gulf corvina and totoaba aggregate and spawn during the period of most rapid rise in primary (phytoplankton) productivity in the Upper Gulf (March-April), thus it is possible that there is a productivity cue affecting spawning time.

Legal (and illegal) Gulf corvina fishing targets the spawning period for this species and harvests thousands of tons annually. Because the Upper Gulf is the only known spawning site, this species is highly vulnerable to overfishing and potential collapse (Erisman et al. 2012). The history of collapses in fisheries elsewhere in the world that have targeted the spawning

1100 migrations of large-bodied sciaenids is well known (Sadovy and Cheung 2003; Erisman et al.
1101 2012). Illegal fishing (poaching) remains a serious concern in the Northern Gulf, where an
1102 estimated 86-90% of Gulf corvina catch and 62% of the total fisheries catch takes place in
1103 marine protected areas (Erisman et al. 2012, Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2012). Concerns exist that
1104 the stock is becoming overexploited and susceptible to collapse due to overfishing (Musick et al.
1105 2000, Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2010, Erisman et al. 2010, Ruelas-Peña et al. 2013). Intense
1106 fishing of spawning aggregations has led to Gulf corvina being one of the few fish species in
1107 Mexico that is regulated by an official management plan (DOF 2007).

1108 Gulf corvina (and totoaba) have been around for many thousands, probably hundreds of
1109 thousands, if not millions of years (Huddelston and Takeuchi 2007), and they have survived in
1110 the Gulf throughout all of the naturally occurring northward and westward diversions of the
1111 lower Colorado River, such as when ancient Lake Cahuilla and all its predecessor lakes in the
1112 Salton Basin received and impounded the total river flow, thus keeping it from reaching the Gulf
1113 for many years each time. Ancient Lake Cahuilla was actually a chronological sequence of four
1114 or more lakes, the last of which was in existence when the Spaniards first arrived in the Pimería
1115 Alta (Waters 1983). Although the land-locked lake had apparently completely evaporated by the
1116 time the first Spanish explorers reached that region (there is no record of it in the writings of
1117 Díaz and Alarcón who passed nearby in 1540, or Oñate who explored the region in 1604), a map
1118 by John Rocque (ca. 1762) in the archives of the British Museum clearly shows the Colorado
1119 River flowing into an inland lake north of the Colorado River Delta that had no outlet to the sea
1120 (Warren 1979). Wilke (1978) documented a series of four lakes extending back over 2000 years,
1121 and evidence suggests that other lakes in the Salton Basin intermittently received the entire
1122 Colorado River flow before that time, probably throughout the Holocene (Sykes 1914, Wilke

1123 1978, Waters 1983, Laylander 2005). Evidence of a long history of standing surface waters in
1124 the Salton Basin/Trough includes travertine deposits (precipitated calcium carbonate) up to 76-
1125 cm thick along old beachlines of the lake(s).

1126 The lowest point on the Colorado River Delta's northern crest is about 10 m above mean
1127 sea level, and the Salton Basin (Cahuilla Basin) is ~84 m below mean sea level, meaning that the
1128 flow of the Colorado River can be directed either northward into the Salton Basin or southward
1129 toward the Gulf of California (Carpelan 1961). In fact, two old distributaries of the lower
1130 Colorado River carry irrigation drainage water northward from Mexico to the Salton Sea today,
1131 the New River and the Alamo River. The lacustrine basin lies in the Salton Trough, which
1132 includes the Coachella and Imperial Valleys of southeastern California, and the western half of
1133 the Mexicali Valley and the Colorado River Delta in Mexico. The Salton Basin is now partly
1134 occupied by what remains of the Salton Sea, a man-made partial recreation of Lake Cahuilla
1135 caused by an accidental, anthropogenic diversion of the Colorado River in 1905-1907 (during the
1136 summer of 1906, the entire volume of the Colorado River flowed northward from Mexico in the
1137 Alamo and New Rivers into the Salton Basin) (Sykes 1937).

1138 Although the Salton Sea is currently the largest inland body of water in California, it is
1139 much smaller than ancient Lake Cahuilla and its predecessors because the man-made river
1140 diversion lasted less than two years. Lake Cahuilla filled, on each of its most recent four
1141 occurrences, to a maximum depth of ~95 m and covered an area of ~5700 km² (Waters 1983,
1142 Laylander 2005). Wilke (1978) estimated that Lake Cahuilla could fill to an elevation of about
1143 12 m above sea level in 12-20 years, after which the lake would overflow southward toward the
1144 Gulf by way of the delta's Río Hardy channel. Sykes (1937) estimated that the Colorado River
1145 naturally altered its flow northwestward to enter the Salton Basin at least six times during the

1146 19th century (in 1840 [probably when the New River was formed], 1842, 1852, 1859, 1867 and
1147 1891). As early as 1851, San Diego newspapers were reporting northward flows of the Colorado
1148 River from Mexico into the Salton Basin via the New River (Sykes 1937). Other, shallower
1149 depressions on the delta have also temporarily impounded Colorado River water, stopping or
1150 reducing its passage to the sea, such as Volcano Lake (e.g., during the years 1909 to 1923) and
1151 Pescadero Basin (e.g., during the years 1923 to 1929), both of which are geologic/topographic
1152 lows along the Cerro Prieto Fault line (Sykes 1937).

1153 The first survey of the Salton Basin was made in 1853 by a party led by Lt. R. S.
1154 Williamson, exploring for westward railroad routes south of the Sierra Nevada. W. P. Blake, the
1155 geologist of the party, was the first to document that the Salton Basin was below sea level. Much
1156 later, he revisited the region after the Salton Sea formed, referring to it as the residual of a more
1157 extensive ancient lake that he named Lake Cahuilla. Both Blake (1914) and Sykes (1914)
1158 interpreted what they called the Cahuilla Basin (after the local Indian tribe) as an ancient cut-off
1159 arm of the Sea of Cortez. Hubbs and Miller (1948), who unnecessarily renamed Lake Cahuilla
1160 as Lake LeConte (after a naturalist who worked in the region in the 1850s), estimated that the
1161 lake lasted for centuries.

1162 Gulf corvina and totoaba were thus historically exposed to, and are clearly adapted to,
1163 long periods of no Colorado River flow to the Gulf at all, and they can successfully spawn and
1164 grow across a wide range of salinities, as has been shown for penaeid shrimp in the Northern and
1165 Central Gulf. Another Gulf sciaenid fish, *Bairdiella icistia*, has also been shown to grow and
1166 spawn successfully in salinities ranging from 15‰ to 40‰ (May 1975). These and a wide array
1167 of other species common in the Northern Gulf are clearly adapted to high, and highly variable
1168 salinity regimes. For example, Reynolds and Thomson (1974) and Reynolds et al. (1976)

1169 showed that the Gulf grunion (*Leuresthes sardina*), found most abundantly in the Northern Gulf,
1170 has an incipient upper lethal salinity of 58‰ to 68‰, with juveniles preferring salinities of 45-
1171 54‰, indicative of its adaptation to the elevated salinities of the region.

1172 More compelling evidence supports the idea that, rather than reduced primary
1173 productivity effects (ostensibly from reduced river flow) on their early life histories, the boom-
1174 and-bust cycles of Gulf commercially-exploited sciaenid fishes are due to fishing trends and
1175 overfishing. Like many other exploited fishes, their vulnerability to capture is exacerbated by
1176 their behavior of forming large, predictable spawning aggregations at restricted locations
1177 (Erisman et al. 2010; Sadovy and Erisman 2010). Most workers have considered
1178 unregulated/unenforced fishing to be the primary threat to stock numbers of these and other
1179 exploited fishes (Cisneros-Mata et al. 1995, Román-Rodríguez 1990, 1998, 2000; Musick et al.
1180 2000; Sadovy and Cheung 2003, Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2010; Erisman et al. 2012, Chao et al.,
1181 Valenzuela-Quíñonez et al. 2015, IUCN online).

1182 Aragón-Noriega et al. (2009) analyzed historical fishing data for another sciaenid, the
1183 Gulf (or bigeye) croaker (*Micropogonias megalops*), in the Upper Gulf. Like other threatened,
1184 large Gulf of California sciaenids (e.g., totoaba; Gulf corvina; white seabass or *cabaicucho*,
1185 *Atractoscion nobilis*), this species is concentrated (and fished) in the Upper Gulf. The
1186 commercial fishery for Gulf croaker began developing around 1991, after a collapse of the
1187 regional shrimp fishery due to extreme overfishing by industrial trawlers. By 2009, Gulf croaker
1188 was one of the five most important fisheries in the Upper Gulf. As with earlier-established
1189 fisheries for totoaba and Gulf corvina, Gulf croaker is taken primarily during its reproductive
1190 period (March to August) when the fish become even more concentrated. Aragón-Noriega et al.
1191 (2009) found direct correlations between overfishing and catch (“production”), and between

1192 legally enacted catch reductions and fishery recovery. Interestingly, they did not find a
1193 significant correlation between boat numbers and capture levels, perhaps due to differences in
1194 individual fishing (boat) efforts. This appears similar to the results of Galindo-Bect et al. (2000)
1195 when they attempted to estimate shrimp catch-per-unit-effort based solely on the San Felipe
1196 licensed shrimp fleet catches.

1197 Sánchez-Velasco et al. (2011) sampled fish larvae from summer plankton tows in the
1198 Upper Gulf and used a Bray-Curtis Index to define main larval fish habitats (based on species
1199 composition). Dissolved oxygen levels were high throughout the study area, and the mean
1200 proportion of fish larvae in relation to total abundance of zooplankton was more than 50%,
1201 exceeding all other observations of larval fish abundance in zooplankton samples from
1202 throughout the entire Gulf. A total of 99 fish “species” (taxa) were recorded, the most abundant
1203 being anchovies (*Anchoa* spp.), threadfin herrings (*Opisthonema* spp.), and Sciaenidae (croakers
1204 and corvinas). Overall larval abundance was very high, with a mean of 1253 fish larvae per 5-m
1205 stratum of the water column. The authors concluded that “the Upper Gulf of California remains
1206 an important fish spawning zone and nursery area,” and that “the species richness and larval
1207 abundance recorded in this study are very high in relation to the fish larvae records for the
1208 Northern Gulf of California for the same month.” Sánchez-Velasco et al. (2011) found that
1209 larval fish habitats with the lowest larval diversity occurred in the most saline environments,
1210 leading them to suggest that increased salinity in the Upper Gulf, caused by cutbacks in Colorado
1211 River inflow, might have reduced the areal size of lower salinity habitats (i.e., the “preferred
1212 larval habitat”) for some fishes. But, there are no records or data for fish larvae in this region
1213 prior to damming of the river. Although the Sánchez-Velasco et al. (2011) study is revealing in
1214 many ways, it does not provide data to unambiguously show that the Upper Gulf ecosystem has

been damaged, or that it currently has reduced fish diversity or production due to reduced Colorado River inflow. It is worth noting, also, that the possible roles of river plumes in marine fish recruitment in general is very unclear although numerous hypotheses exist (Grimes and Kingsford 1996).

As with penaeid shrimp, totoaba and Gulf corvina have been living and reproducing in the Gulf of California with little freshwater inflow to their spawning/nursery habitats since the mid-1930s, and episodic flow before that. Fishing pressure and bycatch are thus far-and-away the greatest threats to these two fish species; perhaps the only threats.

3.4 The “Delta Clam”

The *Mulinia* clam story in the Upper Gulf is intriguing. Kowalewski et al. (2000) and Rodríguez et al. (2001a,b) studied old shells of this small bivalve (which they called *Mulinia coloradoensis*) that they reasoned had eroded from deltaic deposits and accumulated in cherniers (shelly beach ridges) on beaches in the Upper Gulf. Kowalewski et al. (2000) estimated that pre-dam densities of this clam were 25-50 individuals m⁻², and that $\sim 5 \times 10^{12}$ shells were produced in the area “during the last millennium.” They argued that this clam was endemic to the delta region and has experienced a dramatic decrease in abundance due to loss of productivity in the Upper Gulf resulting from decreased Colorado River input and “decrease in nutrients once supplied by the river” (also see <http://www.geo.arizona.edu/ceam/Hecold/hecolcd.htm>).

However, the extremely high nutrient levels and primary productivity of the Upper Gulf have been well documented since oceanographers first began studying the region decades ago (see Section 2 above). Cintra-Buenrostro et al. (2012) later reasoned that nutrient depletion from

reduced river flow was probably not responsible for the reduction in population size of the *Mulinia* population on the delta, instead postulating that salinity might be important and suggesting that the clam might need brackish water to survive well. As noted by Rodriguez et al. (2001a), the alleged “endemic delta clam” *Mulinia coloradoensis* Dall, 1894 is actually a junior synonym of *M. modesta* Dall, 1894, a synonymy made by Grant and Gale in 1931. Thus this species is not endemic to, nor restricted to the Upper Gulf of California, and it has been reported from habitats ranging from brackish to fully marine salinities. The synonymy is well known and included in the standard compendiums of tropical West American molluscs, including Keen (1971), who mistakenly gave priority to the name “*coloradoensis*,” Coan and Valentich-Scott’s (2012) monograph of tropical eastern Pacific bivalves, and the online Macrofauna Golfo Invertebrate Database (<http://www.desertmuseum.org/center/seaofcortez/database.php>). Coan and Valentich-Scott (2012) re-examined the type material to re-verify the synonymy (Paul Valentich-Scott, pers. comm. 2016) (Figure 4). The type locality of this species is Guaymas (Sonora) and the National Museum of Natural History (Smithsonian Institution) has both type material and other (more recently collected) specimens from that location. The Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History houses specimens from the coast of Baja California (from north of San Felipe southward to Bahía de los Ángeles, across from Isla Ángel de la Guarda) and Sonora (El Golfo de Santa Clara to Bahía Adair). However, despite these data and taxonomic realignments, Smith et al. (2016) continued to consider this clam to be endemic to the Colorado River Delta and use the junior synonym name *Mulinia coloradoensis*.

The genus *Mulinia* is not considered to be freshwater-dependent, and *Mulinia modesta* appears to be eurytopic based on its broad distribution (e.g., Guaymas, Bahía de los Ángeles, Bahía Adair). Although it appears to be tolerant of a wide range of salinities, there is no

evidence that it needs brackish or fresh water for any stage in its life history. Although there has not been a direct test of the hypothesis of reduced salinity improving growth rates in *M. modesta*, such a study was done for two other clams from the Colorado River Delta area (*Chione cortezi* and *Chionista fluctifraga*) and just the opposite was found—both species were shown to have increased growth rates during post-dam years, presumably without the adverse influence of reduced salinities due to higher river discharge (Schöne et al. 2003). (Coan and Valentich-Scott [2012] considered *C. cortezi* to be a junior synonym of *C. fluctifraga*.)

Mulinia modesta is a filter-feeding clam and depth, wave exposure, and sedimentation processes are likely important to its occurrence. Loss of river inflow in the post-dam era has switched the delta region's sediment flow from longitudinal/long-basinal to cross-basinal, and sediment dispersal now is mainly controlled by oceanic forcing (instead of fluvial processes) dominated by the cyclonic gyre of the Northern Gulf (Carriquiry et al. 2001, Álvarez and Jones 2002). This has created a different sedimentary regime in the Upper Gulf, which may have caused localized decrease in abundance of *M. modesta*. Sediment mobilization and bedforms in the Northern Gulf are strongly controlled by tidal dynamics (Hernández-Azcúnaga et al. 2014).

3.5 Vaquita

The vaquita (*Phocoena sinus*), a small porpoise found only in the northernmost Gulf of California, is the world's most critically endangered marine mammal (Arellano Peralta et al. 2011, Arellano Peralta and Medrano González 2013, Rojas-Bracho and Reeves 2013, CIRVA 2016). It is listed as endangered by the U.S., Mexico, and CITES. The entire population lives within a 2000-4000 km² area centered near Roca Consag, about 40 km east of San Felipe, Baja

1284 California (Rojas-Bracho et al. 2006), giving it the most restricted range of any marine cetacean
1285 species. The vaquita is believed to be a relict population of an ancestral species most closely
1286 related to two southern hemisphere species (the spectacled porpoise, *P. dioptrica*, and
1287 Burmeister's porpoise, *P. spinipinnis*) that crossed the equator during a period of Pleistocene
1288 cooling (Norris and McFarland 1958, Vidal et al. 1999, Munguía-Vega et al. 2007). Genetic
1289 analyses have corroborated this interpretation and have estimated that vaquitas were likely never
1290 very abundant (Rosel et al. 1995, Taylor and Rojas-Bracho 1999, Munguía-Vega et al. 2007).
1291 Coincident with the species' discovery and its description 1958 (Norris and McFarland 1958),
1292 came the realization that vaquitas frequently become entangled and drowned in gillnets and
1293 shrimp trawls (Norris and Prescott 1961). The primary cause of vaquita mortality today is well
1294 known to be incidental capture (bycatch) in shrimp and finfish gillnets that also incidentally or
1295 illegally take totoaba, and the fate of vaquita today is directly tied to the illegal totoaba fishery
1296 (Villa-Ramírez 1976, Brownell 1982, Hohn et al. 1996, Vidal et al. 1999, Rojas-Bracho and
1297 Taylor 1999, D'Agrosa et al. 2000, Rojas-Bracho et al. 2006, Jaramillo-Legorreta et al. 2007,
1298 Rojas-Bracho and Reeves 2013).

1299 International marine mammal scientific organizations agree that deaths in gillnets entirely
1300 explain the decline in vaquita numbers (International Whaling Commission [IWC] 1991a, b, c,
1301 1995, 1996, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources [IUCN] Red
1302 List, International Committee for the Recovery of the Vaquita [CIRVA] 2014, 2015, 2016,
1303 Rojas-Bracho et al. 2008). However, allegations in the past have argued that at least some of the
1304 decline is due to declining productivity resulting from reduced Colorado River flow into the
1305 Upper Gulf (e.g., Villa-Ramírez 1993, Fleisher 1994, 1996). The hypothesis entertained largely
1306 by the fisheries sector, as stated by Ramírez-León et al. (2015), is that the vaquita population has

declined because the lack of Colorado River flow has reduced nutrient input to the Northern Gulf, and thus its primary productivity, causing the ecosystem to collapse. Galindo-Bect (2012) and Galindo-Bect et al. (2013) argued that although the mortality of the vaquita is mainly due to bycatch, the damming of the Colorado River has caused declines in other species (shrimp and totoaba) and that something similar may be happening to vaquita. However, Ramírez-León et al. (2015), and many other studies (see Section 2, above) found no evidence that nutrient concentrations or primary productivity has decreased and concluded that nutrient-related issues are not risk factors for the vaquita. There also is no evidence for decline in vaquita prey species that might have been caused by reductions in river flow, nor any evidence that pollutants (specifically chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides), that in the past could have been carried to the Northern Gulf of California by Colorado River water, pose a risk (Calambokidis 1988, Vidal et al. 1999, Rojas-Bracho and Taylor 1999, Rojas-Bracho et al. 2006).

Rosel and Rojas-Bracho (1999) sequenced a portion of the mitochondrial DNA control region (a portion of the 5' end of the hyper-variable control region of the mtDNA molecule) from 43 individual vaquita. Every animal had identical sequences. The complete lack of polymorphism in the control region is unique among cetaceans that have been studied, and it strongly suggests that vaquita experienced a bottleneck or founder event, likely at the species' inception, followed by a small long-term population size. Thus the low mtDNA genetic variability they observed was likely a historical feature of the species, rather than the result of recent diminishment of population size. Taylor and Rojas-Bracho (1999) also found no support for the low genetic diversity having resulted from the recent decline in abundance, also concluding that the lack of heterozygosity is the result of a historical bottleneck or founder effect. Both papers noted that no evidence of inbreeding depression has been observed, and that

1330 lack of variability in the control region does not necessarily translate into low overall levels of
1331 heterozygosity in the nuclear genome. Hohn et al. (1996) and Rosel and Rojas-Bracho (1999)
1332 concluded that if incidental mortality of the species could be eliminated, the species could
1333 exhibit positive population growth.

1334 Munguía-Vega et al. (2007) investigated genetic sequence variation at two major
1335 histocompatibility complex (Mhc) class II loci in vaquita (*Phocoena sinus*) and its putative
1336 closest relative, the Burmeister's porpoise (*P. spinipinnis*). Mhc class II genes encode cell-
1337 surface glycoproteins that bind and present antigens from extracellular pathogens (e.g., bacteria)
1338 to T helper cells, and they are an essential part of the immune response of vertebrates (Klein
1339 1986). They found one putative functional allele fixed at the locus DQB, and two presumed
1340 functional alleles at the locus DRB (differing by a single nonsynonymous nucleotide
1341 substitution). Identical trans-specific DQB1 and DRB1 alleles were identified between vaquita
1342 and Burmeister's porpoise, supporting a sister-group relationship. Fixation of one allele, due to
1343 genetic drift, commonly occurs at the DQA or DQB loci in small-range (e.g., island) endemic
1344 mammals. Analysis of the data suggested to Munguía-Vega et al. (2007) that the low levels of
1345 Mhc class II variation seen in vaquita are not the result of the recent population decline in this
1346 species, but of long-term small population size over at least 2000-10,000 years. Taylor and
1347 Rojas-Bracho (1999), Munguía-Vega et al. (2007), and others have previously suggested that
1348 vaquita have probably never had an abundant or widespread population. Ortega-Ortiz (1993),
1349 Torre-Cosio (1995), and Munguía-Vega et al. (2007) note that a high frequency of non-
1350 deleterious anatomical malformations among vaquita supports the likelihood of fixed alleles.
1351 However, there is no evidence that the observed anatomical anomalies cause impairment to the
1352 survival or reproduction of individuals, or whether this condition was present in the ancestral

form (or a trait fixed through genetic drift). Low levels of genetic variation at Mhc genes in other species have led to concern about a low adaptive potential and high susceptibility of the population to novel infectious disease. However, to date there have been no reports of infectious disease in vaquita, and its parasite load is not unusually high or uncommon (Vidal et al. 1999). The NOAA Vaquita Fact Sheet (NOAA 2016) also states that low genetic diversity does not appear to be a threat to the survival of vaquita.

Rojas-Bracho and Taylor (1999) undertook a detailed analysis of risk factors for vaquita. They concluded there is no evidence that Upper Gulf productivity has declined due to reduced Colorado River flow, vaquita food is not limited and no diminishment of vaquita prey species has been documented, pollutant levels in the region are too low to be a risk to vaquita, and reduced fitness from inbreeding (i.e., inbreeding depression) is not evident. They further note that the single serious risk to this species is mortality resulting from fisheries bycatch.

Thus, it appears that the threats facing vaquita have changed little since its discovery more than 50 years ago. Due to the species' low abundance, low reproductive potential, and limited geographic range in a region where fishing is the sole source of income for most people, the vaquita is highly vulnerable to fishing pressure (Rojas-Bracho et al. 2006). In 2015, the Mexican government implemented a near-complete ban on the use of gillnets and long-lines for two years in the area where vaquita are most abundant. However, with an estimated fewer than 60 individuals left (CIRVA 2016, Vidal 2016), it remains to be seen if this last-ditch effort will succeed in saving the vaquita from extinction (Aragón-Noriega et al. 2010). The most recent analysis by the International Committee for Recovery of the Vaquita (CIRVA 2016) states that, today, essentially all vaquita deaths are caused by the increase in illegal gillnet fishing for totoaba swim bladders.

1376

1377 3.6 Fisheries Productivity in the Northern Gulf—Reprise

1378

1379 In considering the above, we conclude that there is no support for the hypothesis of decreased
1380 Colorado River flow reducing primary productivity in the Northern Gulf of California, and there
1381 is only weak to unsubstantiated support for the idea that river flow reduction has historically
1382 been responsible for decreased productivity of shrimp, totoaba, or Gulf corvina. And, there is no
1383 evidence whatsoever that reduced river flow is even partly responsible for the reduction in
1384 vaquita numbers. Any potential loss of nutrients from reduced Colorado River flow is
1385 compensated for by agricultural runoff, halophyte decomposition, erosion of the deltaic
1386 sediments (which release nutrients that have accumulated there for thousands of years), and,
1387 most importantly, by the daily influx of nutrients moving in from the open Pacific and upwelling
1388 in the highly mixed waters of the Northern Gulf. Alles (2011) and others have concluded, the
1389 depletion of commercially exploited fish stocks and the collapse of the vaquita population are the
1390 result of inadequate fisheries management, not the lack of freshwater or nutrient supply from the
1391 Colorado River. Ainsworth et al. (2012a,b) modeled the Northern Gulf under different fisheries
1392 scenarios and concluded that if full compliance with current fisheries regulations could be
1393 achieved, vaquita and totoaba populations would experience significant population increases,
1394 although at a cost to the fishing community of about 30% of its annual revenue.

1395 Bobadilla et al. (2011) undertook a thorough review of the history of environmental
1396 policy in the Upper Gulf, describing the evolution of various federal decrees in the area. They
1397 note how chaotic the situation has become with so many conflicting laws and declarations, and
1398 that this is possibly because the decrees have tried not to interfere with shrimp fishing in the

1399 region. They note that some other possible reasons management tools for totoaba and vaquita
1400 have proven to be ineffective are: there has been no consistency between the goals of fisheries
1401 and conservation sectors, the decrees are not clear on how they will achieve success, the fishers
1402 have not been sufficiently or appropriately informed about the harm done by their work practices
1403 and they only respond to their own needs and interests, and there is not enough honest inspection
1404 and surveillance so illegal and improper practices occur. Regarding totoaba, they note that
1405 protection has been ineffective mainly because the laws have focused on protection of adults
1406 without regard to juveniles. Bobadilla et al. (2011) point out that ".....the 1993 decree that
1407 banned totoaba fishing nets to protect the vaquita leads us to inquire: why after 18 years since
1408 ‘the boom’ period that a total ban on totoaba fishing was enacted (a decree in 1975) it was not
1409 implemented and the nets used to catch them were still being used? This is another example that
1410 in Mexico the laws have often been a dead letter, and there is a strong need for effective law
1411 enforcement."

1412 Interannual variations in fishery takes are most likely due to changes in fishing pressure
1413 and natural cycles. In 2010, over 2000 *pangas* were fishing in the Upper Gulf, mainly out of the
1414 three fishing ports of San Felipe, El Golfo de Santa Clara, and Puerto Peñasco. Rodríguez-
1415 Quiroz et al. (2010) showed that 62% of the artisanal fishing from these three ports takes place in
1416 the Upper Gulf of California and Colorado River Delta Biosphere Reserve (including the
1417 Vaquita Refuge area). The growth of artisanal fishing in the Upper Gulf has been huge over the
1418 past two decades, with the number of *pangas* increasing from 635 to 1269 from 1995 to 1997,
1419 and to 2017 by 2003—over 40% of the entire Gulf of California *panga* “fleet” is now operating
1420 in the Upper Gulf. Most of these fishers use gillnets that incidentally capture vaquita and
1421 totoaba. By 2007, the number of pangas fishing in the Upper Gulf of California far exceeded

that recommended when the Biosphere Reserve was declared (DOF 2005). It is expected that the small-boat fishery will continue to grow as Mexican authorities reduce the size of the industrial fleet (Rodríguez-Quiroz et al. 2009).

The hypothesis that increasing freshwater flow from the Colorado River to the Gulf of California might improve productivity in the Upper Gulf is interesting, but as yet there seems to be no strong or unequivocal data in support of this idea, and multi-year studies have shown no correlation between river flow and nutrients or productivity (e.g., Nieto-García 1998, Ramírez-León et al. 2015). In fact, there is some evidence that nutrient concentrations and primary productivity actually drop during periods of high freshwater flow into the Upper Gulf (Nieto-García 1998, Ramírez-León et al. 2015; Table 1). There is also some evidence that clams (bivalve molluscs) in the Northern Gulf grow more slowly in lowered salinities (Schöne et al. 2003). As early as 1943, Gilbert and Allen (reporting on 1939 and 1940 Gulf research cruises of Scripps Institution of Oceanography) noted that the internal hydrographical features of the region “can fully account for the fertility of the Gulf without the necessity of considering the effect of the Colorado River.”

Yet, seemingly exaggerated claims of environmental degradation in the Upper Gulf marine environment due to reduced Colorado River flow are common in the review literature (e.g., Kellogg 2004, Arias et al. 2004, Glenn and Nagler 2007, Calderón-Aguilera and Flessa 2009, Zamora et al. 2013, Glenn et al. 2013a, Kostogiannis 2015). Glenn et al. (2013a) even went so far as to suggest that “delta restoration” to “restore fisheries in the Upper Gulf of California” may be an impossibly ambitious goal. This is not to say that increased freshwater flow to the Upper Gulf might not change things—it might increase production of some species and reduce production of others in the ecosystem. However, we lack data to specifically address

that question, and there is very little in the way of solid evidence that increased river flow to the Gulf would improve the health of an already healthy marine ecosystem that suffers primarily from fisheries issues. Thus, we disagree with Glenn and Nagler's (2007, page 361) claim that, "The biggest need for the intertidal and marine zone is more [fresh] water." We would argue that the biggest need is improved fisheries management/enforcement.

4. THE COLORADO RIVER DELTA – A HIGHLY VARIABLE ENVIRONMENT

The Colorado River Delta (that area with alluvium deposits from the Colorado River) covers an area of 8,612 km² (3,325 mi²), situated between 31° 03' and 33° 45' N latitude. The Colorado River is unique among the major delta-forming rivers of the world in that it has alternately discharged its waters into the sea and into land-locked basins.

The Mexican portion of the Colorado River Delta was first mapped by Derby in 1851 (Derby 1852), by Ives in 1858 (Ives 1861), and most famously by Sykes in 1907 and again in 1937, although today a variety of satellite-based images allow for accurate GIS mapping of the region (Figure 2). The most comprehensive and detailed description of the delta ever published was probably that of Godfrey Sykes (1937) for the American Geographical Society, although many present-day workers have overlooked that important volume. Sykes's description was based on 45 years of surveys in the delta, often accompanied by botanist-explorer D. T. MacDougal. His 193-page narrative, with abundant statistics, maps and photographs, provides an accurate history of Colorado River flow across the delta and the changing physiographic history of the region from 1890 to 1935 (including a blow-by-blow account of the accidental formation of the Salton Sea). By making detailed comparisons of notes and maps of the delta

1468 from previous explorers, beginning with Francisco de Ulloa in 1539, and continuing through the
1469 explorations of Joseph C. Ives, logs of steamships that once connected the Gulf to Yuma
1470 (Arizona), and border projects by the Imperial Land Company and the U.S. Government, Sykes
1471 described the dynamic history of the delta and its river channels as they changed from one
1472 decade to the next, and even from one flood event to the next.

1473 Sykes (1937) showed that the undammed Colorado River in the delta changed course
1474 frequently, islands and shoals formed and disappeared, and various topographic lows became
1475 temporary lakes that impounded the river's flow for years at a time. From 1909 to 1930, Sykes
1476 described the river as flowing predominantly to the western side of delta, where it was deflected
1477 by the Sierra Cucapá. From there, it could run northward to the Salton Basin (via New River),
1478 southward in the Río Hardy channel to either the Laguna Salada Basin or to the sea, or it could
1479 pool in one of the large topographic lows just south the U.S.-Mexico border, such as Volcano
1480 Lake or Pescadero Basin (east of the Sierra Cucapá). Even when the main channel was on the
1481 eastern side of the delta, it could drain directly into Volcano Lake (a topographic low on the
1482 Cerro Prieto fault line) via the old Paredones River. When the river flowed northward, it
1483 threatened the towns of Calexico/Mexicali or Yuma and, in fact, it flooded those towns on more
1484 than one occasion. The two main watercourses that drained the Colorado River toward the
1485 Salton Basin were the Alamo River and the New River, whose channels still exist, although
1486 today they mainly carry irrigation drainage from croplands. Just after the turn of the 20th
1487 century, the U.S. and Mexico began building levees on the Mexican side of the border to protect
1488 Yuma and Calexico/Mexicali, the first being the Volcano Lake Levee constructed in 1908, and
1489 since then hardly a year passed without the U.S. or Mexico constructing new levees or canals on
1490 the delta.

1491 During the 16th and 17th century explorations of Alarcón, Díaz and Kino, the mainstem of
1492 the Colorado River also flowed on the western side of the delta, probably occupying the Río
1493 Hardy channel. However, by the time of the Derby (1852) and Ives (1858) surveys, the
1494 mainstem had moved to the eastern side of the delta, and it may have maintained that position
1495 until the great floods of 1890-91, when the river again broke toward the west. During those
1496 floods, most of the river's water flowed north into the Salton Basin (Sykes 1937). Beginning in
1497 1901, U.S. land developers opened canals directly from the river to the Imperial Valley to
1498 support a fledgling agricultural enterprise, and it was the flood-rupture of these diversions in
1499 1905 that led to the most recent refilling of the Salton Basin (creating the Salton Sea). In more
1500 recent (post-dam) times, the river has been channeled again on the eastern side of the delta by an
1501 extensive series of dikes and levees. Over the past 75 years, most of the delta has been converted
1502 to irrigated agriculture.

1503 Feirstein et al. (2008) estimated the volume of Colorado River deltaic sediments at
1504 approximately 41,682 km³, but Dorsey (2010) calculated it to be 220,000 km³–340,000 km³.
1505 Most of these sediments lie within the Salton Trough/Basin, a topographic depression that
1506 extends over parts of southeastern California, southwestern Arizona, and northwestern Mexico,
1507 within the Sonoran Desert (Lippmann et al. 1999, Anderson et al. 2003, Crowell et al. 2013).
1508 The trough is a classic graben formation lying on the west side of the San Andreas transform
1509 fault system and was formed by active rifting along the landward extension of the East Pacific
1510 Rise. This rifting/spreading center thus lies between the Pacific and North American tectonic
1511 plates. Cartographers generally recognize the region, from north to south, as the Coachella,
1512 Imperial, and Mexicali Valleys, as well as the floodplain of the Colorado River that abuts the
1513 Upper Gulf of California. Sediments in the Salton Trough have accumulated atop a Paleozoic

1514 basement of limestone, sandstone, conglomerate, and metamorphic rocks (Gastil et al. 1992,
1515 Delgado-Granados et al. 1994, Nations and Gauna 1998, Fletcher and Munguía 2000, Johnson et
1516 al. 2003, Bialas and Buck 2009). The sediment-basement interface is irregular and occurs at
1517 depths from 1.4 to 5.6 km (Anderson et al. 2003, Lovely et al. 2006, Crowell et al. 2013,
1518 Pacheco et al. 2006). Historically, large-scale flood events on the Colorado River served to
1519 recharge the aquifer of this large contiguous hydrologic basin.

1520 Although the Colorado River Delta includes the Salton Basin, much of the recently
1521 published hydrological research focuses only on the southern portion of the basin, from the U.S.-
1522 Mexico border south to the Upper Gulf of California—that part of the delta lying within the
1523 Mexicali Valley (e.g., Olmsted et al. 1973, Feirstein et al. 2008). Some recent workers have
1524 even constrained the “delta,” for working purposes, to the area of the Colorado River between
1525 the constructed levees, plus the various wetlands—about 600 km² (Luecke et al. 1999, Cohen et
1526 al. 2001). The larger of these wetlands today are the Río Hardy and El Doctor wetlands, the
1527 Ciénega de Santa Clara, and Ciénega El Indio. The 36 km-stretch of the Colorado River from
1528 the Morelos Dam (at the California-Baja California border) to San Luis Río Colorado (at the
1529 Arizona-Sonora border) is considered as the uppermost extent of today’s remnant Colorado
1530 River Delta in Mexico and has been called the limitrophe reach (Cohen et al. 2001, Cohen 2013).
1531 Since the 1980s, the Colorado River channel has been bordered by high, engineered levees that
1532 prevent surface water from reaching most of the riverbed (and vice versa).

1533 The delta region from the U.S.-Mexico border to the Upper Gulf lies in the Lower
1534 Colorado River Valley subdivision of the Sonoran Desert, which is one of the hottest and driest
1535 ecologically-defined areas in North America. Zamora-Arroyo et al. (2013) stated that
1536 precipitation on the delta averaged about 65 mm yr⁻¹, whereas Cohen et al. (2001) reported it as

1537 54 mm yr⁻¹ based on IBWC data for the years 1992-1998. Thompson (1968) and Ezcurra and
1538 Rodríguez (1986) reported average annual precipitation across the delta region as 68 mm, with
1539 evaporation rates up to 250 cm yr⁻¹. Not only is it the driest part of the Sonoran Desert, it
1540 experiences significant spatial variability in precipitation; long-term annual precipitation means
1541 from El Centro (California) average around 12.7 mm (1956-1998), from Mexicali (Baja
1542 California) average 160 mm (1973-1991), and from Yuma Valley average 11.6 mm (1987-1998)
1543 (Feirstein et al. 2008). Felger (2000) reported annual precipitation means of 55.3 mm at San
1544 Luis Río Colorado (1927-1967) and 40.2 mm at Riito (1950-1967), based on data from Hastings
1545 (1964) and Hastings and Humphrey (1969).

1546 An understanding of the Colorado River Delta's overall water budget has only just begun
1547 to come into focus. Across the entire delta (on both sides of the international border), agriculture
1548 is the single largest water user, consuming nearly 50% of total river inflow, whereas natural
1549 vegetation uses about 10% of the total inflow. Urban water use accounts for about 2% of total
1550 regional water consumption, most of this being met with groundwater pumping (Cohen and
1551 Henges-Jeck 2001). However, evapotranspiration (from cropland and open-water delivery
1552 canals) accounts for the single largest consumptive use of water in the delta, removing nearly
1553 half of the total inflows during non-flood years (Cohen and Henges-Jeck 2001). Recharge
1554 associated with agriculture is the primary source of recharge to the aquifer today (Cohen and
1555 Henges-Jeck 2001). Cohen (2013) used monitoring-well data to plot water table depth along the
1556 limitrophe stretch between Morelos Dam and the Southerly International Boundary (SIB). He
1557 found that over the past 70 years the water table dropped 12 m near the SIB, and about 3 m near
1558 Morelos Dam. Depth and variability of the water table varies greatly along the limitrophe,

tending to drop more quickly in response to lack of surface flow the farther downstream the measurements are taken.

Carrillo-Guerrero et al. (2013) calculated a water budget for the delta south of the border that estimated a total surface water input of 2985 million $\text{m}^3 \text{yr}^{-1}$ combined Colorado River flow past Morelos Dam, plus rainfall (based on data from April 2004 to April 2005). The U.S. has been compliant in meeting its annual water allotment delivery to Mexico of $1.85 \times 10^9 \text{m}^3$. However, the water delivered is generally of too low quality for urban use and often too high salinity for agricultural use. In non-flood years, about 90% of the Colorado River water entering Mexico is diverted as soon as it crosses the border, at Morelos Dam, into the Canal Reforma and Canal Alamo where it is distributed via approximately 1,662 km of irrigation canals to border-region agriculture (Cohen and Henges-Jeck 2001, Cohen 2005, Feirstein et al. 2008, Carrillo-Guerrero et al. 2013).

In addition to water from the Colorado River allotment, over 700 federal and private wells in the Mexicali Valley pump subterranean water for urban and agricultural use. During non-flood years, water from wells pumping the Mexicali-San Luis Río Colorado aquifer is used to meet agricultural demands and reduce salinity levels of the water entering from the U.S. The Mexicali agricultural valley (Federal Irrigation District 014-Río Colorado) has over 200,000 ha of irrigated fields (Nagler et al. 2007, Carrillo-Guerrero et al. 2013). The main crops are wheat, alfalfa, and cotton that, together, occupy 74% of the cultivated area and use 71% of the water available in the district (Carrillo-Guerrero et al. 2013). At least a quarter of the water delivered for agricultural use is lost from the irrigation canals alone, due to evaporation and ground seepage (Carrillo-Guerrero et al. 2013, based on CONAGUA estimates). Alfalfa is the region's

1581 most water-intensive crop, with a very high evapotranspiration rate (Erie et al. 1982, Jensen
1582 1995).

1583 Carrillo-Guerrero et al. (2013) estimated evapotranspiration rates from agricultural fields
1584 and freshwater/marsh wetlands in the region. They concluded that in non-flood years about 90%
1585 of the water diverted into agriculture fields in the Mexicali Valley is lost due to
1586 evapotranspiration alone (about $1.9 \times 10^9 \text{ m}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, based on data for the 12-month period April
1587 2004-April 2005). This is roughly the same amount of water guaranteed by the U.S.-Mexico
1588 Colorado River water treaty, and thus the amount of surface water that typically crosses into
1589 Mexico during non-flood years. However, the calculations of Carrillo-Guerrero et al. (2013) do
1590 not include water lost by way of crop and other vegetation biomass production, nor loss of water
1591 to the system by pumping it entirely out of the Mexicali Valley (e.g., water supplies to Tecate,
1592 Tijuana, etc.).

1593 Carrillo-Guerrero et al. (2013) note that seepage losses from irrigation canals contribute
1594 to formation of a high, non-saline aquifer that supports trees along the Colorado River's riparian
1595 corridor because subsurface seepage losses drain toward the river channel as underflow. And
1596 they estimate that about 10% of the inflows to the Mexicali Valley end up being used by "natural
1597 ecosystems" (e.g., riparian habitats on the delta). Also, the half-dozen or so riparian (fresh and
1598 brackish water) marshes of the Colorado River Delta are maintained almost entirely by
1599 agricultural return flows from Mexico and the U.S. For example, in the west, the Río Hardy
1600 marshes are sustained by brackish agricultural flows from the Mexicali Valley Irrigation District
1601 that discharge into the Río Hardy channel. In the east, Ciénega de Santa Clara, the largest
1602 brackish marsh in the Sonoran Desert, is sustained primarily by brackish water pumped from the
1603 Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District in the U.S. and sent for disposal in Mexico via

the Main Outlet Drain Extension (MODE) canal, which supplies 95% of the ciénega's water, with most of the remainder being supplied by the Riito-Santa Clara drain that transports surface irrigation runoff from the agricultural fields of the San Luis Río Colorado Valley in Sonora (Mexicano et al. 2013, García-Hernández et al. 2013a).

Orozco-Durán et al. (2015) also used Mexican National Water Commission (CONAGUA) data to assess water balance across the delta. Those data estimated that 755×10^6 m³ of ground water (including rain infiltration) moves across the border annually from the Lower Colorado River Basin (CONAGUA 2006, 2007, 2010; Orozco-Durán et al. 2015; W. Daesslé, pers. comm. 2015). Combined with the Carrillo-Guerrero et al. (2013) estimates of surface water (Colorado River + rainfall, see above), this yields a total freshwater influx to the delta of about 3.74×10^9 m³ yr⁻¹. In the Mexicali Valley Basin, wells pump groundwater to the surface for use in urban centers as far away as Tecate and Tijuana, and for agricultural and industrial use. Water used outside the delta area (e.g., Tijuana and Tecate) is lost to the regional system and removed from the delta's water budget, as is water lost by evapotranspiration and in agricultural and wetland biomass production. Water used within the basin is partly recycled as it sinks back down to the water table from unlined agricultural and industrial canals, wastewater discharge, septic systems, etc. The amount of water that is removed from the system, by being exported outside the Mexicali Valley, by agricultural biomass production, and by evapotranspiration is very high. The National Water Commission estimated that less than 35×10^6 m³ yr⁻¹ (4.6%) finds its way to the Upper Gulf, through a mix of subterranean and surface flow, the latter mainly being via the Río Hardy drainage and Ciénega de Santa Clara seepage. To put this estimate in context, this is about 2% of the 1.85×10^9 m³ (1.5 million acre-feet) of river water annually

1626 allotted to Mexico by the water treaty. (To further put this in context, California alone uses 4.0-
1627 5.5 million acre-feet of water annually just to grow alfalfa [University of California 2016].)

1628 The delta's aquifer is known to have high storage capacity and subterranean water moves
1629 very slowly toward the Gulf. However, the $35 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ estimate may be too high, as some
1630 of this estimated discharge probably does not actually reach the marine environment, but is
1631 captured and impounded in freshwater artesian springs (*pozas*) along the southernmost Cerro
1632 Prieto fault, such as El Doctor wetlands near the town of El Golfo de Santa Clara, and the
1633 numerous *pozas* of coastal Bahía Adair, where it supports small refugial Colorado River Delta
1634 riparian wetland habitats.

1635 Zamora et al. (2013) estimated that, today, less than 1% of the Colorado River's water
1636 reaches the Gulf, noting that the river's relict lowermost channel is plugged by sediment that
1637 accumulates during flood tides. Ebb tidal flows are not strong enough to keep the channel open,
1638 and weak-flowing (or no) river water cannot maintain it. During spring tide cycles, when no
1639 channel blockage was present, tidal flows could reach about 65 km upriver from Montague
1640 Island near the river's mouth due to the slight topographic gradient (about 16 cm/km)
1641 (Thompson 1968, Payne et al. 1992, Nelson et al. 2013a,b). However, without adequate river
1642 flow these penetrating tidal currents result in bedload transport from the Gulf into the lower
1643 channel which builds an obstructive, recurring tidal sand bar across the river bed about 25-30 km
1644 upstream from Montague Island (about half-way to the junction of the Río Hardy). The sand bar
1645 apparently develops when river flow is greatly reduced or absent, and is re-opened only when
1646 sporadic high-river flows occur. Anecdotal reports of a sand bar obstruction in the lower river
1647 channel appeared as early as the late 1950s (Kira 2000), but the first official report was in 1972,
1648 when Mexico's Secretaría de Agricultura y Recursos Hidráulicos (SARH) reported it 23 km

1649 above Montague Island (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1982). The sand bar was noted in
1650 LANDSAT satellite images by Nelson et al. (2013a,b) as early as 1972, and by Zamora et al.
1651 (2013) beginning after the year 2000, and by 2009 Zamora et al. (2013) estimated the up-channel
1652 tidal flow topped the sand bar only 12 days per year. Nelson et al. (2012a) also recorded the
1653 presence of the sand bar in 2011 using pressure-based logger data in the river channel.

1654 Zamora et al. (2013) reasoned that the sand bar began accumulating after Glen Canyon
1655 Dam began operations in 1964, which is likely when tidal processes became dominant over
1656 fluvial processes in the lowermost river channel. During some of the unusually wet years of the
1657 1980s and 1990s, when excess river flows were delivered to Mexico, the sand bar was
1658 apparently, at least periodically, scoured open. Payne et al. (1992) reported that the sand bar was
1659 washed away by the large 1984-1988 floodwater releases down the channel of the Colorado
1660 River. All (2006) argued that most of this discharge ended up in Laguna Salada where it was
1661 lost to evaporation, with little of it reaching the Gulf. On-site observations of the river mouth by
1662 S. M. Nelson showed that at least some fresh water reached the sea in 1984, 1993, and 1997
1663 (Nelson et al. 2013a,b), but the actual amount is unknown. Analysis of LANDSAT satellite
1664 images from late 1979 through 1985 indicated that the sand bar impounded flood waters during
1665 the unusually wet years of the early 1980s, resulting in flooding that connected the river channel
1666 to the Ciénega de Santa Clara at least twice (Nelson et al. 2013a). Nelson (2007) noted that the
1667 presence of the sand bar resulted in back-flooding of most of the delta during the late 1983-early
1668 1984 El Niño (see Figure 3a), but by November 1984 the floods had finally opened a channel
1669 through the sand bar to allow the remaining (unevaporated) water to reach the sea. Connectivity
1670 between the river and Ciénega de Santa Clara ended when the river cut a new channel through
1671 the sand bar in late 1984 (Nelson et al. 2013b). Flood releases during the 1990s kept the river

1672 channel open, but a new tidal sand bar formed after 2000, when river flow again fell (Nelson et
1673 al. 2013b, Zamora et al. 2013). Nelson et al. (2013a) noted the sand bar could be seen re-
1674 forming itself in 2006 LANDSAT images, at approximately the same location as the pre-1983
1675 bar, and by 2008 it was high enough to cross over in a two-wheel drive vehicle during neap tide
1676 periods. However, Zamora et al. (2013) felt that spring tidal bores might have been able to top
1677 the sand bar several times a year even since 2000.

1678 The groundwater flow and surface seepage that does reach the Upper Gulf has the
1679 potential to contribute some dissolved nitrates and silicates to the sea. However, most nitrates in
1680 surface and ground waters in the Mexicali Valley are derived from agriculture drains and sewage
1681 waste, and these might enter the Gulf primarily by surface seepage via the Ciénega de Santa
1682 Clara wetland. Their potential average annual contribution (via the ciénega) has been estimated
1683 at 59,400 kg N-NO₃ (Orozco-Durán et al. 2015). Running southeast from Ciénega de Santa
1684 Clara is the so-called Santa Clara Slough—a roughly 26,000-ha basin subject to periodic
1685 inundation from the Northern Gulf's high-amplitude spring tides, which historically reached the
1686 margin of the ciénega several times each year (Nelson et al. 2013a). The slough receives
1687 brackish water inflow from the ciénega, especially during winter months when delivery of
1688 agricultural wastewater increases and evapotranspiration decreases (Glenn et al. 2013a,b,
1689 Greenberg and Schlatter 2012). During summer months, wastewater inflow to the ciénega is
1690 reduced and evapotranspiration rates reach their highest levels of the year, thus little or no water
1691 passes through to the slough (Greenberg and Schlatter 2012, Glenn et al. 2013a,b). And,
1692 throughout the year, water exits the slough primarily through evaporation (Glenn et al. 2013a,b,
1693 Nelson et al. 2013a).

1694 Silicates reaching the Upper Gulf, mostly in surface flow/seepage, are probably the result
1695 of ground water associated with geothermal sources in the region, and these may be a nutrient
1696 source for the large diatom populations of the Northern Gulf (which require silica to make their
1697 shells). Silica-rich brines from the delta's Cerro Prieto geothermal power station, for example,
1698 have an average value of $69.2 \text{ mg L}^{-1} \text{ Si-SiO}_2$ (Orozco-Durán et al. 2015). Phosphates, however,
1699 are mostly transformed into a particle phase and precipitated out in sediments before reaching the
1700 Gulf, a process occurring at every dam the Colorado River encounters as phosphorous becomes
1701 trapped in reservoir sediments (Stevens et al. 1995, Stromberg and Chew 2002).

1702 Agricultural return-flows to the Colorado River channel in Mexico also carry high levels
1703 of fertilizers and insecticides. For example, during the 1990-91 crop cycle, at least 70,000 tons
1704 of fertilizers and 400,000 liters of insecticides were used in the Mexicali Valley (Daesslé et al.
1705 2009, based on DGE 1993). This has increased the organic and inorganic compounds in the
1706 upper delta region (visible in Figure 2 as the bright green of agricultural fields), including
1707 mercury, copper, arsenic, DDT, DDE, and DDD, in both surface and ground waters (García-
1708 Hernández et al. 2013b, Lugo-Ibarra et al. 2011, Daesslé et al. 2009).

1709 Laguna Salada Basin (also known as Laguna Macuata, in the Pattie Basin, in the early
1710 20th century) is situated in a fault depression between the massive Sierra de Juárez (of Baja
1711 California) on the west, and the 90 km-long Sierra Cucapá-Sierra El Mayor range on the east, the
1712 latter being fault-bounded ranges reaching ~1000 m in elevation (Figure 2). Laguna Salada
1713 Basin is a tectonically active pull-apart basin (described by some geologists as a western
1714 subbasin of the Mexicali Valley), a graben (or half-graben) formed by the Laguna Salada Fault
1715 on the east (part of the Pacific-North American Plate boundary system, and a probable southern
1716 continuation of the Elsinore Fault in southern California), and the Sierra Juárez Fault on the west

1717 (Mueller and Rockwell 1995, Martín-Barajas et al. 2001, Fletcher and Spelz 2009, Alles 2011,
1718 Nelson et al. 2012). Hot artesian springs were reported from the western slopes of the Sierra
1719 Cucapá by Sykes (1937) and also appeared on his 1907 map of the region. The location of the
1720 Laguna Salada Fault itself is easily recognized by surface features, such as fault scarps, faulted
1721 alluvial fans, and freshly exposed bedrock. Visible, young alluvial deposits were probably
1722 displaced during the large regional earthquakes of 1892, 2008 and 2010, and the basin itself is
1723 filled 4-6 km deep with alluvial deposits (Martín-Barajas et al. 2001).

1724 Like the Salton Basin, the Laguna Salada Basin has land surface elevations that lie below
1725 sea level, and the basin is lower in elevation than the Río Hardy channel at the southern tip of the
1726 Sierra El Mayor (Sykes 1937). In April 2016, we measured a low point in the upper part of the
1727 basin (~32°32'N, 115°42'W) using a hand-held GPS altimeter (calibrated 14 hours prior at sea
1728 level) at 11 m below mean sea level. Laguna Salada is a closed freshwater sink and evaporative
1729 basin, as is the Salton Sea. The northern boundary of the laguna is today effectively set by the
1730 high berm that supports Mexico's Federal Highway No. 2, which runs east-west through a pass
1731 in the northernmost Sierra Cucapá.

1732 Compeán-Jimenez et al. (ca. 1981) estimated that Laguna Salada had the potential to lose
1733 13,968 m³ of water per hectare annually through evaporation, but this is probably a significant
1734 under-estimation given that they calculated the surface area at only 400 km² (less than half the
1735 potential areal coverage when the laguna is filled) and with a volume of just 730,106 m³ (also
1736 probably a significant under-estimate).

1737 The great depth of alluvial deposits in Laguna Salada clearly indicates that it has served
1738 as a flood-drainage basin for the Colorado River for millennia, and historically, during flood
1739 years, water also drained from the mainstem of the Colorado River (below the confluence with

the Río Hardy) into the laguna, by way of the topographic low between the southern tip of the Sierra Cucapá-Sierra El Mayor range, and the northern tip (*El Promontorio*) of the Sierra de las Pintas (Sykes 1937, Mueller and Rockwell 1995, Cohen and Henges-Jeck 2001). Sykes (1937) described flood flows filling Laguna Salada numerous times during his field studies, between 1910 and 1932. In the late 19th century it supported a valuable subsistence fishery for the indigenous Cucapá People (when it was called Laguna Maquata). However, construction of Hoover and Glen Canyon Dams cut off the lake's freshwater inflow (the Colorado River) and that fishery was destroyed as the lake dried. Laguna Salada had a resurgence in the late 1970s and early 1980s, during flood years, but those surface waters quickly evaporated (Álvarez de Williams 2007, Brusca 2007). Nelson et al. (2013a) suggested that flow into Laguna Salada may have largely ceased in 1986. However, large precipitation events in the Southwest could lead to it refilling in the future.

The size of the laguna is highly variable, ranging from completely dry to nearly 1000 km² in area of surface water. The Laguna Salada Basin itself exceeds 90 km in length, paralleling the western flanks of the Sierra Cucapá-Sierra El Mayor range (Figures 2 and 3; also see Figure 1.1 in Cohen and Henges-Jeck 2001 and the 1937 Sykes' map). Compeán-Jiménez et al. (ca. 1981) cited the laguna as approximately 400 km². However, All (2006) reported it at ~1000 km², various Arizona Geological Society maps show it at just over 1000 km², Mueller and Rockwell's (1995) map shows it at ~800 km², Mexico's official INEGI map (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática, 1993) shows it at over 800 km², Sykes (1937) measured the basin at 1,280 km², and the cartography of the American Automobile Association map depicts it at around 950 km². GIS maps of the delta show the "bathtub ring" area of Laguna Salada to be 990 km² in size, which is the same as the LANDSAT image of the filled laguna in 1984 (Figure

1763 3a), although the total amount of flood water trapped on the delta in June 1984 was
1764 approximately 2500 km². The high-water line of Laguna Salada is also easily recognized in
1765 Google Earth satellite images, and the calculated size of this area (using a polygon algorithm
1766 provided in Google Earth) is just under 1000 km². The entryway to the basin, which can be
1767 breached by heavy river flows (especially when combined with high spring tidal flows up the
1768 river channel), is south of the Sierra Cucapá-Sierra El Mayor range, as shown in Cohen and
1769 Henges-Jeck (2001, p. 3), Sykes (1937), Mexico's INEGI maps, and satellite imagery (Figure 3).
1770 The prominent "thumb" at the southern end of the Laguna Salada Basin, demarcated by the
1771 northern point, or *Promontorio*, of the Sierra de las Pintas, is evident in Sykes's 1937 map and in
1772 satellite images (Figure 3).

1773 Using NASA images over a span of nearly two decades, All (2007) showed the extreme
1774 ebbs and flows of water into Laguna Salada and that during the 1980s flood years (at least the
1775 first half of the decade) about 1000 km² were inundated. In fact, what matters is not the amount
1776 of water in the basin at any given time (such as the Compeán-Jiménez et al. "snapshot in time"),
1777 but the capacity of the basin itself, which is approximately 1000 km².

1778 Laguna Salada can also form as a small lake during summer monsoon rains, but it is often
1779 completely dry. However, even when Laguna Salada appears "dry" it commonly is not, because
1780 of its high capacity to store interstitial water in the deep, silty, alluvial sediments extending
1781 beneath its surface, and this water bank can be covered by a 2.5 to 7.5-cm-thick cap of
1782 crystalized salt. As with All (2007) and Álvarez de Williams (2007), we have had our 4-wheel-
1783 drive vehicles stuck more than once attempting to drive across what appeared to be a dry lake
1784 bed that actually had a thick layer of water-saturated mud just below the crystallized salt surface.

1785 Evidence of Laguna Salada flooding also comes from records of the brackish-water
1786 barnacle *Amphibalanus subalbidus* (formerly *Balanus subalbidus*). This West Atlantic-native
1787 barnacle can live in nearly freshwater salinities (Poirrier and Partridge 1979) and seems to have
1788 found its way into the Colorado River Delta in the wet years of the 1980s. In 1989, A. Boetzius
1789 found specimens of *A. subalbidus* in a dry portion of Laguna Salada Basin, and, in the same year,
1790 barnacle specialist R. Van Syoc found living specimens in a flooded part of the laguna (Van
1791 Syoc 1992). In 1989 Álvarez de Williams (2007) found dead shells in Laguna Salada, in 1990
1792 Van Syoc found dead shells in the Río Hardy, and in 1991 R. Brusca found dead shells in a dry
1793 peripheral area of Laguna Salada; the latter specimens had been growing in profusion at a height
1794 of 1.5 m on dead shrubs in the westernmost part of the basin (Brusca 2007). In 2002, barnacle
1795 specialist W. Newman found living *A. subalbidus* on the delta again, but this time in agriculture
1796 canals at New River and Colonia Zacatecas, suggesting that there had been an exchange of water
1797 between there and Laguna Salada, possibly during the huge 1983-1984 flood that inundated the
1798 delta (Newman, pers. comm.). *Amphibalanus subalbidus* is native to the Gulf of Mexico and has
1799 never been reported from the Gulf of California (or anywhere else in the East Pacific) in modern
1800 times. This barnacle is well known from estuarine habitats in the Gulf of Mexico (Poirrier and
1801 Partridge 1979). Van Syoc (1992) concluded that the modern-day *A. subalbidus* is the same
1802 species as the fossil barnacle, *Balanus canabus* Zullo and Buising, 1989, described from the
1803 Bouse Formation of the lower Colorado River area of Arizona and California, and Van Syoc
1804 (1992) relegated the latter species to a junior synonym of *A. subalbidus*. This last discovery
1805 suggests that this now-West Atlantic species once lived in the Colorado River Delta, but then
1806 went locally extinct, only to be reintroduced in recent times. Dead specimens of *A. subalbidus*
1807 can be found embedded in the sediments throughout the laguna today (Figure 5).

1808 The topographical gradient of the Colorado River in the lower delta region is so slight
1809 (about 16 cm/km; Thompson 1968) that the river loses its firm channel and becomes a
1810 meandering network of small streams, oxbows, sloughs, and backwaters. The expanse of the
1811 delta between the southern end of the Laguna Salada Basin (on the west) and the Ciénega de
1812 Santa Clara wetland (on the east) is low-lying mudflat that can become inundated by brackish
1813 water during now-rare flood events of the Colorado River, and much of it can also become
1814 saturated with seawater during the highest spring tides in the Upper Gulf. Today, this lower-
1815 most delta region is fundamentally marine in nature, not riparian. Much of it is vegetatively
1816 dominated by the endemic marine grass *Distichlis palmeri* (Felger 2000). In fact, the final 19 km
1817 of the Colorado River has been viewed as part of the Upper Gulf's intertidal zone (Cohen et al.
1818 2001). Because flood flows down the Colorado River channel in this lowermost delta region are
1819 not naturally well channelized, water thinly spreads out over the entire area.

1820 Responding to a long history of flooding on the delta (and loss of homes and agricultural
1821 land), the Mexican government channelized much of the region, diverting most of the lowermost
1822 delta water flow directly into the Laguna Salada Basin. In 1974, a 3 m-deep canal was
1823 constructed to move floodwaters from the Colorado River and lowermost delta (Irrigation
1824 District No. 14) into the basin. The government also excavated the Canal Alimentador (Feeder
1825 Canal), near the Cerro Prieto geothermal power generating plant just east of the Sierra Cucapá,
1826 that moved floodwaters from the west-central Mexicali Valley to Laguna Salada. The 1983-84
1827 floods washed out a large, natural earthen berm along the Río Hardy channel, which had acted to
1828 keep water in the channel, and thus flowing to the delta wetlands. After this event, however,
1829 overflows were diverted into the Laguna Salada Basin via the Laguna Salada Canal.

1830 The 24 km-long Río Hardy (a former channel and now tributary of the Colorado River)
1831 collects water from the eastern watershed of the Sierra Cucapá-Sierra El Mayor range, as well as
1832 flood, agricultural, and various waste waters from the western Mexicali Valley. With declines in
1833 precipitation over the past 25 years, most of the Río Hardy flow is now from agricultural
1834 drainage, wastewater of the Cerro Prieto geothermal wells (which began operating in 1973), and
1835 wastewater from the Arenitas secondary sewage treatment plant (that flows through the small
1836 Las Arenitas wetland, recently created by local conservation groups in collaboration with the
1837 state government to help biologically treat the outflow from the plant). The Río Hardy water is
1838 thus of poor quality; it is high in total salts and may contain pesticide residues, heavy metals,
1839 selenium, and nitrates from fertilizers. During most high-flow events from 1983 to 1985, water
1840 apparently flowed from the Río Hardy more or less directly into Laguna Salada. However,
1841 Nelson et al. (2013a,b) also documented at least some of the flood flow in the river channel all
1842 the way to the Gulf in 1984, 1993 and 1997, so not all of the delta's water was impounded in the
1843 laguna.

1844 The government report by Compeán-Jimenez et al. (ca. 1981) found *Tamarix*
1845 *ramosissima* (tamarisk, salt cedar) and *Typha latifolia* (cattail) to be the dominant macrophyte
1846 vegetation at Laguna Salada. The study also found 11 species of freshwater fishes and 2 species
1847 of crustaceans—none indigenous to the Colorado River south of the U.S.-Mexico border, and all
1848 introduced from California and Arizona, probably via the flood flows that crossed the
1849 international border. In addition, some marine euryhaline species immigrated into the laguna
1850 from the Sea of Cortez—striped mullet (*Mugil cephalus*), machete (*Elops affinis*), small squids,
1851 etc. In the past, high spring tides in the Upper Gulf occasionally reached the laguna, periodically
1852 introducing marine species of fishes and invertebrates. This largely ended with construction of

1853 Mexico's Federal Highway No. 5, running south to San Felipe. Although the floodwater
1854 connection of Laguna Salada to the Sea of Cortez may have largely been closed in the early
1855 1980s, the euryhaline striped mullet was apparently able to spawn and recruit in brackish water
1856 and individuals have been sporadically reported from irrigation waters of the Mexicali Valley
1857 ever since at least 1967. It has been suggested that the floods of the 1983-84 El Niño might have
1858 destroyed most of the diversion canals leading to Laguna Salada, but the extent and impact of
1859 this is unclear, as is any channeling that might have been repaired or rebuilt since that event.

1860 The major impact of all these sinks and natural and man-made diversions in the delta, that
1861 redirect surface-water flood flows in the Colorado River channel, has been to prevent river water
1862 from directly reaching the Gulf of California. As a result, since the mid-1970s only during the
1863 flood years of 1978, 1982-1988, 1993, and 1997-1999 is it likely that any significant Colorado
1864 River surface water could have reached the Upper Gulf (seepage out of Ciénega de Santa Clara
1865 aside). The amount that actually reached the Gulf during those flood years remains a hotly
1866 debated topic.

1867

1868 5. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

1869

1870 Our review of published research and our personal observations indicate that the Northern Gulf
1871 of California is, historically and currently, one of the most biologically productive marine
1872 regions on Earth. This high productivity is driven by a unique mix of factors, including: coastal
1873 upwelling, wind-driven mixing, extreme tidal mixing and turbulence, thermohaline circulation
1874 that moves intermediate waters into the mixed layer, coastal-trapped waves, regular sediment
1875 resuspension, and (to a lesser extent) agricultural runoff and perhaps input from decomposing

1876 tidal-flat plant debris, and released nutrients from erosion of ancient Colorado River Delta
1877 sediments. Suggestions that decreased Colorado River flow due to upstream anthropogenic
1878 water impoundments and diversions has had a negative impact on the health of the Northern Gulf
1879 of California ecosystem, particularly by reducing primary productivity and/or stock production
1880 of finfish and shellfish, appear to be ill-founded. There is no evidence that surface flow from the
1881 Colorado River is now, nor has ever been an important driver of primary productivity in the
1882 Northern Gulf, and there is only equivocal or disputable evidence to support the claim that
1883 reduced river flow has impacted secondary (finfish) production in that region. Two tests of the
1884 river flow-productivity hypothesis made by tracking nutrients and phytoplankton production over
1885 time periods that included high, low, and zero river inflow, found no correlation. In fact, both
1886 studies found that decreased nutrients and primary productivity were associated with high
1887 freshwater flows into the Upper Gulf. Aside from impacts of historical and current fisheries
1888 activities, the marine ecosystem of the Northern Gulf remains healthy, rich in nutrients, and high
1889 in biodiversity and productivity. Primary productivity and human extraction of shrimp, Gulf
1890 corvina, totoaba (largely illegally), and other marine resources, remain very high in this region.
1891 The ecosystem is historically adapted to widely fluctuating Colorado River flows and elevated
1892 salinities. There also is no evidence that reduced Colorado River flow has negatively impacted
1893 the health of the critically endangered vaquita porpoise, and assertions that it has done so deflect
1894 attention from the actual cause of decline—high levels of bycatch in legal and illegal gillnet
1895 fisheries. Climate change models (and actual data trends) suggest there will be even less
1896 Colorado River water reaching the Gulf of California in the foreseeable future, and that the delta
1897 will be gradually inundated by Upper Gulf waters as sea levels continue to rise. However,
1898 productivity should remain high and fisheries can be sustained if they are properly managed.

1899 Future research should focus on the potential effects of climate change on the Northern
1900 Gulf ecosystem and, importantly, on the potential rate of marine transgression across the
1901 Colorado River Delta as sea levels continue to rise. More information is also needed on the
1902 possible negative impact of freshwater inflow from the Colorado River on productivity in the
1903 Northern Gulf. Future studies of river-flow impact on the Upper Gulf should include ground-
1904 truth surface salinity measurements in the study area, to determine how much, if any, Colorado
1905 River water is actually reaching the Upper Gulf.

1906

1907 6. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1908

1909 A number of people were kind enough to critically review early versions of this manuscript, and
1910 we thank them sincerely: Luis Bourillón, Lorenzo Rojas-Bracho, Debra Colodner, Paul Dayton,
1911 Christine Flanagan, Karl Flessa, Michel Hendrickx, Lorayne Meltzer, Sarah Mesnick, Ed Pfeiler,
1912 Tad Pfister, and Barbara Taylor. Linda Brewer created Figure 1; Alan Yanahan (University of
1913 Arizona, Tucson) constructed the GIS map of the Northern Gulf of California/Colorado River
1914 Delta (Figure 2). Alejandro Hinojosa-Corona (CICESE, Ensenada, Baja California) contributed
1915 the LANDSAT images (Figure 3). Paul Valentich-Scott (Santa Barbara Natural History
1916 Museum, California) and Ellen E. Strong (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) provided
1917 assistance with *Mulinia* taxonomy and collection records. The first author thanks The Schlinger
1918 Foundation for its continuing support of his work in Mexico.

1919

1920 7. LITERATURE CITED

1921

1922 Aalbers, S. A. 2008. Seasonal, diel, and lunar spawning periodicities and associated sound
 1923 production of white seabass (*Atractoscion nobilis*). U. S. Fishery Bulletin 106: 143-151.

1924 Ainsworth, C. H., H. N. Morzaria-Luna, I. C. Kaplan, P. S. Levin and E. A. Fulton. 2012a. Full
 1925 compliance with harvest regulations yields ecological benefits: Northern Gulf of California
 1926 case study. Journal of Applied Ecology 49: 63-72.

1927 Ainsworth, C. H., H. N. Morzaria-Luna, I. C. Kaplan, P. S. Levin, E. A. Fulton, R. Cudney-
 1928 Bueno, P. Turk-Boyer, J. Torre, G. D. Danemann and T. Pfister. 2012b. Effective
 1929 ecosystem-based management must encourage regulatory compliance: A Gulf of California
 1930 case study. Marine Policy 36: 1275-1283.

1931 All, J. D. 2006. Colorado River floods, droughts, and shrimp fishing in the upper Gulf of
 1932 California, Mexico. Environmental Management 37: 111-125.

1933 All, J. D. 2007. Sound and fury signifying nothing: using geoinformatics to inform resource
 1934 policy in the Gulf of California, Mexico. Environmental Management 40: 7-11.

1935 All, J. D. and S. R. Yool. 2008. Indexing endangered species risk in the Colorado River Delta,
 1936 Mexico using AVHRR NDVI time-series data. Geocarto International 19: 4-5.

1937 Allen, W. E. 1923. Observations on surface distribution of marine diatoms of Lower California
 1938 in 1921. Proceedings of the California Academy of Sciences 12: 437-442.

1939 Allen, W. E. 1937. Plankton diatoms of the Gulf of California obtained by the G. Allen
 1940 Hancock Expedition of 1936. Hancock Pacific Expeditions, University of Southern
 1941 California 3: 47-59.

1942 Allen, W. E. 1938. The Templeton-Crocker Expedition to the Gulf of California in 1935.
 1943 Phytoplankton. Transactions of the American Microscopy Society 67: 328-335.

- 1944 Alles, D. L. 2011. Geology of the Salton Trough.
- 1945 <http://fire.biol.wvu.edu/trent/alles/GeologySaltonTrough.pdf>. Last updated 28 October
- 1946 2011.
- 1947 Álvarez de Williams, A. 2007. Sing the River. Chapter 11 (pp. 99-116) in, R. S. Felger and B.
- 1948 Broyles (eds.), *Dry Borders. Great Natural Reserves of the Sonoran Desert*. University of
- 1949 Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
- 1950 Álvarez, L. G. and S. E. Jones. 2002. Factors influencing suspended sediment flux in the Upper
- 1951 Gulf of California. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 54: 747-759.
- 1952 Álvarez-Borrego, S. 2001. The Colorado River estuary and Upper Gulf of California, Baja,
- 1953 Mexico. Chapter 33 (pp. 331-340) in, U. Seeliger, L. Drude-De-Lacerda and B. Kjerfve
- 1954 (eds.), *Coastal Marine Ecosystems of Latin-America*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- 1955 Álvarez-Borrego, S. 2002. Physical and biological linkages between the upper and lower
- 1956 Colorado Delta. Pp. 1077-1089 in, D. J. Rapport, W. L. Lasley, D. E. Rolston, N. O.
- 1957 Nielsen, C. O. Qauualset and A. B. Damania (eds.), *Managing for Healthy Ecosystems*. Lewis
- 1958 Publishers, Boca Raton, Louisiana.
- 1959 Álvarez-Borrego, S., B. P. Flores-Báez and L. A. Galindo-Bect. 1975. Hidrología del alto Golfo
- 1960 de California-II. Condiciones durante invierno, primavera y verano. *Ciencias Marinas* 2: 21–
- 1961 36.
- 1962 Álvarez-Borrego, S. and L.A. Galindo-Bect. 1974. Hidrología del alto Golfo de California-I.
- 1963 Condiciones durante otoño. *Ciencias Marinas* 1: 46-64.
- 1964 Álvarez-Borrego, S. and J. R. Lara-Lara. 1991. The physical environment and primary
- 1965 productivity of the Gulf of California. Pp. 555-567 in, J. P. Dauphin and B. Simoneit (eds.),

- 1966 *The Gulf and Peninsular Province of the Californias*. American Association of Petroleum
- 1967 Geologists, Memoir 47. Tulsa, Oklahoma.
- 1968 Álvarez-Borrego, S., J. A. Rivera, G. Gaxiola-Castro, M. J. Acosta-Ruíz, and R. A.
- 1969 Schwartzlose. 1978. Nutrientes en el Golfo de California. *Ciencias Marinas* 5: 53-71.
- 1970 Álvarez-Borrego, S. and R. A. Schwartzlose. 1979. Water masses of the Gulf of California.
- 1971 *Ciencias Marinas* 6: 43–63.
- 1972 Álvarez-Molina, L. L., S. Álvarez-Borrego, J. R. Lara-Lara and S. G. Marinone. 2013. Annual
- 1973 and semiannual variations of phytoplankton biomass and production in the central Gulf of
- 1974 California estimated from satellite data. *Ciencias Marinas* 39: 217-230.
- 1975 Anderson, B. T., J. O. Roads and S. C. Chen. 2000. Large-scale forcing of summertime
- 1976 monsoon surges over the Gulf of California and the southwestern United States. *Journal of*
- 1977 *Geophysical Research, Atmosphere* 105: 24455-24467.
- 1978 Anderson, G., D. C. Agnew and H. O. Johnson. 2003. Salton Trough regional deformation
- 1979 estimated from combined trilateration and survey-mode GPS data. *Bulletin of the*
- 1980 *Seismological Society of America* 93: 2402-2414.
- 1981 Aragón-Noriega, E. A. 2014. Modeling the individual growth of the Gulf corvina, *Cynoscion*
- 1982 *othonopterus* (Pisces: Sciaenidae) using a multi-model approach. *Ciencias Marinas* 40: 149-
- 1983 161.
- 1984 Aragón-Noriega, E. A. and L. E. Calderón-Aguilera. 2000. Does damming of the Colorado
- 1985 River affect the nursery area of blue shrimp *Litopenaeus stylirostris* (Decapoda: Penaeidae)
- 1986 in the Upper Gulf of California. *Revista de Biología Tropical* 48: 1-5

1987 Aragón-Noriega, E. A. and L. E. Calderón-Aguilera. 2001. Age and growth of shrimp
1988 postlarvae in the Upper Gulf of California. *Aqua, Journal of Ichthyology and Aquatic*
1989 *Biology* 4: 99-104.

1990 Aragón-Noriega, E. A. and A. R. García-Juárez. 2002. Postlarvae recruitment of blue shrimp
1991 *Litopenaeus stylirostris* (Stimpson, 1871) in antiestuarine conditions due to anthropogenic
1992 activities. *Hidrobiológica* 12: 37-46.

1993 Aragón-Noriega, E. A., C. Cervantes-Valle, A. R. García-Juárez and L. E. Calderón-Aguilera.
1994 1999. Distribución y abundancia de la población desovante de camarones del norte del Golfo
1995 de California durante el verano de 1996. *Ciencia y Mar* 3: 37-48.

1996 Aragón-Noriega, E. A., G. Rodríguez, M. A. Cisneros-Mata and A. Ortega-Rubio. 2010.
1997 Managing a protected marine area for the conservation of critically endangered vaquita
1998 (*Phocoena sinus* Norris and McFarland, 1958) in the Upper Gulf of California. *International*
1999 *Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 17: 410-416.

2000 Aragón-Noriega, E. A., W. Valenzuela-Quñones, H. Esparza-Leal, A. Ortega-Rubio and G.
2001 Rodríguez-Quiroz. 2009. Analysis of management options for artisanal fishing of the bigeye
2002 croaker *Micropogonias megalops* (Gilbert, 1890) in the Upper Gulf of California.
2003 *International Journal of Biodiversity Science and Management* 5: 208-214.

2004 Arellano-Peralta, V. A. and L. Medrano González. 2013. Mamíferos marinos en el golfo de
2005 California. Macroecología, impacto humano y su perspectiva hacia la conservación.
2006 Colección Posgrado, Biblioteca Nacional de México, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de
2007 México. 265 pp.

2008 Arellano-Peralta, V. A., A. Sáez Arroyo and L. Medrano González. 2011. Historia del impacto
 2009 humano sobre los mamíferos marinos del Golfo de California. CONABIO, Biodiversitas
 2010 98: 8-12.

2011 Argote, M. L., A. Amador and M. F. Lavín. 1995. Tidal dissipation and stratification in the
 2012 Gulf of California. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 100(C8): 16,103-16,118.

2013 Arias, E., M. Albar, M. Becerra, A. Boone, D. Chia, J. Gao, C. Muñoz, I. Parra, M. Reza, J.
 2014 Saíenz and A. Vargas. 2004. Gulf of California/Colorado River Basin. Global International
 2015 Waters Assessment, United Nations Environment Programme, Report 27. University of
 2016 Kalmar, Sweden. 116 pp.

2017 Arvizu, J. and H. Chávez. 1972. Sinopsis sobre la biología de la totoaba *Cynoscion macdonaldi*
 2018 Gilbert, 1891. FAO Fisheries Synopses 108: 1-27.

2019 Baba, J. C. D. Peterson and H. J. Schrader. 1991. Fine-grained terrigenous sediment supply and
 2020 dispersal in the Gulf of California during the last century. Pp. 589-602 in, J. P. Dauphin and
 2021 B. R. T. Simoneit (eds.), *The Gulf and Peninsular Province of the Californias*. American
 2022 Association of Petroleum Geologists, Memoir 47.

2023 Bahre, C. J., L. Bourillón and J. Torre. 2000. The Seri and commercial totoaba fishing (1930-
 2024 1965). *Journal of the Southwest* 42: 559-575.

2025 Barrera-Guevara, J. C. 1990. The conservation of *Totoaba macdonaldi* (Pisces: Sciaenidae) in
 2026 the Gulf of California, Mexico. *Journal of Fish Biology* 37 (Suppl. A): 201-202.

2027 Beier, S. 1997. A numerical investigation of the annual variability in the Gulf of California.
 2028 *Journal of Physical Oceanography* 27: 615-632.

2029 Beier, S. and P. Ripa. 1999. Seasonal gyres in the northern Gulf of California. *Journal of*
 2030 *Physical Oceanography* 29: 305-311.

2031 Berdegúe-A., J. 1955. La pesquería de la totoaba (*Cynoscion macdonaldi* Gilbert) en San Felipe,
2032 Baja California. Revista de la Sociedad Mexicana de Historia Natural 16: 45-78.

2033 Bernal, P. A. 1981. A review of the low-frequency response of the pelagic ecosystem in the
2034 California Current. CalCOFI Reports 22: 49-62.

2035 Beron-Vera, F. J. and P. Ripa. 2000. Three dimensional aspects of the seasonal heat balance in
2036 the Gulf of California. Journal of Geophysical Research 105: 11,441-11,457.

2037 Bialas, R. W. and W. R. Buck. 2009. How sediment promotes narrow rifting: application to the
2038 Gulf of California. Tectonics 28, doi: 10.1029/2008TC002394.

2039 Blake, W. P. 1914. The Cahuilla Basin and Desert of the Colorado. Pp. 1-12 in, D. T.
2040 MacDougal (ed.), *The Salton Sea*. Carnegie Institute of Washington, Publ. No. 193.

2041 Bobadilla, M., S. Alvarez-Borrego, S. Avila-Foucat, F. Lara-Valencia and I. Espejel. 2011.
2042 Evolution of environmental policy instruments implemented for the protection of totoaba and
2043 the vaquita porpoise in the Upper Gulf of California. Environmental Science and Policy 14:
2044 998-1007.

2045 Bordoni, S. and B. Stevens. 2006. Principal component analysis of the summertime winds over
2046 the Gulf of California: A Gulf Surge index. Monthly Weather Review 134: 3395-3414.

2047 Bray, N. A. 1988. Thermohaline circulation in the Gulf of California. Journal of Geophysical
2048 Research: Oceans 93: 4993-5020, doi:10.1029/JC0093iC05p04993.

2049 Bray, N. A. and J. M. Robles. 1991. Physical oceanography of the Gulf of California. Pp. 511–
2050 553 in, J. P. Dauphin and B. R. T. Simoneit (eds.), *The Gulf and Peninsular Province of the*
2051 *Californias*. American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Memoir 47. Tulsa, Oklahoma.

2052 Brinton, E., A. Fleminger and D. Siegel-Causey. 1986. The temperate and tropical planktonic
2053 biotas of the Gulf of California. CalCOFI Reports 27: 228-266.

2054 Brito-Castillo, L., S. Díaz-Castro, C. A. Salinas-Zavala and A. V. Douglas. 2003.
 2055 Reconstruction of long-term winter streamflow in the Gulf of California continental
 2056 watershed. *Journal of Hydrology* 278: 39-50.

2057 Brownell, R. L. Jr. 1982. Status of the cochito, *Phocoena sinus*, in the Gulf of California. Pp.
 2058 85-90 in, J. G. Clark (ed.), *Mammals in the Seas. Volume IV: Small Cetaceans, Seals,*
 2059 *Sirenians and Otters*. FAO Advisory Committee on Marine Resources Research. Working
 2060 Party on Marine Mammals. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

2061 Brusca, R. C. 2007. Invertebrate biodiversity in the northern Gulf of California. Pp. 418-504
 2062 (chapter 29) in, R. S. Felger and W. Broyles (eds.), *Dry Borders. Great Natural Reserves of*
 2063 *the Sonoran Desert*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.

2064 Brusca, R. C. (ed.). 2010. *The Gulf of California: Biodiversity and Conservation*. University of
 2065 Arizona Press & Arizona-Sonora Desert Museum Press, Tucson, Arizona.

2066 Brusca, R. C., L. T. Findley, P. A. Hastings, M. E. Hendrickx, J. Torre Cosio and A. M. van der
 2067 Heiden. 2005. Macrofaunal biodiversity in the Gulf of California. Pp. 179-203 (chapter 9)
 2068 in, J.-L. E. Cartron, G. Ceballos and R. Felger (eds.), *Biodiversity, Ecosystems, and*
 2069 *Conservation in Northern Mexico*. Oxford University Press, New York.

2070 Brusca, R. C. and M. E. Hendrickx. 2015 Macrofauna Golfo Invertebrate Database.
 2071 <http://www.desertmuseum.org/center/seaofcortez/database.php>.

2072 Brusca, R. C., J. F. Wiens, W. M. Meyer, J. Eble, K. Franklin, J. T. Overpeck and W. Moore.
 2073 2013. Dramatic response to climate change in the Southwest: Robert Whittaker's 1963
 2074 Arizona mountain plant transect revisited. *Ecology and Evolution* 3: 3307-3319, doi:
 2075 10.1002/ece3.720.

2076 Calambokidis, J. 1988. Chlorinated hydrocarbons in the Gulf of California harbor porpoise
 2077 (*Phocoena sinus*). Final contract report MM4465846-3 to the U. S. Marine Mammal
 2078 Commission. Available at <http://www.cascadiaresearch.org/>
 2079 Calderón-Aguilera, L. E. and K. W. Flessa. 2009. Just add water? Transboundary Colorado
 2080 River flow and ecosystem services in the upper Gulf of California. Chapter 10 (pp. 155-169)
 2081 in, L. López-Hoffman, E. D. McGovern, R. G. Varady and K. W. Flessa (eds.), *Conservation*
 2082 *of Shared Environments. Learning from the United States and Mexico*. University of
 2083 Arizona Press, Tucson.
 2084 Calderón-Aguilera, L. E., S. G. Marinone and E. A. Aragón-Noriega. 2003. Influence of
 2085 oceanographic processes on the early life stages of the blue shrimp (*Litopenaeus stylirostris*)
 2086 in the Upper Gulf of California. *Journal of Marine Systems* 39: 117–128.
 2087 Carbajal, N., A. Souza and R. Durazo. 1997. A numerical study of the ex-ROFI of the Colorado
 2088 River. *Journal of Marine Systems* 12: 17-33.
 2089 Carpelan, L. H. 1961. History of the Salton Sea. Pp. 9-15 in, B. W. Walker (ed.), *The ecology*
 2090 *of the Salton Sea, California, in relation to the sportfishery*. California Department of Fish
 2091 and Game, Fish Bulletin No. 113.
 2092 Carrillo, L. E., M. F. Lavín and E. Palacios-Hernández. 2002. Seasonal evolution of the
 2093 geostrophic circulation in the northern Gulf of California. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf*
 2094 *Science* 54: 157–173.
 2095 Carrillo-Guerrero, Y., E. P. Glenn and O. Hinojosa-Huerta. 2013. Water budget for agricultural
 2096 and aquatic ecosystems in the delta of the Colorado River, Mexico: Implications for
 2097 obtaining water for the environment. *Ecological Engineering* 59: 41-51.

2098 Carriquiry, J. D. 1993. Dynamics of sedimentation in the deltaic system of the Colorado River.
 2099 Proceedings of the II International Meeting on Geology of Baja California Peninsula.
 2100 Ensenada, B. C., Mexico.

2101 Carriquiry, J. D. and A. Sánchez. 1999. Sedimentation in the Colorado River Delta and Upper
 2102 Gulf of California after nearly a century of discharge loss. *Marine Geology* 158: 125-145.

2103 Carriquiry, J. D., A. Sánchez and V. F. Camacho-Ibar. 2001. Sedimentation in the northern
 2104 Gulf of California after cessation of the Colorado River discharge. *Sedimentary Geology*
 2105 144: 37-62.

2106 Carriquiry, J. D., J. A. Villaescusa, V. Camacho-Ibar, L. W. Daesslé and P. G. Castro-Castro.
 2107 2011. The effects of damming on the material flux in the Colorado River delta.
 2108 *Environmental and Earth Science* 62: 1404-1418.

2109 Castillo-Moreno, G. 1999. Efecto de algunas variables sobre la abundancia relativa de
 2110 postlarvas de camarón de los géneros *Litopenaeus* y *Farfantepenaeus* (Crustacea: Decapoda)
 2111 en el Alto Golfo de California. Tesis de Maestría, Centro de Investigación Científica y de
 2112 Educación Superior de Ensenada, Baja California. 74 pp.

2113 Chao, N. L., H. Espinosa, L. T. Findley and A. van der Heiden. *Cynoscion othonopterus*. IUCN
 2114 Red List of Threatened Species. (Accessed 15 May 2015)

2115 Christensen, N.S., A. W. Wood, N. Voisin, D. P. Lettenmaier and R. N. Palmer. 2004. The
 2116 effects of climate change on the hydrology and water resources of the Colorado River Basin.
 2117 *Climate Change* 62: 337-363.

2118 Chute, G. R. 1928. The totuava fishery of the California Gulf. California Department of Fish
 2119 and Game 14: 275-281.

2120 Chute, G. R. 1930. Seen Kow, a regal soup-stock. California Department of Fish and Game 16:
 2121 23-35.

2122 Cinti, A., W. Shaw, R. Cudney-Bueno and M. Rojo. 2010. The unintended consequences of
 2123 formal fisheries policies: Social disparities and resource overuse in a major fishing
 2124 community in the Gulf of California, Mexico. *Marine Policy* 34: 328-339.

2125 Cintra-Buenrostro, C. E., K. W. Flessa and D. L. Dettman. 2012. Restoration flows for the
 2126 Colorado River estuary, Mexico: Estimates from oxygen isotopes in the bivalve mollusk
 2127 *Mulinia coloradoensis* (Mactridae: Bivalvia). *Wetlands Ecology Management*, doi:
 2128 10.1007/s11273-012-9255-5.

2129 CIRVA (Comité Internacional para la Recuperación de la Vaquita). 2014. Report of the 5th
 2130 meeting of the International Committee for the Recovery of the Vaquita. Available at:
 2131 [http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/Report-of-the-Fifth-Meeting-of-](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/Report-of-the-Fifth-Meeting-of-CIRVA.pdf)
 2132 [CIRVA.pdf](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/Report-of-the-Fifth-Meeting-of-CIRVA.pdf) (Accessed 7 March 2016)

2133 CIRVA (Comité Internacional para la Recuperación de la Vaquita). 2015. Report of the 6th
 2134 meeting of the International Committee for the Recovery of the Vaquita. Available at
 2135 [http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-6-Report-Rev-19-July-](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-6-Report-Rev-19-July-2015.pdf)
 2136 [2015.pdf](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-6-Report-Rev-19-July-2015.pdf) (Accessed 7 March 2016)

2137 CIRVA (Comité Internacional para la Recuperación de la Vaquita). 2016. Report of the 7th
 2138 meeting of the International Committee for the Recovery of the Vaquita, May 10-13, 2016.
 2139 Available at [http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-6-Report-Rev-19-](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-6-Report-Rev-19-July-2015.pdf)
 2140 [July-2015.pdf](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-6-Report-Rev-19-July-2015.pdf) (accessed 7 March 2016). Available at [http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-7-Final-Report.pdf)
 2141 [content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-7-Final-Report.pdf](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/CIRVA-7-Final-Report.pdf).

2142 Cisneros-Mata, M. A. 2010. The importance of fisheries in the Gulf of California and eco-
 2143 system-based sustainable co-management for conservation. Pp. 119-134 in, R. Brusca (ed.),
 2144 *The Gulf of California. Biodiversity and Conservation*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
 2145 Cisneros-Mata, M. A., M. A. Cisneros-Mata, S. Harper and D. Pauly. 2013. Extent and
 2146 implications of IUU catch in Mexico's marine fisheries. *Marine Policy* 39: 283-288.
 2147 Cisneros-Mata, M. A., G. Montemayor-López and M. J. Román-Rodríguez. 1995. Life history
 2148 and conservation of *Totoaba macdonaldi*. *Conservation Biology* 94: 806–814.
 2149 CITES. 2015. Totoaba, in, Review of Appendixes, based on Resolution of the Conference 9.24
 2150 (Rev.). (Accessed 15 May 2015)
 2151 CLIMAS Project (University of Arizona). 2012. Available at
 2152 www.climas.arizona.edu/projects/southwest-climate-outlook (Accessed 15 November 2012)
 2153 Coan, E. V. and P. Valentich-Scott. 2012. *Bivalve Seashells of Tropical West America* (2 vols).
 2154 Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History, Santa Barbara, California.
 2155 Cohen, M. J. 2005. Understanding flows through the remnant Colorado River Delta—
 2156 recommendations for stream-gauge sites and data collection. Pacific Institute Publication,
 2157 Boulder, Colorado. www.pacinst.org.
 2158 Cohen, M. J. 2013. Groundwater dynamics in the Colorado River limitrophe. Pacific Institute,
 2159 Oakland, California. www.pacinst.org.
 2160 Cohen, M. J. and C. Henges-Jeck. 2001. Missing water: The uses and flows of water in the
 2161 Colorado River Delta region. A Report of the Pacific Institute, Sept. 2001, Oakland,
 2162 California. ISBN: 1-893790-05-3.
 2163 Cohen, M. J., C. Henges-Jeck and G. Castillo-Moreno. 2001. A preliminary water balance for
 2164 the Colorado River Delta, 1992-1998. *Journal of Arid Environments* 49: 35-48.

2165 Compeán-Jiménez, G., O. Baylon-Grecco, H. Robles and J. Aranda. Undated (ca. 1981).

2166 Estudio preliminar de la pesquería de la Laguna Salada, Baja California. Delegación Federal

2167 de Pesca en el Estado de Baja California.

2168 <http://www.sci.sdsu.edu/salton/EstudioPesqueriaLagunaSala.html>

2169 CONAGUA. 2006. Relación de cultivos establecidos: Total sistemas (año agrícola 2005-06).

2170 Comisión Nacional del Agua, Jefatura del Distrito de Riego 014. Departamento de

2171 Estadística Agrícola, Mexicali, Baja California.

2172 CONAGUA. 2007. Determinación de la disponibilidad de agua en el acuífero del valle de

2173 Mexicali, Estado de Baja California. Diario Oficial de la Federación (13 de agosto).

2174 CONAGUA. 2010. Determinación de la disponibilidad de agua en el acuífero 2601 valle de San

2175 Luis Río Colorado, Estado de Sonora. Diario Oficial de la Federación (16 de agosto).

2176 CONAPESCA. 2010. Subdelegación de Pesca en Sonora. In, Manual de capacitación y diseño

2177 de recursos sobre diferentes técnicas recomendadas para el manejo y procesamiento de la

2178 curvina golfina que permitirá dar el valor agregado requerido, que será diverso y muy

2179 relacionado a los hábitos de consumo de los diferentes mercados en los que se pretende

2180 colocar el recurso (producto 3). Consultores Ejecutivos de Sonora S.A. de C. V. Agosto de

2181 2010, Guaymas, Sonora. 84 pp.

2182 Cortés-Lara, M. del C., S. Álvarez-Borrego and A. D. Giles-Guzmán. 1999. Vertical mixing

2183 effect on the distribution of nutrients and phytoplankton in two regions of the Gulf of

2184 California during summer. *Revista Sociedad Mexicana de Historia Natural* 49: 193-206.

2185 Crowell, B. W., Y. Bock, D. T. Sandwell and Y. Fialko. 2013. Geodetic investigation into the

2186 deformation of the Salton Trough. *Journal of Geophysical Research: Solid Earth* 18: 5030-

2187 5039, doi:10.1002/jgrb.50347.

2188 Cummings, J. A. 1977. Seasonal and aerial variation of zooplankton standing stocks in the
 2189 Northern Gulf of California. M.Sc. thesis, University of Arizona, Tucson. 61 pp.
 2190 Cupul-Magaña, L. A. 1994. Flujos de sedimentos en suspension y de nutrientes en la Cuenca
 2191 estuarine del Río Colorado. Tesis de Maestría. Universidad Autónoma de Baja California.
 2192 Ensenada, Baja California, Mexico. 117 pp.
 2193 Daesslé, L., K. C. Lugo-Ibarra, H. J. Tobschall, M. Melo, E. A. Gutiérrez-Galindo and J. García-
 2194 Hernández. 2009. Accumulation of As, Pb and Cu associated to the recent sedimentary
 2195 processes in the Colorado Delta, south of the US-Mexico boundary. Archives in
 2196 Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 56: 680-692.
 2197 Daesslé, L., A. Orozco, U. Struck, V. F. Camacho-Ibar, R. van Geldern, E. Santamaría-del-Ángel
 2198 and J. A. C. Barth. 2016. Sources and sinks of nutrients and organic carbon during the 2014
 2199 pulse flow of the Colorado River into Mexico. Ecological Engineering, doi:
 2200 org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2016.02.018.
 2201 Dall, W. H. 1894. On the species of *Mulinia* from the Pacific coast. The Nautilus 8: 5-6.
 2202 Delgado-Granados, H., G. Aguirre-Gutiérrez and J. Stock (eds.). 1994. *Cenozoic Tectonics and*
 2203 *Volcanism of Mexico*. Geological Society of America, Special Paper 334.
 2204 Derby, G. H. 1852. Report of the expedition of the United States transport “Invincible” to the
 2205 Gulf of California and River Colorado, 1850 and 1851. 32nd Congress, 1st Session, U.S.
 2206 Senate Executive Document No. 81.
 2207 Dettman, D. L., K. W. Flessa, P. D. Rooparine, B. R. Schöne and D. H. Goodwin. 2004. The
 2208 use of oxygen isotope variants in shells of estuarine mollusks as a quantitative record of
 2209 seasonal annual Colorado River discharge. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta 68: 1253-
 2210 1263.

2211 Diffenbaugh, N. S. and F. Giorgi. 2012 Climate change hotspots in the CMIP5 global climate
 2212 model ensemble. *Climate Change* 114: 813-822.

2213 DGE. 1993. Plan de Ordenamiento Ecológica del Estado de Baja California. Dirección General
 2214 de Ecología, Gobierno del Estado de Baja California. 122 pp.

2215 DOF (Diario Oficial de la Federación). 2005. Programa de protección de la vaquita dentro de
 2216 área de Refugio ubicada en la porción occidental del Alto Golfo de California. Publ. DOF,
 2217 Septiembre 2005.

2218 DOF (Diario Oficial de la Federación). 2007. NORMA Oficial Mexicana, NOM-063-PESC-
 2219 2005, pesca responsable de curvina golfina (*Cynoscion othonopterus*) en aguas de
 2220 jurisdicción federal del Alto Golfo de California y Delta del Río Colorado. Especificaciones
 2221 para su aprovechamiento. Publ. DOF, Agosto 2007.

2222 Dorsey, R. J. 2010. Sedimentation and crustal recycling along an active oblique-rift margin:
 2223 Salton Trough and northern Gulf of California. *Geology* 38: 443-446.

2224 Douglas, M. W. 1995. The summertime low-level jet over the Gulf of California. *Monthly*
 2225 *Weather Review* 123: 2334-2347.

2226 Douglas, R., O. Gonzalez-Yajimovich, J. Ledesma-Vazquez and F. Staines-Urias. 2007.
 2227 Climate forcing, primary production and the distribution of Holocene biogenic sediments in
 2228 the Gulf of California. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 26: 115-129.

2229 Enríquez-Andrade, R., G. Anaya-Reyna, J. C. Barrera-Guevara, M. A. Carvajal-Moreno, M. E.
 2230 Martínez-Delgado, J. Vaca-Rodríguez and C. Valdés-Casillas. 2005. An analysis of critical
 2231 areas for biodiversity conservation in the Gulf of California region. *Ocean and Coastal*
 2232 *Management* 48: 31–50.

2233 Erie, L. J., O. F. French, D. A. Bucks and K. Harris. 1982. Consumptive use of water by major
 2234 crops in the southwestern United States. Conservation Research Report No. 29, Agricultural
 2235 Research Service. U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

2236 Erisman, B., O. Aburto-Oropeza, C. González-Abraham, I. Mascareñas-Osorio, M. Moreno-
 2237 Báez and P. Hastings. 2012. Spatio-temporal dynamics of a fish spawning aggregation and
 2238 its fishery in the Gulf of California. Science Reports 2, 284; doi: 10.1038/srep00284.

2239 Erisman B., I. Mascareñas, C. López-Sagástegui, M. Moreno-Báez, V. Jiménez-Esquivel and O.
 2240 Aburto-Oropeza. 2015. A comparison of fishing activities between two coastal communities
 2241 within a biosphere reserve in the Upper Gulf of California. Fisheries Research 164: 254-265.

2242 Erisman B., I. Mascareñas, G. Paredes, Y. Sadovy de Mitcheson, O. Aburto-Oropeza and P.
 2243 Hastings. 2010. Seasonal, annual, and long-term trends in commercial fisheries for
 2244 aggregating reef fishes in the Gulf of California, Mexico. Fisheries Research 106: 279-288.

2245 Erisman B., G. A. Paredes, T. Plomozo-Lugo, J. J. Cota-Nieto, P. A. Hastings and O. Aburto-
 2246 Oropeza. 2011. Spatial structure of commercial marine fisheries in Northwest Mexico. *ICES*
 2247 *Journal of Marine Sciences*, doi: 10.1093/icesjms/fsq179.

2248 Erisman, B., J. A. Rosales-Casián and P. A. Hastings. 2008. Evidence of gonochorism in a
 2249 grouper, *Mycteroperca rosacea*, from the Gulf of California, Mexico. *Environmental Biology*
 2250 *of Fishes* 82: 23–33.

2251 Ezcurra, E. and V. Rodríguez. 1986. Rainfall patterns in the Gran Desierto, Sonora, Mexico.
 2252 *Journal of Arid Environments* 10: 13-28.

2253 Feirstein, E. J., F. Zamora, L. B. Vionnet and T. Maddock III. 2008. Simulation of groundwater
 2254 conditions in the Colorado River Delta, Mexico. Unpubl. document of the Department of
 2255 Hydrology and Water Resources, University of Arizona, Tucson Arizona..

2256 Felger, R. S. 2000. *Flora of the Gran Desierto and Río Colorado of Northwestern Mexico*.
 2257 University of Arizona Press, Tucson.

2258 Félix-Ortíz, M. E. Siu-Quevedo, N. Castañeda-Lomas, G. Rodríguez-Domínguez, G. Rodríguez-
 2259 Montes de Oca and E. A. Aragón-Noriega. 2014. Species composition and timing of
 2260 penaeid shrimp postlarvae (Decapoda, Penaeidae) in two zones of the Mexican Pacific coast.
 2261 Crustaceana 87: 801-813.

2262 Findley, L. 2010. *Totoaba macdonaldi*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2010:
 2263 e.T22003A9346099. doi: org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.20103.RLTS.T22003A9346099.en.

2264 Flanagan, C. A. and J. R. Hendrickson. 1976. Observations on the commercial fishery and
 2265 reproductive biology of the totoaba, *Cynoscion macdonaldi*, in the northern Gulf of
 2266 California. U. S. Fishery Bulletin 74: 531–554.

2267 Fleischer, L. 1996. Mexico progress report on cetacean research. April 1994 to March 1995.
 2268 Report of the International Whaling Commission 46: 262-265.

2269 Fleischer, L., R. Moncada Cooley, H. Pérez-Cortés Moreno and A. Polanco Ortiz. 1996.
 2270 Análisis de la mortalidad incidental de la vaquita, *Phocoena sinus*. Historia y actualidad
 2271 (April de 1994). Ciencia Pesquera 13: 78-82.

2272 Fleischer, L. and H. Pérez-Cortés. 1996. Diagnosis del recurso vaquita, *Phocoena sinus*.
 2273 Ciencia Pesquera 13: 83-86.

2274 Flessa, K. W., E. P. Glenn, O. Hinojosa-Huerta, C. A. de la Parra-Rentería, I. Ramírez-
 2275 Hernández, J. C. Schmidt and F. Zamora-Arroyo. 2013. Flooding the Colorado River Delta:
 2276 A landscape-scale experiment. IOS 94: 485-486.

2277 Fletcher, J. M. and L. Munguía. 2000. Active continental rifting in southern Baja California,
 2278 Mexico: implications for plate motion partitioning and the transition to seafloor spreading in
 2279 the Gulf of California. *Tectonics* 19: 1107-1123.

2280 Fletcher, J. M. and R. M. Spelz. 2009. Patterns of Quaternary deformation and rupture
 2281 propagation associated with an active low-angle normal fault, Laguna Salada, Mexico:
 2282 Evidence of a rolling hinge? *Geosphere* 5: 385-407.

2283 Galindo-Bect, M. S. 2012. Nutrients in the upper Gulf of California and the Colorado River
 2284 Delta. Report of the 4th meeting of the International Committee for the Recovery of the
 2285 Vaquita. Available at: [http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/Report-of-the-](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/Report-of-the-Fourth-Meeting-of-the-International-Committee-for-the-Recovery-of-Vaquita.pdf)
 2286 [Fourth-Meeting-of-the-International-Committee-for-the-Recovery-of-Vaquita.pdf](http://www.iucn-csg.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/03/Report-of-the-Fourth-Meeting-of-the-International-Committee-for-the-Recovery-of-Vaquita.pdf).
 2287 (Accessed 18 March 2016)

2288 Galindo-Bect, M. S., A. A. Aragón Noriega, J. M. Hernández Ayón, M. F. Lavín, M. A. Huerta
 2289 Díaz, F. Delgadillo Hinojosa and J. A. Segovia Zavala. 2010. Distribution of penaeid
 2290 shrimp larvae and postlarvae in the upper Gulf of California. *Crustaceana* 83: 809-819.

2291 Galindo-Bect, M. S., E. P. Glenn, H. M. Page, K. Fitzsimmons, L. A. Galindo-Bect, J. M.
 2292 Hernández-Ayon, R. L. Petty, J. García-Hernández, and D. Moore. 2000. Penaeid shrimp
 2293 landings in the upper Gulf of California in relation to Colorado River freshwater discharge.
 2294 *U. S. Fisheries Bulletin* 98: 222–225.

2295 Galindo-Bect, M. S., A. Santa Ríos, J. M. Hernández-Ayón, M. A. Huerta-Díaz and F.
 2296 Delgadillo-Hinojosa. 2013. The use of urban wastewater for the Colorado River delta
 2297 restoration. *Procedia Environmental Sciences* 18: 829-835.

2298 García-Borbón, J. A., E. F. Balart, J. J. Gallo and P. A. Loreto-Campos. 1996. Pesquería del
 2299 camarón. Pp. 187-206 in, M. Casas-Valdez and G. Ponce-Díaz (eds.), *Estudio del Potencial*

2300 *Pesquero y Acuicola de Baja California Sur*. Ediciones CIBNOR, La Paz, Baja California
 2301 Sur.
 2302 García-Caudillo, J. M., M. A. Cisneros-Mata and A. Balmori-Ramírez. 2000. Performance of a
 2303 bycatch reduction device in the shrimp fishery of the Gulf of California, México. *Biological*
 2304 *Conservation* 92: 199-205.
 2305 García-De León, F. J. 2013. La totoaba, un pez enigmático del golfo de California.
 2306 *Investigaciones Ciencias* 10: 11.
 2307 García-De León, F. J., R. Valles-Jimenez, K. Shaw, R. Ward, J. De-Anda-Montañez and M.
 2308 Martinez-Delgado. 2010. Characterization of fourteen microsatellite loci in the endemic and
 2309 threatened totoaba (*Totoaba macdonadi*) from the Gulf of California. *Conservation of*
 2310 *Genetic Resources* 2: 219-221.
 2311 García-Hernández, J., K. Flessa, E. Santiago-Serrano, S. Romero-Hernández, F. Zamora-Arroyo
 2312 and J. Ramírez-Hernández. 2013a. Salinity responses to inflow alterations in a 6500 ha
 2313 *Typha* wetland. *Ecological Engineering* 59: 18-29.
 2314 García-Hernández, J., E. P. Glenn and K. Flessa. 2013b. Identification of chemicals of potential
 2315 concern (OPECs) in anthropogenic wetlands of the Colorado River Delta. *Ecological*
 2316 *Engineering* 59: 52-60.
 2317 Gastil, R. G., M. Wracher, G. Strand, L. L. Kear, D. Eley, D. Chapman and C. Anderson. 1992.
 2318 The tectonic history of the southwestern United States and Sonora, Mexico, during the past
 2319 100 M.Y. *Tectonics* 11: 990-997.
 2320 Gaxiola-Castro, G., S. Álvarez-Borrego, M. F. Lavín, A. Zirino and S. Najera-Martínez. 1999.
 2321 Spatial variability of the photosynthetic parameters and biomass of the Gulf of California
 2322 phytoplankton. *Journal of Plankton Research* 21: 231-245.

2323 Gaxiola-Castro, G., J. García-Cordova, J. E. Valdéz-Holguin and M. Botello-Ruvalcaba. 1995.
 2324 Spatial distribution of chlorophyll *a* and primary productivity in relation to winter physical
 2325 structure in the Gulf of California. *Continental Shelf Research* 15: 1043-1059.

2326 Gerrodette, T. and L. Rojas-Bracho. 2011. Estimating the success of protected areas for the
 2327 vaquita, *Phocoena sinus*. *Marine Mammal Science* 27: E101-E125.

2328 Gherard, K. E., B. E. Erisman, O. Aburto-Oropeza, K. Rowell and L. G. Allen. 2013. Growth,
 2329 development, and reproduction in Gulf Corvina (*Cynoscion othonopterus*). *Bulletin of the*
 2330 *Southern California Academy of Sciences* 112: 1-18.

2331 Gilbert, J. Y. and W. E. Allen. 1943. The phytoplankton of the Gulf of California obtained by
 2332 the “E. W. Scripps” in 1939 and 1940. *Journal of Marine Research* 5: 89-110.

2333 Glenn, E. P., R. S. Felger, A. Búrquez and D. S. Turner. 1992. Ciénega de Santa Clara:
 2334 endangered wetland in the Colorado River Delta, Sonora, Mexico. *Natural Resources*
 2335 *Journal* 32: 817-824.

2336 Glenn, E. P., K. W. Flessa, M. J. Cohen, P. L. Nagler, K. Rowell and F. Zamora-Arroyo. 2007.
 2337 Just add water and the Colorado River still reaches the sea. *Environmental Management*
 2338 40:1–6.

2339 Glenn, E. P., K. W. Flessa and J. Pitt. 2013a. Restoration potential of the aquatic ecosystems of
 2340 the Colorado River Delta, Mexico: Introduction to special issue on “Wetlands of the
 2341 Colorado River Delta.” *Ecological Engineering* 59: 1-6.

2342 Glenn, E. P., K. Hucklebridge, O. Hinojosa-Huerta, P. L. Nagler and J. Pitt. 2008. Reconciling
 2343 environmental and flood control goals on an arid-zone river: Case study of the limitrophe
 2344 region of the Lower Colorado River in the United States and Mexico. *Environmental*
 2345 *Management* 41: 322-335.

2346 Glenn, E. P., C. Lee, R. Felger and S. Zengel. 1995. Effects of water management on the
 2347 wetlands of the Colorado River Delta, Mexico. *Conservation Biology* 10: 1175-1186.
 2348 Glenn, E. P., C. Lee and C. Valdés-Casillas. 2001. Introduction [to special issue on the
 2349 Colorado River Delta]. *Journal of Arid Environments* 49: 1-4.
 2350 Glenn, E. P., L. Mexicano, J. García-Hernández, P. L. Nagler, M. M. Gómez-Sapiens, D. Tang,
 2351 M. A. Lomeli, J. Ramírez-Hernández and F. Zamora-Arroyo. 2013b. Evapotranspiration
 2352 and water balance of an anthropogenic coastal desert wetland: Responses to fire, inflows and
 2353 salinities. *Ecological Engineering* 59: 176-184.
 2354 Glenn, E. P. and P. L. Nagler. 2007. New life for the Colorado River Delta. Chapter 25 (pp.
 2355 357-363) in, R. S. Felger and B. Broyles (eds.), *Dry Borders. Great Natural Reserves of the*
 2356 *Sonoran Desert*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
 2357 Glenn, E. P., F. Zamora-Arroyo, P. L. Nagler, M. Briggs, W. Shaw and K. Flessa. 2001.
 2358 Ecology and conservation biology of the Colorado River Delta, Mexico. *Journal of Arid*
 2359 *Environments* 49: 5-15.
 2360 Gómez-Sapiens, M. M., D. Tang, E. P. Glenn, M. A. Lomelí, J. Ramírez-Hernández and J. Pitt.
 2361 2013. Modeling water management scenarios for the Ciénega de Santa Clara, an
 2362 anthropogenic coastal desert wetland system, based on inflow volumes and salinities.
 2363 *Ecological Engineering* 59: 30-40.
 2364 González-Yajimovich, O., R. Douglas and D. Gorsline. 2007. Holocene rainfall and
 2365 productivity variation in the Gulf of California. American Geophysical Union, Spring
 2366 Meeting, Abstract OS32A-07.

2367 Grant, U. S. IV and H. R. Gale. 1931. Catalogue of the marine Pliocene and Pleistocene
 2368 Mollusca of California and adjacent regions. San Diego Society of Natural History, Memoirs
 2369 1: 1036 pp. [Reprinted 1958.]
 2370 Greenberg, K. and K. Schlatter (eds.). 2012. Ciénega de Santa Clara Monitoring Program, Final
 2371 Report. International Boundary and Water Commission, El Paso, Texas.
 2372 Grijalva-Ortíz, N. 1972. Tidal computation in the Gulf of California. *Geofísica Internacional*
 2373 12: 13-34.
 2374 Grimes, C. B. and M. J. Kingsford. 1996. How do riverine plumes of different sizes influence
 2375 fish larvae: Do they enhance recruitment? *Marine and Freshwater Research* 47: 191-208.
 2376 Harding, B. L., T. B. Sangoyomi and E. A. Payton. 1995. Impacts of severe sustained drought
 2377 on Colorado River water resources. *Water Resources Bulletin* 31: 815-824.
 2378 Hastings, J. R. 1964. Climatological data for Sonora and northern Sinaloa. Technical Reports
 2379 on the Meteorology and Climatology of Arid Regions 15. University of Arizona, Institute of
 2380 Atmospheric Physics, Tucson.
 2381 Hastings, J. R. and R. R. Humphrey. 1969. Climatological data and statistics for Sonora and
 2382 northern Sinaloa. Technical Reports on the Meteorology and Climatology of Arid Regions
 2383 19. University of Arizona, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, Tucson.
 2384 Hastings, P. A. and L. T. Findley. 2007. Marine fishes of the Upper Gulf Biosphere Reserve,
 2385 northern Gulf of California. Pp. 364-382, 716-720 (chapter 26) in, R. S. Felger and B.
 2386 Broyles (eds.), *Dry Borders. Great Natural Areas of the Gran Desierto and Upper Gulf of*
 2387 *California*. University of Utah Press, Salt Lake City.
 2388 Hastings, P. A., H. J. Walker and G. R. Galland. 2014. *Fishes: A Guide to their Diversity*.
 2389 University of California Press, Berkeley.

2390 Hayhoe, K., D. Cayan, C. B. Field, P. C. Ferumhoff, E. P. Maurer, N. L. Miller, S. C. Moser, S.
 2391 H. Schneider, K. N. Cahill, E. E. Cleland, L. Dale, R. Drapek, R. M. Hanemann, L. S.
 2392 Kalkstein, J. Lenihan, C. K. Lunch, R. P. Neilson, S. C. Sheridan and J. H. Verville 2004.
 2393 Emissions pathways, climate change, and impacts on California. Proceedings U. S. National
 2394 Academy of Sciences 101: 12,422-12,427.
 2395 Hendrickx, M. E. and R. C. Brusca. 2007. Distribución de invertebrados marinos endémicos en
 2396 el Golfo de California, México. XII Congresso Latino-Americano de Ciências do Mar,
 2397 Florianópolis, Brazil, 15 a 19 de Abril de 2007. Memorias AOCEANO – Associação
 2398 Brasileira de Oceanografia, 4 pp.
 2399 Hendrickx, M. E., R. C. Brusca and L. T. Findley (eds.). 2005. *A Distributional Checklist of the*
 2400 *Macrofauna of the Gulf of California, Mexico. Part I. Invertebrates.* [Listado y Distribución
 2401 *de la Macrofauna del Golfo de California, México, Parte I. Invertebrados*]. Arizona-Sonora
 2402 Desert Museum and Conservation International. 429 pp.
 2403 Hernández-Ayón, M., S. Galindo-Bect, B. P. Flores-Báez and S. Álvarez-Borrego. 1993.
 2404 Nutrient concentrations are high in the turbid waters of the Colorado River delta. Estuarine,
 2405 Coastal and Shelf Science 37: 593–602.
 2406 Hernández-Azcúnaga, L., N. Carbajal and Y. Montaña-Ley. 2014. Bedload transport of
 2407 sediments and morphodynamics in the northern Gulf of California. Journal of Coastal
 2408 Research 30: 228-236.
 2409 Herrera-Cervantes, H., S. E. Lluch-Cota, D. B. Lluch-Cota, G. Gutiérrez de Velasco San Román
 2410 and D. Lluch-Belda. 2010. ENSO influence on satellite-derived chlorophyll trends in the
 2411 Gulf of California. Atmosfera 23: 253-262.

2412 Herrera-Valdivia, E., J. López-Martínez and S. Castillo Vargasmachuca. 2015. Estrés en la
 2413 comunidad íctica en la pesca de arrastre del camarón en el norte del Golfo de California.
 2414 Revista de Biología Tropical 63: 741-754.

2415 Hidalgo-González, R. M., S. Álvarez-Borrego and A. Zirino. 1997. Mixing in the region of the
 2416 Midriff Islands of the Gulf of California: effect on surface pCO₂. Ciencias Marinas 23: 317-
 2417 327.

2418 Hinojosa-Huerta, O., P. L. Nagler, Y. K. Carrillo-Guererro and E. P. Glenn. 2013b. Reprint of:
 2419 Effects of drought on birds and riparian vegetation in the Colorado River Delta, Mexico.
 2420 Ecological Engineering 59: 104-110.

2421 Hinojosa-Huerta, O., E. Soto-Montoya, M. Gómez-Sapiens, A. Calvo-Fonseca, R. Guzmán-
 2422 Olachea, J. Butrón-Méndez, J. J. Buitrón-Rodríguez and M. Román-Rodríguez. 2013a. The
 2423 birds of the Ciénega de Santa Clara, a wetland of international importance within the
 2424 Colorado River Delta. Ecological Engineering 59: 61-73.

2425 Hodson, H. 2014. Colorado River back from the dead. New Scientist 221 (2969): 8-9. doi:
 2426 org/10.1016/S0262(14)60509-1.

2427 Hohn, A. A., A. J. Read, S. Fernández, O. Vidal and L. T. Findley. 1996. Life history of
 2428 vaquita, *Phocoena sinus* (Phocoenidae, Cetacea). Journal of Zoology, London 239: 235-251.

2429 Hubbs, C. L. and R. R. Miller. 1948. The Great Basin, with emphasis on glacial and postglacial
 2430 times. II. The zoological evidence. Bulletin of the University of Utah 38: 103-112.

2431 Huddleston, R. W. and G. T. Takeuchi. 2007. First fossil record of *Totoaba* Villamar 1980
 2432 (Teleostei: Sciaenidae) based upon early Miocene otoliths from California with comments on
 2433 the ontogeny of the saccular otoliths. Bulletin of the Southern California Academy of
 2434 Sciences 106: 1-15.

2435 IBWC. 2014. Initial Progress Report for Minute 319 Colorado River Delta Environmental
 2436 Flows Monitoring. International Boundary and Water Commission, USA-Mexico.
 2437 <http://www.ibwc.gov/EMD/Min319Monitoring.pdf>. (Accessed 16 March 2016)
 2438 INEGI. 1993. Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática, Carta Topográfica,
 2439 San Felipe (H11-3) and Mexicali (11-S) sectors.
 2440 INEGI. 2000. Dirección general de Estadística. Encuesta Nacional de Población y Vivienda
 2441 2000. Instituto Nacional de Estadística, Geografía e Informática, México, D.F.
 2442 IPCC. 2013. Summary for Policymakers. Pp. 1-29 in, *Climate Change 2013. The Physical*
 2443 *Science Basis*. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the
 2444 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [T. F. Stocker, D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M.
 2445 Tignor, S. K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P. M. Midgley (eds.)].
 2446 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England.
 2447 IUCN. 2016. International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, Morges,
 2448 Switzerland. Available at <http://www.iucnredlist.org/details/17028/0>. (Accessed 18 March
 2449 2016.)
 2450 Ives, J. C. 1861. Report upon the Colorado River of the West, explored in 1857 and 1858. 36th
 2451 Congress, 1st Session, U.S. House Executive Document No. 90.
 2452 IWC. 1991a. Chairman's report of the forty-second meeting. Report of the International
 2453 Whaling Commission 41: 11-50.
 2454 IWC. 1991b. Report of the scientific committee. Report of the Internal Whaling Commission
 2455 41: 51-82.
 2456 IWC. 1991c Report of the subcommittee on small cetaceans. Report of the International
 2457 Whaling Commission 41: 172-190.

2458 IWC. 1996. Report of the scientific committee. Report of the International Whaling
 2459 Commission 46: 49-236.

2460 Jaramillo-Legorreta, A. M., L. Rojas-Bracho, R. L. Brownell Jr., A. J. Read, R. R. Reeves, K.
 2461 Ralls and B. L. Taylor. 2007. Saving the vaquita: immediate action, not more data.
 2462 Conservation Biology 21:1653-1655.

2463 Jennings, S. and G. R. Thompson. 1986. Diagenesis of Plio-Pleistocene sediments of the
 2464 Colorado River Delta, Southern California. Journal of Sedimentary Petrology 56: 89-98.

2465 Jensen, M. E. 1995. Water use assessment of the Imperial Irrigation District, Fort Collins,
 2466 California. Final Report. Report to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, Boulder City, Nevada.

2467 Johnson, S. E., S. R. Paterson, J. M. Fletcher, G. H. Girty, D. L. Kimbrough and A. Martin-
 2468 Barajas (eds.). 2003. Tectonic evolution of northwestern Mexico and the southwestern
 2469 USA. Geological Society of America Special Paper No. 374. Geological Society of
 2470 America, Boulder, Colorado.

2471 Jordan, D. S. and B. W. Evermann. 1898. The fishes of North and Middle America: a
 2472 descriptive catalogue of the species of fish-like vertebrates found in the waters of North
 2473 America, north of the Isthmus of Panama. Part II. Bulletin of the United States National
 2474 Museum 47: 1241-1936.

2475 Kahru, M., S. G. Marinone, S. E. Lluch-Cota, A. Parés-Sierra and G. Mitchell. 2004. Ocean
 2476 color variability in the Gulf of California: Scales from the El Niño-La Niña cycle to tides.
 2477 Deep Sea Research II 51: 139-146.

2478 Keen, A. M. 1971. *Sea Shells of Tropical West America. Marine Mollusks from Baja California*
 2479 *to Peru. 2nd ed.* Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

2480 Kellogg, B. 2004. The dam controversy: Does the endangered species act apply internationally
 2481 to protect foreign species harmed by dams on the Colorado River? *Journal of Transnational*
 2482 *Law and Policy* 13: 447-474.

2483 Kira, G. S. 2000. *The Unforgettable Sea of Cortez: Baja California's Golden Age, 1947-1977:*
 2484 *The Life and Writings of Ray Cannon*. Cortez Publications, Torrance, California.

2485 Kostogiannis, A. 2015. Restoring the Colorado River Delta. *Water Policy, Governance and*
 2486 *Law*. [http://ucwosl.rebo.uu.nl/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Kostogiannis-de-la-Fuente-](http://ucwosl.rebo.uu.nl/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Kostogiannis-de-la-Fuente-Tedder.pdf)
 2487 [Tedder.pdf](http://ucwosl.rebo.uu.nl/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Kostogiannis-de-la-Fuente-Tedder.pdf). (Accessed 15 February 2016)

2488 Kowalewski, M., G. E. Ávila Serrano, K. W. Flessa and G. A. Goodfriend. 2000. Dead delta's
 2489 former productivity: Two trillion shells at the mouth of the Colorado River. *Geology* 28:
 2490 1059-1062.

2491 Lavín, M. F., E. Beier and A. Badán. 1997a. Estructura hidrográfica y circulación del Golfo de
 2492 California: escalas estacional e interanual. Pp. 141–171 in, M.F. Lavín (ed.), *Contribuciones*
 2493 *a la Oceanografía Física en México*, Monografía No. 3, Unión Geofísica Mexicana.

2494 Lavín, M. F., R. Castro, E. Beier, C. Cabrera, V. M. Godínez and A. Amador-Buenrostro. 2014.
 2495 Surface circulation in the Gulf of California in summer from surface drifters and satellite
 2496 images (2004-2006). *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, doi:
 2497 10.1002/2013JC009345.

2498 Lavín, M. F., R. Durazo, E. Palacios, M. L. Argote and L. Carrillo. 1997b. Lagrangian
 2499 observations of the circulation in the northern Gulf of California. *Journal of Physical*
 2500 *Oceanography* 27: 2298–2305.

2501 Lavín, M. F., G. Gaxiola-Castro, J. M. Robles and K. Richter. 1995. Winter water masses and
 2502 nutrients in the northern Gulf of California. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 100: 8587-
 2503 8605.

2504 Lavín, M. F., V. M. Godínez and L. G. Álvarez. 1998. Inverse-estuarine features of the upper
 2505 Gulf of California. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 47: 769–795.

2506 Lavín, M. F. and S. G. Marinone. 2003. An overview of the physical oceanography of the Gulf
 2507 of California. Pp. 173-204 in, O. U. Velasco Fuentes et al. (eds.), *Nonlinear Processes in*
 2508 *Geophysical Fluid Dynamics*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands.

2509 Lavín, M. F. and S. Organista. 1988. Surface heat flux in the northern Gulf of California.
 2510 *Journal of Geophysical Research* 93: 14,033-14,038.

2511 Lavín, M. F. and S. Sánchez. 1999. On how the Colorado River affected the hydrography of the
 2512 upper Gulf of California. *Continental Shelf Research* 19: 1545–1560.

2513 Laylander, D. 2005. The regional consequences of Lake Cahuilla.
 2514 <http://soap.sdsu.edu/Volume1/LakeCahuilla/cahuilla.htm>. (Accessed 1 July 2015.)

2515 Leal-Gaxiola, A., J. López-Martínez, E. A. Chávez, S. Hernández-Vázquez and F. Méndez-
 2516 Tenorio. 2001. Interannual variability of reproductive period of the brown shrimp,
 2517 *Farfantepenaeus californiensis* (Holmes, 1900) (Decapoda, Natantia). *Crustaceana* 74: 839-
 2518 851.

2519 Lepley, L. K., S. P. Vonder Harr, J. R. Hendrickson and G. Calderón-Riveroll. 1975.
 2520 Circulation in the northern Gulf of California from orbital photographs and ship
 2521 investigations. *Ciencias Marinas* 2: 86-93.

2522 Lercari, D. and F. Arreguín-Sánchez. 2009. An ecosystem modeling approach to deriving
 2523 viable harvest strategies for multispecies management of the northern Gulf of California.
 2524 Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems 19: 384-397.

2525 Lercari, D., F. Arreguín-Sánchez and W. Le Quesne. 2007. An ecosystem simulation model of
 2526 the northern Gulf of California. Pp. 100-113 in, W. J. F. Le Quesne, F. Arreguín-Sánchez
 2527 and S. J. J. Heymons (eds.), INCOFISH ecosystem models: Transiting from Ecopath to
 2528 Ecospace. Fisheries Centre Research Reports 15(6). Fisheries Centre, University of British
 2529 Columbia.

2530 Lercari, D. and E. A. Chávez. 2007. Possible causes related to historic stock depletion of the
 2531 totoaba, *Totoaba macdonaldi* (Perciformes: Sciaenidae) endemic to the Gulf of California.
 2532 Fisheries Research 86: 136-142.

2533 Lippmann, M., A. Truesdell and G. Frye. 1999. The Cerro Prieto and Salton Sea geothermal
 2534 fields—are they really alike? Proceedings 24th Workshop on Geothermal Reservoir
 2535 Engineering, Stanford University, California, January 25-27, SGP-TR-162.

2536 Lluch-Belda, D. 1974. La pesquería del camarón de altamar en el noroeste. Instituto Nacional
 2537 de Pesca, Ser. Informativa INP/SI, Programa del Pacífico. 116 pp.

2538 Lluch-Belda, D., D. B. Lluch-Cota and S. E. Lluch-Cota. 2003. Baja California's biological
 2539 transition zones: refuges for the California sardine. Journal of Oceanography 59: 503–513.

2540 Lluch-Belda, D., D. B. Lluch-Cota, S. E. Lluch-Cota, M. Ramírez-Rodríguez and C. Salinas-
 2541 Zavala. 2014. Fisheries of northwest Mexico. Pp. 513-533 in, E. V. Wehncke, J. R. Lara-
 2542 Lara, S. Álvarez-Borrego and E. Ezcurra (eds.), *Conservation Science in Mexico's*
 2543 *Northwest*. U.C. MEXUS (Institute for Mexico and the United States, University of

2544 California, Riverside) and SEMARNAT (Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos
 2545 Naturales, México, D.F.).
 2546 Lluch-Cota, S. E., E. A. Aragón-Noriega, F. Arreguín-Sánchez, D. Aurióles-Gamboa, J. J.
 2547 Bautista-Romero, R. C. Brusca, R. Cervantes-Duarte, R. Cortés-Altamirano, P. Del-Monte-
 2548 Luna, A. Esquivel-Herrera-Cervantes, M. Kahru, M. Lavín, D. Lluch-Belda, D. B. Lluch-
 2549 Cota, J. López-Martínez, S. G. Marinone, M. O. Nevárez-Martínez, S. Ortega-García, E.
 2550 Palacios-Castro, A. Parés-Sierra, G. Ponce-Díaz, M. Ramírez-Rodríguez, C. A. Salinas-
 2551 Zavala, R. A. Schwartzlose and A. P. Sierra-Beltrán. 2007. The Gulf of California: Review
 2552 of ecosystem status and sustainability challenges. *Progress in Oceanography* 73: 1-26.
 2553 Lluch-Cota, S. E. and J. P. Arias-Aréchiga. 2000. Sobre la importancia de considerar Centros
 2554 de Actividad Biológica para la regionalización del océano: El caso del Golfo de California.
 2555 In, D. Lluch-Belda, J. Elourduy-Garay, S. E. Lluch-Cota and G. Ponce-Diaz (eds.). Centros
 2556 de Actividad Biológica del Pacífico Mexicano. Centro de Investigaciones Biológicas del
 2557 Noroeste, Centro Interdisciplinario de Ciencias Marinas-IPN, Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y
 2558 Tecnología, México, D.F. 367 pp.
 2559 Lluch-Cota, S. E., A. Parés-Sierra, V. O. Magaña-Rueda, F. Arreguín-Sánchez, G. Bazzino, H.
 2560 Herrera-Cervantes and D. Lluch-Belda. 2010. Changing climate in the Gulf of California.
 2561 *Progress in Oceanography* 87: 114-126.
 2562 López, L. 1968. Estudio preliminar sobre las migraciones de postmisis de *Penaeus vannamei*
 2563 Boone. FAO Fisheries Report No. 57: 405-413. Rome.
 2564 López, M., J. Candela and M. L. Argote. 2006. Why does the Ballenas Channel have the coldest
 2565 SST in the Gulf of California? *Geophysical Research Letters* 33, L11603.
 2566 doi.org/10.1029/2006GL025908

- 2567 López, M., J. Candela and J. García. 2008. Two overflows in the Northern Gulf of California.
2568 Journal of Geophysical Research 113, C08023. doi.org/10.1029/2007JC004575.
- 2569 López-Martínez, J., F. Arreguín-Sánchez, S. Hernández-Vázquez, A. R. García-Juárez and W.
2570 Valenzuela-Quíñonez. 2003. Interannual variation of growth of the brown shrimp
2571 *Farfantepenaeus californiensis* and its relation to temperature. Fisheries Research 61: 95-
2572 105.
- 2573 Loverly, P., J. H. Shaw, Q. Liu and J. Tromp. 2006. A structural Vp model of the Salton
2574 Trough, California, and its implications for seismic hazard. Bulletin of the Seismological
2575 Society of America 96: 1882-1896, doi: 10.1785/0120050166.
- 2576 Luecke, D. F., J. Pitt, C. Congdon, E. Glenn, C. Valdés-Casillas and M. Briggs. 1999. *A Delta*
2577 *Once More: Restoring Riparian and Wetland Habitat in the Colorado River Delta*.
2578 Environmental Defense Fund Publication, Washington D. C. 51 pp.
- 2579 Lugo-Ibarra, K. C., L. W. Daesslé, J. V. Macías-Zamora and N. Ramírez-Álvarez. 2011.
2580 Persistent organic pollutants associated to water fluxes and sedimentary processes in the
2581 Colorado River Delta, Baja California, Mexico. Chemosphere 85: 210-217.
- 2582 Mair, J. McD. 1980. Salinity and water-type preferences of four species of postlarval shrimp
2583 (*Penaeus*) from west Mexico. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 45: 69-
2584 82.
- 2585 Mair, J. McD., J. L. Watkins and D. I Williamson. 1982. Factors affecting the immigration of
2586 postlarval penaeid shrimp into a Mexican lagoon system. Oceanologica Acta, Proc. Internat.
2587 Symp. on Coastal Lagoons, Bordeaux France, 8-14 September 1981, pp. 339-345.
- 2588 Manzano-Sarabia, M. M., E. A. Aragón-Noriega, C. A. Salinas-Zavala and D. B. Lluch-Cota.
2589 2007. Distribution and abundance of penaeid shrimp in a hypersaline lagoon in northwestern

2590 Mexico, emphasizing the brown shrimp *Farfantepenaeus californiensis* life cycle. Marine
 2591 Biology 152: 1021-1029.

2592 Marinone, S. G. 2007. A note on “Why does the Ballenas Channel have the coldest SST in the
 2593 Gulf of California?” Geophysical Research Letters 34, doi: 10.1029/2006GL028589.

2594 Marinone S. G. 2008. On the three-dimensional numerical modeling of the deep circulation
 2595 around Ángel de la Guarda Island in the Gulf of California. Estuarine and Coastal Shelf
 2596 Science 80: 430–434.

2597 Márquez-Farías, J. F. and F. J. Rosales-Juárez. 2013. Intrinsic rebound potential of the
 2598 endangered *Totoaba macdonaldi* population endemic to the Gulf of California, Mexico.
 2599 Fisheries Research 147: 150-153.

2600 Mateos, E., S. G. Marinone and M. F. Lavín. 2006. Role of tides and mixing in the formation of
 2601 an anticyclonic gyre in San Pedro Mártir Basin, Gulf of California. Deep-Sea Research II
 2602 53: 6076.

2603 Martín-Barajas, A., S. Vázquez-Hernández, L. L. Carreño, J. Helenes, F. Suárez-Vidal and J.
 2604 Álvarez-Rosales. 2001. Late Neogene stratigraphy and tectonic control on facies evolution
 2605 in the Laguna Salada Basin, northern Baja California, Mexico. Sedimentary Geology 144: 5-
 2606 35.

2607 Martínez-Díaz-de-León, A. 2001. Upper-ocean circulation patterns in the northern Gulf of
 2608 California, expressed in ERS-2 synthetic aperture radar imagery. Ciencias Marinas 27: 209-
 2609 221.

2610 Matthews, J. B. 1969. Tides in the Gulf of California. In, D. A. Thomson, A. R. Mead and J. E.
 2611 Schreiber (eds.), Environmental Impact of Brine Effluents on Gulf of California. U.S.
 2612 Department of Interior Research and Development Progress Report No. 387.

2613 May, R. C. 1975. Effects of temperature and salinity on fertilization, embryonic development,
 2614 and hatching in *Bairdiella icistia* (Pisces: Sciaenidae), and the effect of parental salinity
 2615 acclimatization on embryonic and larval salinity tolerance. U. S. Fisheries Bulletin 73: 1-22.
 2616 Mexicano, L., E. P. Glenn, O. Hinojosa-Huerta, J. García-Hernández, K. Flessa and A. Hinojosa-
 2617 Corona. 2013. Long-term sustainability of the hydrology and vegetation of Ciénega de
 2618 Santa Clara, an anthropogenic wetland created by disposal of agricultural drain water in the
 2619 delta of the Colorado River, Mexico. Ecological Engineering,
 2620 doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2012.12.096.
 2621 Millán-Núñez, R., E. Santamaría-del-Ángel, R. Cajal-Medrano and O. A. Barocio-León. 1999.
 2622 The Colorado River Delta: A high primary productivity ecosystem. Ciencias Marinas 25:
 2623 509-540.
 2624 Milliman, J. D. and R. H. Meade. 1983. World-wide delivery of river sediment to the oceans.
 2625 Journal of Geology 91: 1-21.
 2626 Minckley, W. L. 1991. Native fishes of the Grand Canyon region: An obituary? In, National
 2627 Research Council (eds.), *Colorado River Ecology and Dam Management*. National
 2628 Academies Press, Washington, D.C.
 2629 Miranda-Reyes, F., S. Reyes-Coca, and J. García-López. 1990. Climatología de la región
 2630 noroeste de México. Parte I. Precipitación. Technical Report EBA No. 3, CICESE,
 2631 Ensenada, Baja California. 160 pp.
 2632 Montaña, Y. 2003. Long-term effects of the bedload sediment transport on the sea-bottom
 2633 morphodynamics of the Colorado River Delta. PhD thesis, Université de Liège, Belgium.
 2634 Montaña, Y. and N. Carbajal. 2008. Numerical experiments on the long-term morphodynamics
 2635 of the Colorado River Delta. Ocean Dynamics 58: 19-29.

2636 Morales-Bojórquez, E., J. López-Martínez and L. F. J. Beléndez-Moreno. 2013. Estimating
 2637 biomass, recruitment, and harvest rate for the Pacific yellowleg shrimp *Farfantepenaeus*
 2638 *californiensis* from a size-based model. Journal of Shellfish Research 32: 815-823.
 2639 Morales-Zárate, M. V., F. Arreguín-Sánchez, J. López-Martínez and S. E. Lluch-Cota. 2004.
 2640 Ecosystem trophic structure and energy flux in the northern Gulf of California, México.
 2641 Ecological Modeling 174: 331-345.
 2642 Morita, K. S. H. Morita. 2002. Rule of age and size at maturity: individual variation in the
 2643 maturation history of resident white-spotted charr. Journal of Fish Biology (2002) 61, 1230–
 2644 1238.
 2645 Morrison, J. I., S. L. Postel and P. H. Gleick. 1996. The sustainable use of water in the Lower
 2646 Colorado River Basin. Report of the Pacific Institute, Oakland, California.
 2647 Morzaria-Luna, H. N., C. H. Ainsworth, I. C. Kaplan, P. S. Levin and E. A. Fulton. 2012.
 2648 Exploring tradeoffs between fisheries and conservation of the vaquita porpoise (*Phocoena*
 2649 *sinus*) using an Atlantis Ecosystem Model. PLOS ONE 7(8): E42917
 2650 Morzaria-Luna, H. N., P. Turk-Boyer and M. Moreno-Báez. 2013. Social indicators of
 2651 vulnerability for fishing communities in the northern Gulf of California, Mexico:
 2652 Implications for climate change. Marine Policy, doi: org/10.1016/j.marpol. 2013.10.013
 2653 Morzaria-Luna, H. N., P. Turk-Boyer, A. Rosemartin and V. F. Camacho-Ibar. 2014.
 2654 Vulnerability to climate change of hypersaline salt marshes in the northern Gulf of
 2655 California. Ocean and Coastal Management 93: 37-50.
 2656 Mueller, K. J. and T. K. Rockwell. 1995. Late quaternary activity of the Laguna Salada Fault in
 2657 northern Baja California, Mexico. Bulletin of the Geological Society of America 107: 8-18.

2658 Munguía-Vega, A., Y. Esquer-Garrigos, L. Rojas-Bracho, R. Vázquez-Juárez, A. Castro-Prieto
 2659 and S. Flores-Ramírez. 2007. Genetic drift vs. natural selection in a long-term small isolated
 2660 population: Major histocompatibility complex class II variation in the Gulf of California
 2661 endemic porpoise (*Phocoena sinus*). *Molecular Ecology* 16: 4051-4065.

2662 Munguía-Vega, A., A. Jackson, S. G. Marinone, B. Erisman, M. Moreno-Báez, A. Giron, T.
 2663 Pfister, O. Aburto-Oropeza and J. Torre. 2014. Asymmetric connectivity of spawning
 2664 aggregation of a commercially important marine fish using a multidisciplinary approach.
 2665 *PeerJ*2:e511.

2666 Musick, J. A., M. M. Harbin, S. A. Berkeley, G. H. Burgess, A. M. Eklund, L. Findley, R. G.
 2667 Gilmore, J. T. Golden, D. S. Ha, G. R. Huntsman, J. C. McGovern, S. J. Parker, S. G. Poss,
 2668 E. Sala, T. W. Schmidt, G. R. Sedberry, H. Weeks and S. G. Wright. 2000. Marine,
 2669 estuarine, and diadromous fish stocks at risk of extinction in North America (exclusive of
 2670 Pacific salmonids). *Fisheries* 25: 6–30.

2671 Nagler, P. L., E. P. Glenn, O. Hinojosa-Huerta, F. Zamora and K. Howard. 2007. Riparian
 2672 vegetation dynamics and evapotranspiration in the riparian corridor in the delta of the
 2673 Colorado River, Mexico. *Journal of Environmental Management* 88: 864-874.

2674 NASA. 2015. NASA/USGS satellite sees green-up along Colorado River's delta after
 2675 experimental flow. NASA online report by K. Ramsayer, updated June 9, 2015, by R.
 2676 Garner. www.nasa.gov/content/goddard.

2677 Nations, J. D. and D. Gauna. 1998. Stratigraphic, sedimentological, and paleobotanical
 2678 investigations of terrace gravels, U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground. U.S. Department of
 2679 Defense, Legacy Resource Management Program.

2680 Nelson, S. M., E. Fielding, F. Zamora-Arroyo and K. Flessa. 2013a. Delta dynamics: Effects of
 2681 tides, river flows and a major earthquake on Ciénega de Santa Clara and the Colorado River
 2682 delta, Mexico. *Ecological Engineering* 59: 144-156.

2683 Nelson, S. M., F. Zamora-Arroyo, J. Ramírez-Hernández and E. Santiago. 2013b.
 2684 Geomorphology of a recurring tidal sandbar in the estuary of the Colorado, Mexico:
 2685 Implications for restoration. *Ecological Engineering* 59:121-133.

2686 Nieto-García, E. 1998. Nutrientes en el norte del golfo de California durante condiciones
 2687 estuarinas y antiestuarinas. Tesis de Maestría. Centro de Investigación Científica y de
 2688 Educación Superior de Ensenada (CICESE), Ensenada, Baja California. 73 pp.

2689 NOAA, Southwest Fisheries Science Center. Vaquita Fact Sheet.
 2690 <https://swfsc.noaa.gov/textblock.aspx?Division=PRD&ParentMenuId=229&id=13812>
 2691 (accessed October 2016).

2692 Norris, K. S. and W. N. McFarland. 1958. A new harbor porpoise of the genus *Phocoena* from
 2693 the Gulf of California. *Journal of Mammalogy* 39: 22-39.

2694 Norris, K. S. and J. H. Prescott. 1961. Observations on Pacific cetaceans of California and
 2695 Mexican waters. *University of California Publications in Zoology* 63: 291-402.

2696 Olmsted, F. H., O. J. Loeltz and B. Irelan. 1973. Geohydrology of the Yuma area, Arizona and
 2697 California. Geological Survey Professional Paper 486-H, U.S. Government Printing Office,
 2698 Washington, D.C.

2699 Orozco-Durán, A., L. W. Daesslé, V. F. Camacho-Ibar, E. Ortiz-Campos and J. A. C. Barth.
 2700 2015. Turnover and release of P-, N-, Si-nutrients in the Mexicali Valley (Mexico):
 2701 interactions between the lower Colorado River and adjacent ground- and surface water
 2702 systems. *Science of the Total Environment* 512-513: 185-193.

2703 Pacheco, M., A. Martín-Barajas, W. Elders, J. M. Espinosa-Cardena, J. Helenes and A. Segura.
 2704 2006. Stratigraphy and structure of the Altar Basin of NW Sonora: implications for the
 2705 history of the Colorado River Delta and the Salton Trough. *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias*
 2706 *Geológicas* 23: 1-22.

2707 Paden, C. A., M. R. Abbott and C. D. Winant. 1991. Tidal and atmospheric forcing of the upper
 2708 ocean in the Gulf of California. 1. Sea surface temperature variability. *Journal of*
 2709 *Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 96(C10): 18,337-18,359.

2710 Pérez-Osuna, F., J. A. Sanchez-Cabeza, A. C. Ruiz-Fernández, A. C. R. Alonso-Rodríguez, A.
 2711 Piñon-Gimate, J. G. Cardoso-Mohedano, F. J. Flores-Verdugo, J. L. Carballo, M. A.
 2712 Cisneros-Mata and S. Álvarez-Borrego. 2016. Environmental status of the Gulf of
 2713 California: A review of responses to climate change and climate variability. *Earth-Science*
 2714 *Reviews* 162: 253-268.

2715 Palacios-Hernández, E., E. Beier, M. F. Lavín and P. Ripa. 2002. The effect of the seasonal
 2716 variation of stratification on the circulation of the northern Gulf of California. *Journal of*
 2717 *Physical Oceanography* 32: 705–728.

2718 Paredes, G. A., B. Erisman, I. Mascareñas Osorio, J. Cota Nieto, K. Gherard and O. Aburto
 2719 Oropeza. 2010. La curvina golfina: Biología, pesquería, y su gente. CONABIO,
 2720 *Biodiversitas* 91: 1-5.

2721 Payne, J. M., F. A. Reid and E. C. González. 1992. Feasibility study for the possible
 2722 enhancement of the Colorado Delta wetlands, Baja California Norte, Mexico. Ducks
 2723 Unlimited/Ducks Unlimited Mexico, Rancho Cordova, California.

2724 Pedrín-Osuna, O., J. H. Córdova-Murieta and M. Delgado-Marchena. 2001. Crecimiento y
 2725 mortalidad de la totoaba, *Totoaba macdonadi*, del alto Golfo de California. Ciencia Pesquera
 2726 (INP, SAGARPA) 14: 131-128.

2727 Pérez-Arvizu, E. M., E. A. Aragón-Noriega and T. L. Espinosa-Carreón. 2009. Response of the
 2728 shrimp population in the Upper Gulf of California to fluctuations in discharges of the
 2729 Colorado River. Crustaceana 82: 615-625.

2730 Pérez-Arvizu, E. M., E. A. Aragón-Noriega and T. L. Espinosa-Carreón. 2013. Variabilidad
 2731 estacional de la clorofila *a* y su respuesta a condiciones El Niño y La Niña en el norte del
 2732 Golfo de California. Revista de Biología Marina y Oceanografía 48: 131-141.

2733 Pérez-Mellado, J. and L. T. Findley. 1985. Evaluación de la ictiofauna acompañante del
 2734 camarón capturado en las costas de Sonora y norte de Sinaloa, México. Pp. 201–254, in A.
 2735 Yañéz-Arancibia (ed.), *Recursos Potenciales de México: La Pesca Acompañante del*
 2736 *Camarón*. Programa Universitario de Alimentos, Instituto de Ciencias del Mar y
 2737 Limnología, Instituto Nacional de la Pesca. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
 2738 México, D.F.

2739 Pitt, J. 2001. Can we restore the Colorado River Delta? Journal of Arid Environments 49: 211-
 2740 220.

2741 Pitt, J., D. F. Luecke, M. Cohen, E. P. Glenn and C. Valdés-Casillas. 2000. Two nations, one
 2742 river: Managing ecosystem conservation in the Colorado River Delta. Natural Resources
 2743 Journal 40: 819-864.

2744 Poirrier, M. A. and M. R. Partridge. 1979. The barnacle, *Balanus subalbidus*, as a salinity
 2745 bioindicator in the oligohaline estuarine zone. Coastal and Estuarine Research Federation 2:
 2746 204-206.

2747 Pontius, D. 1997. Colorado River Basin Study. Final Report to the Western Water Policy
 2748 Review Advisory Commission. 132 pp.

2749 Ramírez-León, M. R., S. Álvarez-Borrego, C. Turrent-Thompson, G. Gaxiola-Castro and G.
 2750 Heckel-Dziendzielewski. 2015. Nutrient input from the Colorado River water to the
 2751 northern Gulf of California is not required to maintain its pelagic ecosystem productivity.
 2752 Ciencias Marinas 41: 169-188.

2753 Ramírez-Rojo, R. A. and E. A. Aragón-Noriega. 2006. Postlarval ecology of the blue shrimp
 2754 (*Litopenaeus stylirostris*) and brown shrimp (*Farfantepenaeus californiensis*) in the Colorado
 2755 River Estuary. Ciencias Marinas 32(IA): 45-52.

2756 Reynolds, W.W. and D.A. Thomson. 1974. Temperature and salinity tolerances of young Gulf
 2757 of California grunion, *Leuresthes sardina* (Atheriniformes: Atherinidae). Journal of Marine
 2758 Research 32: 37-45.

2759 Reynolds, W. W., D. A. Thomson and M. E. Casterlin. 1976. Temperature and salinity
 2760 tolerances of larval Californian grunion, *Leuresthes tenuis* (Ayres): A comparison with Gulf
 2761 grunion, *L. sardina* (Jenkins & Evermann). Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and
 2762 Ecology 24: 73-82.

2763 Ripa, P. 1997. Toward a physical explanation of the seasonal dynamics and thermodynamics of
 2764 the Gulf of California. Journal of Physical Oceanography 27: 597-614.

2765 Roden, G. I. 1958. Oceanographic and meteorological aspects of the Gulf of California. Pacific
 2766 Science 12: 21-45.

2767 Roden, G. I. 1964. Oceanographic aspects of the Gulf of California. Pp. 30-58 in, T. H. Van
 2768 Andel and G. G. Shor Jr. (eds.), *Marine Geology of the Gulf of California: A Symposium*.
 2769 American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Memoir 3. Tulsa,. Oklahoma.

2770 Rodríguez, C. A., K. W. Flessa and D. L. Dettman. 2001a. Effects of upstream diversion of
 2771 Colorado River water on the estuarine bivalve mollusk *Mulinia coloradoensis*. Conservation
 2772 Biology 15: 249-258.

2773 Rodríguez, C. A., K. W. Flessa, M. A. Téllez-Duarte, D. L. Dettman and G. E. Ávila-Serrano.
 2774 2001b. Macrofaunal and isotopic estimates of the former extent of the Colorado River
 2775 estuary, upper Gulf of California, Mexico. Journal of Arid Environments 49: 183–193.

2776 Rodríguez-Quiroz, G., E. A. Aragón-Noriega, M. A. Cisneros-Mata and A. Ortega Rubio. 2012.
 2777 Fisheries and biodiversity in the upper Gulf of California, Mexico. Pp. 281-296 in, M.
 2778 Marcelli (ed.), *Oceanography*. InTech, Rijeka, Croatia.

2779 Rodríguez-Ibañez, C., S. Álvarez-Borrego, S. G. Marinone and J. R. Lara-Lara. 2013. The Gulf
 2780 of California is a source of CO₂ to the atmosphere. Ciencias Marinas 39: 137-150.

2781 Rodríguez-Quiroz, G., E. A. Aragón-Noriega and A. Ortega-Rubio. 2009. Artisanal shrimp
 2782 fishing in the biosphere reserve of the Upper Gulf of California. Crustaceana 82(12): 1481-
 2783 1493.

2784 Rodríguez-Quiroz, G., E. A. Aragón-Noriega, W. Valenzuela-Quinonez and H. M. Esparza-Leal.
 2785 2010. Artisanal fisheries in the conservation zones of the upper Gulf of California. Revista
 2786 de Biología Marina y Oceanografía 45: 89-98.

2787 Rojas-Bracho, L. and R. R. Reeves. 2013. Vaquitas and gillnets: Mexico's ultimate cetacean
 2788 conservation challenge. Endangered Species Research 21: 77-87

2789 Rojas-Bracho, L., R. R. Reeves and A. Jaramillo-Legorreta. 2006. Conservation of the vaquita,
 2790 *Phocoena sinus*. Mammal Review 36: 179-216.

2791 Rojas-Bracho, L. R. R. Reeves, A. Jaramillo-Legorreta and B. L. Taylor. 2008. *Phocoena sinus*.
 2792 The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2008: eT17028A6735464. Available at

2793 <http://dx.doi.org/10.2305/IUCN.UK.2008RLTS.T17028A6735464.en>. (Accessed 18 March
2794 2016.)

2795 Rojas-Bracho, L. and B. L. Taylor. 1999. Risk factors affecting the vaquita (*Phocoena sinus*).
2796 Marine Mammal Science 15: 974-989.

2797 Román-Rodríguez, M. J. 1990. Alimentación de *Totoaba macdonaldi* (Gilbert) (Pisces:
2798 Sciaenidae) en la parte norte del Alto Golfo de California. Ecológica 1: 1-9.

2799 Román-Rodríguez, M. J. 1998. Los sciaenidos en la reserva de la biósfera Alto Golfo de
2800 California. Pesca y Conservación 2: 7–8.

2801 Román-Rodríguez, M. J. 2000. Estudio poblacional del chano norteño *Micropogonias megalops*
2802 y la curvina golfina *Cynoscion othonopterus* (Gilbert) (Pisces: Sciaenidae), especies
2803 endémicas del alto Golfo California, México. Instituto del Medio Ambiente y Desarrollo
2804 Sustentable del Estado de Sonora (IMADES). Informe final SNIB-CONABIO Proyecto No.
2805 L298. México, D.F.

2806 Román-Rodríguez, M. J. and M. G. Hammann. 1997. Age and growth of totoaba, *Totoaba*
2807 *macdonaldi* (Sciaenidae), in the upper Gulf of California. U. S. Fishery Bulletin 95: 620–
2808 628.

2809 Romero-Sedano, J. C., E. A. Aragón-Noriega, M. M. Manzano-Sarabia, C. A. Salinas-Zavala
2810 and A. R. García-Juárez. 2004. Reproductive period of the brown shrimp *Farfantepenaeus*
2811 *californiensis* (Holmes, 1900) in the Agiabampo coastal lagoon system, Sonora/Sinaloa,
2812 Mexico. Ciencias Marinas 30: 465-475.

2813 Rosales-Juárez, F. and E. Ramírez-González. 1987. Estado actual sobre el conocimiento de la
2814 totoaba (*Cynoscion macdonaldi* Gilbert 1890). Secretaria de Pesca, México, D.F.

2815 Rosel, P. E., M. G. Haywood and W. F. Perrin. 1995. Phylogenetic relationships among the true
 2816 porpoises (Cetacea: Phocoenidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 4: 463-474.
 2817 Rosel, P. E. and L. Rojas-Bracho. 1999. Mitochondrial DNA variation in the critically
 2818 endangered vaquita *Phocoena sinus* Norris and MacFarland, 1958. *Marine Mammal Science*
 2819 15: 990-1003.
 2820 Rowell, K., K. W. Flessa, D. L. Dettman and M. J. Román. 2005. The importance of Colorado
 2821 River flow to nursery habitats of the Gulf corvina (*Cynoscion othonopterus*). *Canadian*
 2822 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 62: 2874–2885.
 2823 Rowell, K., K. W. Flessa, D. L. Dettman, M. J. Román, L. R. Gerber and L. T. Findley. 2008b.
 2824 Diverting the Colorado River leads to a dramatic life history shift in an endangered marine
 2825 fish. *Biological Conservation* 114: 1138-1148.
 2826 Rowell, K., C. True, K. W. Flessa and D. L. Dettman. 2008a. Fish without water: Validation
 2827 and application of $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ in *Totoaba macdonaldi* otoliths. *Ciencias Marinas* 34: 55-68.
 2828 Ruelas-Peña, J. H., C. Valdez-Muñoz and E. A. Aragón-Noriega. 2013. La pesquería de la
 2829 corvina golfina y las acciones de manejo en el Alto Golfo de California, México. *Latin*
 2830 *American Journal of Aquatic Research* 41: 498-505.
 2831 Ruiz-Fernández, A. C., J.-A. Sánchez-Cabeza, J. L. Serrato-de la Peña, L. H. Pérez-Bernal, A.
 2832 Cearreta, F. Flores-Verdugo, M. L. Machain-Castillo, E. Chamizo, R. García-Tenorio, I.
 2833 Queralt, R. Dunbar, D. Mucciarnoe and M. Diaz-Asencio. 2016. Accretion rates in coastal
 2834 wetlands of the southeastern Gulf of California and their relationship with sea-level rise. *The*
 2835 *Holocene* 26: 1126-1137.
 2836 Sadovy, Y. and W. L. Cheung. 2003. Near extinction of a highly fecund fish: the one that
 2837 nearly got away. *Fish and Fisheries* 4: 86-99.

2838 Sadovy, Y. and B. Erisman. 2010. Fishery and biological implications of fishing spawning
 2839 aggregations, and the social and economic importance of aggregating fishes. Pp. 225-284 in,
 2840 Y. J. Sadovy and P. I. Colin (eds.), *Reef Fish Spawning Aggregations: Biology, Research,*
 2841 *and Management*. Springer, New York.

2842 Sánchez-Velasco, L., M. F. Lavín, S. P. A. Jimenez-Rosenberg, J. M. Montes and P. J. Turk-
 2843 Boyer. 2011. Larval fish habitats and hydrography in the biosphere reserve of the Upper
 2844 Gulf of California. *Continental Shelf Research* 33: 89-99.

2845 Santamaría-del-Ángel, E., S. Álvarez-Borrego, R. Millán-Núñez and F. E. Müller-Karger. 1999.
 2846 Sobre el efecto de las surgencias de verano en la biomasa fitoplanctónica del Golfo de
 2847 California. *Revista de la Sociedad Mexicana de Historia Natural* 49: 207–212.

2848 Santamaría-del-Ángel, E., S. Álvarez-Borrego and F. E. Müller-Karger. 1994a. Gulf of
 2849 California biogeographic regions based on coastal zone color scanner imagery. *Journal of*
 2850 *Geophysical Research* 99(C4): 7411-7421.

2851 Santamaría-del-Ángel, E., S. Álvarez-Borrego and F. E. Müller-Karger. 1994b. The 1982-1984
 2852 El Niño in the Gulf of California as seen in coastal zone color scanner imagery. *Journal of*
 2853 *Geophysical Research* 99(C4): 7423-7431.

2854 Santiago-García, M. W., S. G. Marinone and O. U. Velasco-Fuentes. 2014. Three-dimensional
 2855 connectivity in the Gulf of California based on a numerical model. *Progress in*
 2856 *Oceanography* 123: 64-73.

2857 Schöne, B. R., K. W. Flessa, D. L. Dettman and D. H. Goodwin. 2003. Upstream dams and
 2858 downstream clams: growth rates of bivalve mollusks unveil impact of river management on
 2859 estuarine ecosystems (Colorado River Delta, Mexico). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*
 2860 58: 715-726.

2861 Snyder-Conn, E. and R. C. Brusca. 1975. Shrimp population dynamics and fishery impact in the
 2862 northern Gulf of California. *Ciencias Marinas* 2: 54-67.

2863 Soto-Mardones, L., S. G. Marinone and A. Parés-Sierra. 1999. Time and spatial variability of sea
 2864 surface temperature in the Gulf of California. *Ciencias Marinas* 25: 1-30.

2865 Souza, A. J., L. G. Álvarez and T. D. Dickey. 2004. Tidally induced turbulence and suspended
 2866 sediment. *Geophysical Research Letters* 31, doi: 10.1029/2004GL021186.

2867 Staines-Urías, F., R. G. Douglas and D. S. Gorsline. 2009. Oceanographic variability in the
 2868 southern Gulf of California over the past 400 years: Evidence from faunal and isotopic
 2869 records from planktic foraminifera. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*
 2870 284: 337-354.

2871 Stearns, S. C. (1992). *The Evolution of Life Histories*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2872 Stevens, L. E., J. C. Schmidt, T. J. Ayers and B. T. Brown. 1995. Flow regulation,
 2873 geomorphology, and Colorado River marsh development in the Grand Canyon, Arizona.
 2874 *Ecological Applications* 5: 1025-1039.

2875 Stock, G. G. 1976. Modeling of tides and tidal dissipation in the Gulf of California. PhD
 2876 dissertation, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego, La
 2877 Jolla, California, 102 pp.

2878 Streets, T. H. 1878. The discolored waters of the Gulf of California. *The American Naturalist*
 2879 12: 85-90.

2880 Stromberg, J. C. 2001. Restoration of riparian vegetation in the south-western United States:
 2881 importance of flow regimes and fluvial dynamism. *Journal of Arid Environments* 49: 17-34.

2882 Stromberg, J. and M. K. Chew. 2002. Flood pulses and restoration of riparian vegetation in the
 2883 American Southwest. Pp. 11-49 in, B. A. Middleton (ed.), *Flood Pulsing in Wetlands.*
 2884 *Restoring the Natural Hydrological Balance.* Wiley, New York.
 2885 Sykes, G. 1914. Geographical features of the Cahuilla Basin. Pp. 13-20 in, D. T. MacDougal
 2886 (ed.), *The Salton Sea.* Carnegie Institute of Washington, Publ. No. 193.
 2887 Sykes, G. 1937. *The Colorado Delta.* Carnegie Institute of Washington (Publ. No. 460) and
 2888 American Geographical Society of New York (Publ. No. 19).
 2889 Taylor, B. L. and L. Rojas-Bracho. 1999. Examining the risk of inbreeding depression in a
 2890 naturally rare cetacean, the vaquita (*Phocoena sinus*). *Marine Mammal Science* 15: 1004-
 2891 1028.
 2892 Thomson, D. A. and C. E. Lehner. 1976. Resilience of a rocky-intertidal fish community in a
 2893 physically unstable environment. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 22:
 2894 1-29.
 2895 Thompson, R. W. 1968. Tidal flat sedimentation on the Colorado River delta, northwestern
 2896 Gulf of California. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of America, Memoir* 107: 1-133.
 2897 Thunnell, R. C. 1998. Seasonal and annual variability in particle fluxes in the Gulf of
 2898 California: A response to climate forcing. *Deep-Sea Research (Part I)* 45: 2059-2083.
 2899 Thunnell, R. C., C. J. Pride, E. Tappa and F. E. Müller-Karger. 1994. Biogenic silica fluxes and
 2900 accumulation rates in the Gulf of California. *Geology* 22: 303-306.
 2901 Turk-Boyer, P. J., H. N. Morzaria-Luna, I. Martínez-Tovar, C. Downton-Hoffmann and A.
 2902 Munguía-Vega. 2014. Ecosystem-based fisheries management of a biological corridor along
 2903 the northern Sonora coastline (NE Gulf of California). Pp. 125-154 in, F. Amezcua and B.

2904 Bellgraph (eds.), *Fisheries Management of Mexican and Central American Estuaries*.
 2905 *Estuaries of the World*. Springer Science, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
 2906 Ulate, K., C. Sánchez, A. Sánchez-Rodríguez, D. Alonso, O. Aburto-Oropeza and L. Huato-
 2907 Soberanis. 2016. Latitudinal regionalization of epibenthic macroinvertebrate communities
 2908 on rocky reefs in the Gulf of California. *Marine Biology Research*, doi:
 2909 org/10.1080/17451000.2016.1143105.
 2910 University of California, U.C. Drought Management.
 2911 http://ucmanagedrought.ucdavis.edu/Agriculture/Crop_Irrigation_Strategies/Alfalfa/
 2912 (Accessed 28 June 2016.)
 2913 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District. 1982. Colorado River Basin, Hoover
 2914 Dam, review of food control regulation. Final Report. U. S. Government Printing Office,
 2915 Washington, D. C.
 2916 U.S. Department of the Interior. 2013a. Historical flows below Hoover Dam. U. S. Bureau of
 2917 Reclamation, Lower Colorado River Operations, Boulder City, Nevada.
 2918 www.usbr.gov/lc/riverops.html.
 2919 U.S. Department of the Interior. 2013b. Drought in the Upper Colorado River Basin. U. S.
 2920 Bureau of Reclamation, Lower Colorado River Operations, Boulder City, Nevada.
 2921 www.usbr.gov/lc/riverops.html.
 2922 U.S. Hydrographic Office. 1887. The West Coast of Mexico and Central America, from the
 2923 boundary line between the United States and Mexico to Panama, including the Gulf of
 2924 California. U.S. Hydrographic Office Publication No. 84, Government Printing Office,
 2925 Washington, D.C.

2926 Valdés-Casillas, C., O. Hinojosa-Huerta, M. Muñoz-Viveros, F. Zamora-Arroyo, Y. Carrillo-
 2927 Guerrero, S. Delgado-García, M. López-Camacho, E. Glenn, J. García-Hernández, J. Riley,
 2928 D. Baumgartner, M. Briggs, C. T. Lee, E. Chavarría-Correa, C. Congdon and D. Luecke.
 2929 1998. *Informational Database and Local Outreach Program for the Restoration of the*
 2930 *Hardy River Wetlands, Lower Colorado River Delta, Baja California and Sonora, Mexico.*
 2931 CECARENA, Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey (ITESM)-
 2932 Campus Guaymas. Guaymas, Sonora, México.

2933 Valdéz-Muñoz, C., E. A. Aragón-Noriega, A. Ortega-Rubio, C. A. Salinas-Závala, J. A. Arreola-
 2934 Lizárraga, S. Hernández-Vázquez and L. F. Beltrán-Morales. 2010. Distribución y
 2935 abundancia de juveniles de totoaba, *Totoaba macdonaldi*, y la salinidad del hábitat de
 2936 crianza. *Interciencia* 35: 136–139.

2937 Valenzuela-Quiñónez, F., F. Arreguín-Sánchez, S. Salas-Márquez, F. J. García-de León, J. C.
 2938 Garza, M. J. Román-Rodríguez and J. A. De Anda-Montañez. 2015. Critically endangered
 2939 totoaba *Totoaba macdonaldi*: Signs of recovery and potential threats after a population
 2940 collapse. *Endangered Species Research* 29: 1-11.

2941 Valenzuela-Quiñónez, F., J. A. De-Anda-Montañez, E. Gilbert-Horvath, J. C. Garza and F. J.
 2942 García-de León. 2016. Panmixia in a critically endangered fish: The totoaba (*Totoaba*
 2943 *macdonaldi*) in the Gulf of California. *Journal of Heredity*, Advance Access,
 2944 doi:10.1093/jhered/esw046.

2945 Valenzuela-Quiñónez, F., F. García-de León, J. De-Anda-Montañez and E. F. Balart. 2011. La
 2946 totoaba del Golfo de California—una especie en peligro de extinción? *Interciencia* 36: 664-
 2947 671.

- 2948 Valenzuela-Quiñonez, F., J. C. Garza, J. A. De-Anda-Montañez and F. J. García-de León. 2014.
 2949 Inferring past demographic changes in a critically endangered marine fish after fishery
 2950 collapse. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 71: 1619-1628.
- 2951 van Andel, T. H. and G. G. Shor, Jr. (eds.). 1964. *Marine Geology of the Gulf of California*.
 2952 Memoir 3, American Association of Petroleum Geologists, Tulsa, Oklahoma.
- 2953 Van Syoc, R. J. 1992. Living and fossil populations of a western Atlantic barnacle, *Balanus*
 2954 *subalbidus* Henry, 1974, in the Gulf of California region. *Proceedings of the San Diego*
 2955 *Society of Natural History* 12: 9-27.
- 2956 Vidal, O. 2016. Salvar a la Vaquita. La Última Oportunidad. Información en Movimiento,
 2957 World Wildlife Fund-Mexico, México D.F.
- 2958 Vidal, O., R. L. Brownell Jr. and L. T. Findley. 1999. Vaquita *Phocoena sinus* Norris and
 2959 McFarland, 1958. Chapter 13 (pp. 357-378) in, S. H. Ridgway and R. Harrison (eds.),
 2960 *Handbook of Marine Mammals: Volume 6, The Second Book of Dolphins and Porpoises*.
 2961 Academic Press, San Diego, California.
- 2962 Villa-Ramírez, B. 1993. Recovery plan for the vaquita, *Phocoena sinus*. NTIS Report PB93-
 2963 169415. Report to the U.S. Marine Mammal Commission, Washington D.C. 36 pp.
- 2964 Villa-Ramírez, B. 1976. Report on the status of *Phocoena sinus* Norris and McFarland, 1958, in
 2965 the Gulf of California. *Anales del Insituto de Biología, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de*
 2966 *México, Serie Zoología* 47: 203-208.
- 2967 Vizziano, D., F. Forni, G. Saona and W. Norbis. 2002. Reproduction of *Micropogonias furnieri*
 2968 in a shallow temperate coastal lagoon in the southern Atlantic. *Journal of Fish Biology*
 2969 61(sA): 196-206.

2970 Warren, C. N. 1979. Wilke: Late prehistoric human ecology at Lake Cahuilla, Coachella
 2971 Valley, California. A review. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 1: 200-
 2972 203.
 2973 Waters, M. R. 1983. Late Holocene lacustrine chronology and archaeology of ancient Lake
 2974 Cahuilla, California. *Quaternary Research* 19: 373-387.
 2975 Wheeler, K. G., J. Pitt, T. M. Magee and D. F. Luecke. 2007. Alternative for restoring the
 2976 Colorado River Delta. *Natural Resources Journal* 47: 917-967.
 2977 Wilke, P. J. 1978. Late prehistory of human ecology at Lake Cahuilla, Coachella Valley,
 2978 California. *Contributions of the University of California Archaeological Research Facility*
 2979 38, 168 pp. Riverside, California.
 2980 Witze, A. 2014. Water returns to arid Colorado River Delta: US-Mexico agreement paves the
 2981 way for a rare environmental test. *Nature* 507: 286-287.
 2982 Zamora, F. and K. W. Flessa. 2009. Nature's fair share. Finding and allocating water for the
 2983 Colorado River Delta. Chapter 2 (pp. 23-38) in, L. López-Hoffman, E. D. McGovern, R. G.
 2984 Varady and K W. Flessa (eds). *Conservation of Shared Environments. Learning from the*
 2985 *United States and Mexico*. University of Arizona Press, Tucson.
 2986 Zamora, F., P. L. Nagler, M. Griggs, D. Radtke, H. Rodríguez, J. García, C. Valdés, A. Huete
 2987 and E. P. Glenn. 2001. Regeneration of native trees in response to flood releases from the
 2988 United States into the delta of the Colorado River, Mexico. *Journal of Arid Environments*
 2989 49: 49-64.
 2990 Zamora, H. A., S. M. Nelson, K. W. Flessa and R. Nomura. 2013. Post-dam sediment dynamics
 2991 and processes in the Colorado River estuary: Implications for habitat restoring. *Ecological*
 2992 *Engineering* 59: 134-143. Doi: [org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2012.11.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2012.11.012).

- 2993 Zeilinski, S. 2014. The Colorado River Delta turned green after a historic water pulse.
2994 Smithsonian Magazine (18 December 2014).
2995 Zeitzschel, B. 1969. Primary productivity in the Gulf of California. Marine Biology 3: 201-
2996 207.
2997

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. The Gulf of California, showing geographic place names mentioned in the text.

Figure 2. GIS-based map of the Northern Gulf of California and Colorado River Delta. The Laguna Salada Basin covers approximately 990 km².

Figure 3. LANDSAT images of the Colorado River Delta, showing Laguna Salada Basin filled (1984) and empty (1990). (A) The 1983-84 El Niño event led to excess water releases into the Colorado River channel through Morelos Dam, filling the Laguna Salada Basin and connecting it to Ciénega de Santa Clara when most of the delta flooded from April to June. This June 1984 composite image of the Colorado River Delta, based on Landsat Thematic Mapper (sensor 5), shows Laguna Salada covering approximately 990 km², and a total flooded area of the delta covering 2,500 km². Dark blue and black represent standing surface water (data ground-truthed). For scale, the Sierra Cucapá-Sierra El Mayor range is approximately 90 km long. (B) After several years without flooding rains or excess water releases through Morelos Dam, Laguna Salada is reduced to a very small size (1990 image). LANDSAT images courtesy of Alejandro Hinojosa-Corona (CICESE, Ensenada, México).

Figure 4. Type specimens of *Mulinia modesta* (senior synonym of *M. coloradoensis*) from Guaymas, Sonora, Mexico (Smithsonian Institution). Photo courtesy Paul Valentich-Scott (Santa Barbara Natural History Museum, California).

Figure 5. Dried shells of the barnacle *Amphibalanus subalbidus* in situ in Laguna Salada (2016).
A. subalbidus is an Atlantic species likely introduced to Colorado River Delta brackish-water wetlands in the 1980s.

TABLE CAPTION

Table 1. Ranges of surface salinity (S), nutrients (NO₃, PO₄), and chlorophyll *a* (Chl) concentration values in the Upper Gulf. Values are from water samples and CTD measurements. Nutrients are in μM and Chl is in mg m⁻³. 1993 was a “wet” year, 1973 and 1996 were “dry” Colorado River flow years. Salinity data for March 1973 are from Álvarez-Borrego et al. (1975), and from Lavín and Sánchez (1999) for April 1993. Nutrients and Chl data from April 1993 and April 1996 are from Nieto-García (1998). WUG, Western Upper Gulf. CUG, Central Upper Gulf. EUG, Eastern Upper Gulf.

Table 1. Ranges of surface salinity (S), nutrients (NO_3 , PO_4), and chlorophyll *a* (Chl) concentration values in the Upper Gulf. Values are from water samples and CTD measurements. Nutrients are in μM and Chl is in mg m^{-3} . 1993 was a “wet” year, 1973 and 1996 were “dry” Colorado River flow years. Salinity data for March 1973 are from Álvarez-Borrego et al. (1975), data for April 1993 from Lavín and Sánchez (1999), and data for April 1996 from Nieto-García (1998). Nutrients and Chl data from April 1993 and April 1996 are from Nieto-García (1998). WUG, Western Upper Gulf. CUG, Central Upper Gulf. EUG, Eastern Upper Gulf.

	Years	S (‰)	NO_3	PO_4	Chl
WUG	1993 (wet)	32.0 - 35.4	0.1 - 0.3	0.3 – 0.7	0.5 – 1.5
	1973 (dry)	36.2 - 36.4			
	1996 (dry)	36.0 – 37.0	0.5 – 1.0	1.0 – 2.0	0.5 – 1.5
CUG	1993 (wet)	32.2 - 35.4	0.1 – 0.7	0.2 – 0.6	0.5 – 1.5
	1973 (dry)	36.0 - 36.1			
	1996 (dry)	35.8 – 36.4	0.5 – 1.0	1.0 – 2.0	0.5 – 1.5
EUG	1993 (wet)	34.6 - 35.4	0.3 – 0.5	0.6 – 0.7	0.5 – 4.5
	1973 (dry)	35.7 – 36.2			
	1996 (dry)	35.8 – 36.2	0.1 – 0.5	1.0 – 2.0	0.5 – 1.0

Figure

Figure
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure

Figure

Figure

Figure