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## Foreward

This is the seventeenth annual report to the United States Bureau of Reclamation (USBOR). This year's activities were conducted under terms of Cooperative Agreement Number 02FG200027, and cover the period October 1, 2004 through September 30, 2005 (FFY 2005). The field work was conducted by personnel of the California Department of Fish and Game’s (CDFG) Klamath-Trinity Program. Cooperators of CDFG field studies include the Hoopa Valley Tribe (HVT) fisheries department, Yurok Tribe (YT) fisheries department, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) fisheries department and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) fisheries department. The HVT, YT, and USFWS were contracted separately by the USBOR for cooperative and singular work performed during FFY 2005. Please refer to the respective agency/tribal fisheries departments or USBOR for information regarding cooperative or other projects/studies.

This year's CDFG work was comprised of five separate projects (Tasks) performed on the lower Klamath River, mainstem Trinity River, and at Trinity River Hatchery. The necessity for performing our Klamath-Trinity basin monitoring activities have been outlined in several Acts of Congress including Public Law 386 (69 Stat. 719), August 12, 1955; Public Law 98-541, October 24, 1984; "Trinity River Basin Fish and Wildlife Management Reauthorization Act" of 1995; and Trinity River "Record of Decision", 2000.
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TASK 1
ANNUAL RUN-SIZE, HARVEST, AND SPAWNER ESCAPEMENT ESTIMATES FOR TRINITY RIVER BASIN CHINOOK AND COHO SALMON AND STEELHEAD
by
Morgan Knechtle and Wade Sinnen


#### Abstract

The California Department of Fish and Game's Trinity River Project conducted tagging and recapture operations from July 2004 through March 2005 to obtain spring and fall run Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), coho salmon (O. kisutch), and adult fall run steelhead (O. mykiss) run-size, angler harvest, and spawner escapement estimates in the Trinity River basin. The project was conducted by the California Department of Fish and Game with cooperation from the Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries Department. We placed weirs in the Trinity River near the towns of Junction City and Willow Creek, and trapped 3,035 Chinook salmon, 1,009 coho salmon, 2,217 fall steelhead and 256 brown trout (Salmo trutta).

Based on tagged fish recovered at Trinity River Hatchery and on the return of reward tags by anglers, we estimated that 16,147 spring Chinook salmon migrated into the Trinity River basin upstream of Junction City Weir this season. We estimate that 889 of these were caught by anglers, leaving 15,258 fish as potential spawners. We estimated 29,534 fall Chinook salmon migrated past Willow Creek Weir and that 708 of these were caught by anglers, leaving 28,826 potential spawners.


The coho salmon run in the Trinity River basin, upstream of Willow Creek Weir, was estimated to be 38,882 fish. We estimated 40 of these were harvested by anglers, leaving 38,842 potential spawners.

An estimated 19,855 ( 4,817 naturally produced and 15,038 hatchery produced) adult fall run steelhead entered the Trinity River basin upstream of Willow Creek Weir. Anglers harvested an estimated 461 of the adult fall steelhead that migrated past Willow Creek Weir, leaving 19,394 fish as potential spawners.

## JOB OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the size, composition, distribution and timing of adult Chinook and coho salmon, and steelhead runs in the Trinity River basin.
2. To determine the in-river angler harvest and spawner escapements of Trinity River Chinook and coho salmon, and steelhead.

## INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG) Trinity River Project (TRP), in cooperation with the Hoopa Valley Tribe (HVT) conducts annual tagging and recapture operations for Chinook and coho salmon, and fall adult steelhead in the mainstem Trinity River. This effort determines the composition (race and proportion of hatchery-marked ${ }^{1 /}$ or Project-tagged ${ }^{2 /}$ fish), distribution, and timing of Chinook and coho salmon, and fall steelhead runs in the Trinity River basin. Recaptures of hatchery-marked or Project-tagged fish are used to develop run-size, angler harvest, and spawner escapement estimates for Chinook and coho salmon, and steelhead runs. Additionally, we continued tagging studies of brown trout this season to determine angler harvest and growth rates.

This is a continuation of studies that began in 1977 with the trapping, tagging, and recapture of fall-run Chinook salmon (fall Chinook), coho salmon (coho), and fall steelhead (steelhead) in the Trinity River in order to determine run-size and angler harvest rates. In 1978, similar studies were added to include spring-run Chinook salmon (spring Chinook). Steelhead were dropped from the program in 1985 through 1989 and reinstated in 1990. Results of these studies are available from California Department of Fish and Game (Heubach 1984a, 1984b; Heubach and Hubbell 1980; Heubach et al. 1992a, 1992b; Lau et al. 1994; Zuspan et al. 1985; Zuspan et al. 1995; Zuspan and Sinnen 1995, Zuspan 1996, Zuspan 1997, Lau and Sinnen 1998, Lau and Sinnen 2000, Sinnen et al. 2000, Reese, 2001; Reese and Sinnen, 2004; and Sinnen and Knechtle, 2005.

Earlier studies were funded by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (USBR), and with Anadromous Fish Act funds administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service. The USBR has funded the program from 1 October 1989 through the present.

[^0]2/ Spaghetti tags applied by CDFG personnel to returning sea-run fish.

Prior to the current program, all efforts to measure salmon and steelhead populations in the Trinity River basin had been restricted to portions of the upper mainstem Trinity River and several of its tributaries, including the South Fork Trinity River and some of its tributaries (Gibbs 1956; La Faunce 1965a, 1965b, 1967; Miller 1975; Moffett and Smith 1950; Rogers 1970, 1972, 1973a, 1973b, 1982; Smith 1975; Weber 1965). Earlier efforts did not include fish which used the mainstem and tributaries of the lower Trinity River or attempt to determine the proportion of hatchery fish in the runs and the rates at which various runs contributed to the fisheries. To develop a comprehensive management plan for the Trinity River basin, all salmon stocks utilizing the basin must be considered.

## METHODS

## Trapping and Tagging

## Trapping Locations and Periods

Trapping and tagging operations were conducted by TRP and HVT personnel from July through mid November 2004 at temporary weir sites near the towns of Willow Creek and Junction City in the mainstem Trinity River. The downstream site, Willow Creek Weir (WCW), was located 36.5 km upstream from the Trinity River's confluence with the Klamath River ( $40^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 29.85^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}, 123^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 8.61^{\prime \prime}$ W). The upstream site, Junction City Weir (JCW), was located 132.7 km upstream from the Klamath River confluence ( $40^{\circ} 41^{\prime} 5.51 " \mathrm{~N}, 123^{\circ} 01^{\prime}$ $35.55 "$ W) (Figure 1). Prior to 1995, JCW was operated from May through November. Currently, JCW is operated from late June or mid-July through September. WCW is generally operated from mid-August through November. Most fall Chinook salmon spawning occurs upstream of WCW, while the majority of spring Chinook spawning occurs upstream of JCW.

We operated the WCW from September 14 through November 22, 2004 and the JCW from July 21 through October 7, 2004. At JCW there was a three week period between August 20 and September 15 when no trapping occurred. The weir was removed due to "fall fishery" flows released from Lewiston Dam. The flows peaked at $1,780 \mathrm{cfs}$ and were released to provide migrational cues to Trinity River fall Chinook in the lower Klamath River. This was done to alleviate crowding in the lower Klamath River, which was one factor identified as contributing to a fish kill in September of 2002 (DFG, 2003).


Figure 1. Location of trapping and tagging weirs for anadromous salmonids near Willow Creek and Junction City in the mainstem Trinity River, 2004-05 season.

At both weir sites, we attempted to trap during a five day period beginning late-afternoon on Sunday and ending mid-afternoon on Friday. We opened the weir each trapping day for approximately four hours allowing fish to pass unimpeded. Occasionally, trapping schedules were modified to allow for holidays or high flows which prevented trapping in a safe manner. Trapping and tagging were not conducted if stream temperatures exceeded $22^{\circ} \mathrm{Celsius}$.

## Weir and Trap Design

Since 1989, we have used the Bertoni (Alaskan) weir design at both sites (Figures 2-4). The weir was supported by wooden tripods set 2.5 m apart. Weir panels consisted of $3.0-\mathrm{m}$ X 1.9-$\mathrm{cm}(10-\mathrm{ft} \mathrm{X} 3 / 4-\mathrm{in})$ electrical conduit spaced 5.1 cm apart on center, leaving a gap of 3.2 cm between conduits. Conduits were supported by three pieces of aluminum channel arranged
0.92 m apart, that connected to the supporting tripods. We anchored the tripods with cable attached to $1.8-\mathrm{m}$ stakes driven into the stream bottom. The weir panels were angled, with the top of the weir standing 1.8 m above the river bottom.


Figure 2. Photograph of Alaskan style weir tripods, support channels and conduit.


Figure 3. Photograph (taken downstream) of Alaskan weir. Note the boat gate (right side of picture).


Figure 4. Photograph of Alaskan weir showing the trapping boxes on the upstream side of the weir.

The trap was made of $1.9-\mathrm{cm}$ electrical conduit spaced 2.5 cm apart and welded into panels. The panels were wired together at the corners to produce a $2.4-\mathrm{m}$ square box which was bolted to a plywood floor and covered with plywood to prevent fish from jumping out. A fyke, also made of conduit panels, was installed in the trap. Its purpose was to guide the fish into the trap and prevent their escape. The trap was placed on the upstream side of the weir. About 12 weir conduits were raised creating an opening approximately 60 cm , to allow fish to pass through the weir into the trap. To allow boat passage, at both weirs, gates approximately 6 m were inserted between two weir panels. The gate at JCW was constructed of welded conduit panels with $2.5-\mathrm{cm}$ spacing between conduits and was perpendicular to the stream substrate. The gate at WCW was constructed of chain-link fencing supported by a livestock gate with 4.0 cm mesh spacing and was sloped even with the weir.

## Processing of Fish

At both weirs, we identified all trapped salmonids to species, measured them to the nearest cm fork length (FL), and examined them for hook, predator, and gill-net scars, fin clips, and tags. Each untagged salmonid judged in good condition and un-spawned was tagged with a serially numbered FT- $4^{3 /}$ spaghetti tag (Project-tagged). Tags were inserted using an applicator needle through the fishes back approximately two cm below the posterior insertion point of the dorsal fin. To determine angler harvest and catch-and-release rates upstream of the weirs, one-third of

3/ The use of brand or trade names is for identification purposes only, and does not imply the endorsement of any product by the CDFG.
the Chinook salmon received \$10-reward tags, while the remaining tags were non-reward. At WCW, half of the steelhead received reward tags, while the remaining received non-reward. Coho were tagged with non-reward tags due to their status as threatened under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) which prohibits their take by sport anglers. At JCW, brown trout were tagged with serially numbered FD-94 anchor tags. All brown trout tagged during 2004 received non-reward tags. Steelhead and coho were not tagged at JCW.

Determining the Separation Between Spring and Fall Chinook Salmon Runs at the Weirs Each year there is a temporal overlap in the spring and fall Chinook runs in the Trinity River. Since the timing of runs varies between years, each season we assign new dates separating the two runs so that numbers of spring and fall Chinook used to estimate the run-size and angler harvest could be determined. We compared the proportions of known and estimated spring and fall Chinook trapped at the weirs each week. The week at which the proportion of fall Chinook exceeded spring Chinook was designated as the first week of the fall Chinook run at that weir. If there are two consecutive weeks with nearly identical proportions, then the first week is designated as spring and the following as fall. A recovered tagged Chinook was identified as either a spring or a fall Chinook based on two separate criteria. First, some Chinook tagged at the weirs carried coded-wire tags (CWT's), placed in their snouts as juveniles at TRH. These fish are identified by the absence of an adipose (AD) fin, which is clipped during the tagging process. If these fish were recovered at the hatchery or during spawning surveys, the CWT code indicated whether they were spring or fall fish. Second, nonCWT'ed Chinook tagged at the weir and recovered at the hatchery were classified as either spring or fall fish based on the date they entered the hatchery. If they entered the hatchery during the period associated with the spring run (based on CWT recoveries at the hatchery) they were considered spring Chinook. Those Chinook entering the hatchery during the period associated with the fall run (based on CWT recoveries) were considered fall Chinook.

## Estimating Numbers of Spring and Fall Chinook Salmon at Trinity River Hatchery

 As at the weirs, there is an overlap in the return timing of spring and fall Chinook into TRH. To estimate the respective numbers of spring and fall Chinook without CWT's entering TRH, we expanded the numbers of tags recovered from each returning CWT group by the ratio of tagged to total Chinook salmon (production multiplier) when they were originally released (same strain, brood year [BY], release site, release group and date). For example, 44,654 fall Chinook of CWT group 06-52-54 plus 438,756 unmarked fall Chinook were released directly from TRH in June of 2000. The expanded estimate for each return of this group is 10.83 $(44,654+438,756 / 44,654)$. Thus, each CWT return was expanded by its production multiplier to estimate the total number of spring and fall Chinook that entered the hatchery.If more Chinook salmon entered the hatchery on a particular sorting day than could be accounted for by the expansion of all CWT groups, we assumed the additional fish were naturally produced. We designated these fish as spring or fall in the same proportions that were determined by the expansion of the CWT groups on that day.

For the purpose of estimating spring and fall Chinook run-sizes, we assigned a separation date
at the hatchery between the two runs. The separation date was the week in which fall Chinook out- numbered spring Chinook based on the expansion of coded-wire tags.

## Size Discrimination Between Adult and Grilse Chinook and Coho Salmon

We designated the size separating an adult fish from a grilse for spring and fall Chinook based on two criteria; length frequency data obtained at the two trapping sites and TRH and length data obtained from groups of CWT'ed fish that entered TRH whose exact age was known. Daily Chinook salmon FL data from TRH were assigned to either spring or fall Chinook only when the expansion of the number of CWT's indicated $\geq 90 \%$ of the Chinook salmon entering TRH were from either spring or fall runs.

Coho salmon do not receive CWT's, therefore exact ages are unknown. We relied on length frequency analysis to separate grilse and adults.

Chinook and coho length frequency data collected at the weirs and TRH were smoothed with a moving average of five, $1-\mathrm{cm}$ increments to determine the nadir separating grilse and adults.

## Size Discrimination Between Adult and Immature Steelhead

All steelhead $>41 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were considered adults, and steelhead $\leq 41 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL captured at the weirs were assumed to be half-pounders (assumed to have migrated to the ocean). Steelhead $\leq 41 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL that entered TRH were not counted and were classified as sub-adults. We did not know whether theses fish had migrated to the ocean or were residual fish.

## Recovery of Tagged Fish

## Weir Recovery

We measured to the nearest cm, FL all dead salmonids recovered against the weir and examined them for tags, fin clips, and spawning condition. Heads of adipose fin-clipped (Adclipped) (potentially hatchery-marked) fish were removed for the recovery of the CWT. After examination, the carcasses were cut in half to prevent recounting and returned to the river downstream of the weir.

## Tagging Mortalities

Tagged salmonids recovered dead at the weir, in spawning surveys, or reported dead by anglers were considered tagging mortalities, if there was no evidence they had spawned and they were recovered dead $\leq 21$ days after tagging. Tagged fish recovered dead more than 21 days after tagging, or those that had spawned, regardless of the number days after tagging, were not considered tagging mortalities.

## Angler Tag Returns

We used the information from Project-tags returned by anglers to assess sport harvest. All the tags placed on fish at the weirs were inscribed with our address so anglers could return the tags to us. All anglers that returned tags were sent questionnaires asking the date and location of
their catch and whether they harvested (kept) or released their catch. The questionnaire informed them of the fish's tagging date and location.

Tags returned to us through June 1, 2005 were used to assess harvest and catch-and-release rates. Tags returned after that date were processed for payment but not used for analysis. This date was chosen due to time constraints associated with the completion of this report and because the vast majority of tags have been returned by this date in previous years.

## Trinity River Hatchery

The TRH fish ladder was open from 03 September 2004 through 15 March 2005. Hatchery personnel conducted fish sorting and spawning operations generally two days per week. We considered the initial day a fish was observed during sorting as the day it entered the hatchery.

On all sorting days, salmon and steelhead entering TRH were identified to species, sexed, and examined for tags and fin clips. We measured all salmonids to the nearest cm FL, except those that were Project-tagged fish from the weirs. Project-tagged salmon and steelhead recovered at TRH were assigned the FL recorded for them at the weir where they were originally tagged. At TRH we are unable to distinguish between large rainbow trout and small steelhead trout therefore, O.mykiss $\leq 41 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were not counted and were returned to the river

During each sorting week, we gave a distinguishing fin-clip to AD-clipped and project-tagged Chinook that were placed in ponds to ripen, so the week they initially entered the hatchery (i.e., were sorted) could be determined when they were spawned. Fish that were neither AD-marked or project-tagged were tallied. On the day they were spawned, we removed the heads of all AD-clipped salmon and placed each in a plastic bag with a serially numbered tag noting the date and location of recovery, species, sex, and FL. Project personnel later performed CWT extraction and decoding.

## Spawner Surveys

In cooperation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Forest Service and Yurok Tribe, we conducted spawner surveys in the upper Trinity River from Cedar Flat (RK 78) upstream to Lewiston Dam (RK 180). Tagged fish recovered in these surveys were examined for spawning success and project tags. Results of these surveys are presented in Task 4 of this report.

## Statistical Analyses

## Effectively Tagged Fish

We estimated the number of effectively tagged fish by subtracting from the total tagged, those fish we classified as tagging mortalities, tagged-fish recovered downstream of the tagging site, and angler-caught-and-released fish.

## Run-size Estimates

We determined the run-size estimates by using Chapman's version ${ }^{4 /}$ of the Petersen Single Census Method:

$$
\mathrm{N}=\frac{(\mathrm{M}+1)(\mathrm{C}+1)}{(\mathrm{R}+1)} \text {, where }
$$

$\mathrm{N}=$ estimated run-size
$M=$ the number of effectively tagged fish
$\mathrm{C}=$ the number of fish examined at TRH
$\mathrm{R}=$ the number of Project-marked fish recovered in the hatchery sample.
We attempted to tag and recover enough fish to obtain $95 \%$ confidence limits within $\pm 10 \%$ of the run-size estimate. We used criteria established by Chapman (1948) to select the type of confidence interval estimator. We used the proportions of grilse and adult salmon trapped at each weir to estimate the numbers of grilse and adults comprising the run upstream of that respective weir. We did not stratify the estimates into grilse and adult salmon because there were not sufficient grilse and adult salmon recovered to obtain $95 \%$ confidence of $\pm 10 \%$ of each of the stratified portions of the run.

All steelhead run-size estimates were for adults only. Since the 1997 BY, all TRH-produced steelhead have received adipose-fin clips. We determined the proportion of the run that was hatchery produced based upon the percentage of adipose fin clipped steelhead observed at Willow Creek Weir.

For the run-size estimates, we assumed that: 1) fish trapped and released from the weir were a random sample representative of the population; 2) tagged and untagged fish were equally vulnerable to recapture at TRH; 3) all Project tags were recognized upon recovery; 4) tagged and untagged fish were randomly mixed throughout the population and among the fish recovered at TRH; and 5) we accounted for all tagging mortalities.

## Angler Harvest and Catch-and-Release Rates and Harvest Estimates

Generally, anglers will return reward tags at a rate higher or nearly equal to that of non-reward tags. When this was the case, we used only reward tag returns to determine harvest rates. When non-reward tags were returned at higher rates than reward tags, we combined the two to determine harvest rates.

We computed the harvest rate for each species (and race of Chinook) by dividing the number of angler-returned tags from harvested fish by the number of fish we effectively tagged. We calculated independent harvest rates for grilse and adult salmon. We computed the catch-andrelease rate for each species (and race of Chinook) by dividing the number of angler-returned

4/ Chapman, D. G. 1951. Some properties of the hypergeometric distribution with applications to zoological census. Univ. Calif. Publ. Stat. 1:131-160, As cited in Ricker (1975).
tags from caught and released fish by the number of fish effectively tagged plus the number of fish reported as released.

We estimated the numbers of fish harvested upstream of each weir by multiplying the harvest rates (for each species and race) by their respective run-sizes upstream of each weir.

Use of Standard Julian Week
Weekly sampling data collected by Project personnel at the weirs are presented in Julian week (JW) format. Each JW is defined as one of a consecutive set of 52 weekly periods, beginning 1 January, regardless of the day of the week on which 1 January falls. The extra day in leap years is included in the ninth week (Appendix 1). This procedure allows inter-annual comparisons of identical weekly periods.

## RESULTS

## Trapping and Tagging

## Chinook Salmon

Spring-Fall Chinook Separation and Run Timing. Spring Chinook were the predominant race at JCW through JW 37, after which fall Chinook became predominate (Figure 5). No trapping was attempted during JW's 35 and 36 due to the aforementioned increased flows, which precluded operation of the weir. At JCW, spring Chinook catch peaked during JW 29, the first week of trapping, at 75.5 fish $/$ night. Chinook catch declined thereafter to a low of 1 fish $/$ night in JW 34. Twenty nine percent of spring Chinook caught $(151 / 518)$ during the season was in the first week of trapping, indicating that the trap was installed during a pulse of migration. After this initial pulse of fish moved upstream, two additional pulses of fish were trapped peaking in JW's 32 and 37 with 30.6 and 26.0 fish/night trapped. (Table 1, Figure 6).

Based on the return of project-tagged and AD-clipped fish, the proportion of fall Chinook tagged at WCW exceeded spring Chinook throughout the entire season, so for the purpose of analysis all Chinook salmon trapped at the WCW were considered fall-run (Figure 5). Fall Chinook daily catch (fish/night) averaged greater than 38 fish between JW's 37 and 42, with the peak observed during JW 39 when 123 fish/night were trapped. Thirteen percent of the fall Chinook caught $(274 / 2,137)$ during the season was in the first week of trapping, indication that the trap was installed during a pulse of upstream migration. During JW 42 daily catch of Chinook dropped to 0.5 fish per night. Chinook catch stayed below 8 fish per night for the remainder of the season and only one Chinook was caught the last week of trapping, JW 47 (Table 2, Figure 7).

Fall Chinook run timing may have been affected by increased "fishery" flows released in the Trinity River during late August through early September. The increased flows, released from Lewiston Dam, peaked at 1780 cfs on August 24 and gradually receded to below 500 cfs , on

September $13^{\text {th }}$ (Appendices 19-20). The flows were increased to stimulate Chinook migration out of the lower Klamath River to help avoid a fish kill, similar to which occurred in 2002. These increased flows also impacted our ability to trap JW's 34-37 at JCW.



Figure 5. Percent recovery of Junction City and Willow Creek Weir marked Chinook at Trinity River Hatchery during the 2004-05 season. Chinook salmon were designated as either spring or fall-run based on recoveries of coded-wire tags or entry timing into Trinity River Hatchery. For the purposes of analysis, all Chinook salmon captured at Willow Creek Weir were considered fall-run and Chinook salmon captured prior to Julian week 38 at Junction City Weir were considered springrun.

Table 1. Weekly summary of spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon trapped in the Trinity River at Junction City Weir during 2004. a/

| Julian Week | Inclusive dates |  | Nights Number Trapped |  |  |  | fish/night |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Trapped | Grilse b/ | Adults | Total |  |
| Spring Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 16-Jul | 22-Jul | 2 | 87 | 64 | 151 | 75.5 |
| 30 | 23-Jul | 29-Jul | 5 | 39 | 45 | 84 | 16.8 |
| 31 | 30-Jul | - 5-Aug | 5 | 11 | 12 | 23 | 4.6 |
| 32 | 6-Aug | - 12-Aug | 5 | 61 | 92 | 153 | 30.6 |
| 33 | 13-Aug | - 19-Aug | 5 | 26 | 28 | 54 | 10.8 |
| 34 | 20-Aug | - 26-Aug | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - 16-Sep | 2 | 16 | 36 | 52 | 26.0 |
|  |  | Sub-total: | 25 | 240 | 278 | 518 |  |
|  |  | Sub-mean: |  |  |  |  | 23.6 |
| Fall Chinook c/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - 23-Sep | 5 | 24 | 47 | 71 | 14.2 |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - 30-Sep | 5 | 49 | 74 | 123 | 24.6 |
| 40 | 1-Oct | 7-Oct | 5 | 56 | 130 | 186 | 37.2 |
|  |  | Sub-total: | 15 | 129 | 251 | 380 |  |
|  |  | Sub-mean: |  |  |  |  | 25.3 |
| Grand total: Combined mean: |  |  | 40 | 369 | 529 | 898 | 24.1 |

a/ Trapping at Junction City took place from 21 July (Julian week 29) through 20 August (Julian week 34) and 15 September (Julian week 37) through 7 October (Julian week 40) of 2004.
b/ Spring-run Chinook $<57 \mathrm{~cm}$, FL and fall-run $<55 \mathrm{~cm}$, FL were considered grilse.
c/ There was a temporal overlap of spring and fall-run Chinook during Julian week 37, 38, and 39. For the purpose of analysis all Chinook trapped prior to Julian week 38 were considered spring run. Chinook trapped during julian week 38 through 40 were considered fall Chinook.


Figure 6. Average catch of spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon in the Trinity River at Junction City Weir during 2004.

Table 2. Weekly summary of fall-run Chinook salmon trapped in the Trinity River at Willow Creek Weir during 2004. For the purpose of analysis there were no spring-run Chinook salmon trapped at the Willow Creek Weir. a/

| Julian Week | Inclusive dates |  |  | Nights | Number Trapped |  |  | fish/night |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Trapped | Grilse b/ | Adults | Total |  |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - | 16-Sep | 3 | 76 | 198 | 274 | 91.3 |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - | 23-Sep | 5 | 102 | 311 | 413 | 82.6 |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - | 30-Sep | 5 | 106 | 509 | 615 | 123.0 |
| 40 | 1-Oct | - | 7-Oct | 5 | 50 | 288 | 338 | 67.6 |
| 41 | 8-Oct | - | 14-Oct | 5 | 23 | 240 | 263 | 52.6 |
| 42 | 15-Oct | - | 21-Oct | 4 | 8 | 146 | 154 | 38.5 |
| 43 | 22-Oct | - | 28-Oct | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0.5 |
| 44 | 29-Oct | - | 4-Nov | 5 | 2 | 15 | 17 | 3.4 |
| 45 | 5-Nov | - | 11-Nov | 5 | 8 | 31 | 39 | 7.8 |
| 46 | 12-Nov | - | 18-Nov | 5 | 3 | 18 | 21 | 4.2 |
| 47 | 19-Nov | - | 25-Nov | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 0.5 |
| Total: |  |  |  | 48 | 378 | 1,759 | 2,137 |  |
| Mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 42.9 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from 14 September (Julian Week 37) through 22 November (Julian Week 47) of 2004.
b/ Fall run Chinook <55 cm, FL were considered grilse.


Figure 7. Average catch of fall-run Chinook salmon in the Trinity River at Willow Creek Weir during 2004.

Sizes of Trapped Fish. Spring Chinook trapped this season at JCW and TRH averaged 59.7 and 69.6 cm FL , respectively. The combined average of the two sites was 68.6 cm , FL (Figure 8). The nadir between grilse and adult spring Chinook indicated a maximum grilse size of 56 cm FL. Data from known-age, hatchery-marked spring Chinook that entered TRH, reinforced a minimum adult length of 57 cm FL. Although, there was some overlap between sizes of age 2 (fingerling releases) and age 3 (yearling releases) spring Chinook (Appendix 2). Applying this size to observed populations, we estimate that grilse comprised $46.3 \%$ and $15.8 \%$ of the spring Chinook observed at JCW and TRH, respectively. Based on fork length and CWT analysis the age composition of spring Chinook trapped at JCW was different than at TRH. Spring Chinook age composition based on CWT analysis alone at TRH was 14.7, 35.2, 49 and 1.2 percent 2, 3, 4 and 5 year old fish respectively. While the age composition of CWT'ed spring Chinook that were trapped at JCW and were recovered at TRH was 37.5, 42.5, 20 and 0 percent 2, 3, 4 and 5 year old fish respectively.

Fall Chinook trapped at WCW averaged 64.7 cm, FL and 66.8 cm , FL at TRH. The fork length frequency analysis for the two sites combined indicated that the nadir separating grilse from adults was 54 cm (Figure 9). Size data of known-age, hatchery-marked fall Chinook entering TRH supported this size separation, however there was some overlap between sizes of age 2 (fingerling releases) and age 3 (yearling releases) fall Chinook (Appendix 3). Based on a maximum grilse size of 54 cm , fall Chinook grilse comprised $17.7 \%$ and $7.9 \%$ of the run observed at WCW and TRH respectively.

Effectively Tagged Fish. We trapped 518 spring Chinook at JCW, of which 509 (238 grilse and 271 adults) were effectively tagged (Appendix 4). There were 2 tagging mortalities and 4 caught-and-released spring Chinook from which anglers reported removing tags that were not considered effectively tagged. We reward-tagged 168 ( $33.0 \%$ ) spring Chinook ( 87 grilse and 81 adults). The remaining fish received non-reward tags.

We trapped 2,137 fall Chinook at WCW and 2,075 of them (363 grilse and 1,712 adults) were effectively tagged (Appendix 5). Due to poor condition we did not tag 43 fall-run Chinook, anglers removed the tags from 15 caught and released fish, and there were two tagging mortalities. We placed reward tags on 686 ( 112 grilse and 574 adults), or $33.1 \%$, of the effectively tagged fall Chinook at WCW.

Incidence of Tags and Fin Clips. 12 of the Chinook tagged at WCW were subsequently recaptured at JCW this year. Ad-clipped fish comprised $17.9 \%$ (93/518) of the spring Chinook captured at JCW (Appendix 4). Forty two of the 93 Ad-clipped Chinook designated as Spring Chinook and tagged at JCW were subsequently recovered at TRH (Table 3). These were predominantly from CWT release group code 0625288, three-year-old spring Chinook released as yearlings in October of 2001. Of the 380 Chinook designated as fall-run captured at JCW, $16.3 \%$ (62) were Ad-clipped. Twenty one of these fish were subsequently recaptured at TRH.




Figure 8. Spring-run Chinook salmon fork lengths (cm) observed at Junction City Weir and Trinity River Hatchery during the 2004-05 season. The number of fish at each fork length is shown as a moving average of five, $1-\mathrm{cm}$ increments. The arrow denotes the size we used to separate grilse and adults for analysis.



Figure 9. Fall-run Chinook salmon fork lengths (cm) observed at Willow Creek Weir and Trinity River Hatchery during the 2004-05 season. The number of fish at each fork length is shown as a moving average of five, 1-cm increments. The arrow denotes the size we used to separate grilse and adults for analysis.

Table 3. Release data and recoveries of coded-wire tagged (CWT) and maxillary-clipped salmon trapped in the Trinity River at Willow Creek and Junction City weirs, and subsequently recovered at Trinity River Hatchery during the 2004-05 season.

| Release data |  |  |  |  |  |  | Numbers recovered from tagging site: b/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CWT and |  |  | Brood |  | Number |  |  |  |
| release type a/ | Species | Race | year | Date | of fish | Site c/ | WCW | JCW |
| Spring-run Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065251-f | Chinook | spring | 1999 | 06/01-07/00 | 49,421 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065252-f | Chinook | spring | 1999 | 06/01-07/00 | 51,993 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065253-f | Chinook | spring | 1999 | 06/01-07/00 | 46,966 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065258-y | Chinook | spring | 1999 | 10/03-06/00 | 129,919 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065260-f | Chinook | spring | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 33,049 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065261-f | Chinook | spring | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 32,621 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065262-f | Chinook | spring | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 24,480 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065263-f | Chinook | spring | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 34,385 | TRH | 0 | 1 |
| 065264-f | Chinook | spring | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 31,857 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065269-f | Chinook | spring | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 52,491 | TRH | 0 | 1 |
| 065270-f | Chinook | spring | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 52,580 | TRH | 0 | 2 |
| 065279-y | Chinook | spring | 2000 | 10/01-10/01 | 99,304 | TRH | 0 | 4 |
| 065281-f | Chinook | spring | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 89,482 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065282-f | Chinook | spring | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 89,978 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065283-f | Chinook | spring | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 73,788 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065288-y | Chinook | spring | 2001 | 10/10-16/02 | 104,627 | TRH | 0 | 17 |
| 065295-f | Chinook | spring | 2002 | 06/03-09/03 | 89,284 | TRH | 0 | 4 |
| 065296-f | Chinook | spring | 2002 | 06/03-09/03 | 84,568 | TRH | 0 | 8 |
| 065297-f | Chinook | spring | 2002 | 06/03-09/03 | 70,902 | TRH | 0 | 2 |
| 065308-y | Chinook | spring | 2002 | 10/01-07-03 | 106,139 | TRH | 0 | 1 |
| shed tag d/ | Chinook | spring |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| Total spring-run Chinook: |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 42 |
| Fall-run Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065254-f | Chinook | fall | 1999 | 06/01-07/00 | 44,654 | TRH | 1 | 0 |
| 065255-f | Chinook | fall | 1999 | 06/01-07/00 | 42,549 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065257-f | Chinook | fall | 1999 | 06/01-07/00 | 50,533 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065256-f | Chinook | fall | 1999 | 06/01-07/00 | 43,565 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065259-y | Chinook | fall | 1999 | 10/03-06/00 | 296,892 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065265-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 32,795 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065266-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 33,806 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065267-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 34,852 | TRH | 1 | 0 |
| 065268-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 33,240 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065271-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 54,867 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065272-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 36,035 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065273-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 57,444 | TRH | 2 | 0 |
| 065274-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 32,096 | TRH | 1 | 0 |
| 065275-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 64,250 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065276-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 27,159 | TRH | 1 | 0 |
| 065277-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 56,582 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065278-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 34,183 | TRH | 1 | 0 |
| 065280-y | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 10/01-10/01 | 216,593 | TRH | 17 | 6 |
| 065643-f | Chinook | fall | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 25,007 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065284-f | Chinook | fall | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 119,555 | TRH | 2 | 0 |
| 065285-f | Chinook | fall | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 114,119 | TRH | 3 | 0 |
| 065286-f | Chinook | fall | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 126,135 | TRH | 2 | 0 |
| 065287-f | Chinook | fall | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 121,607 | TRH | 1 | 0 |
| 065290-f | Chinook | fall | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 10,234 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065291-f | Chinook | fall | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 8,269 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065289-y | Chinook | fall | 2001 | 10/10-16/02 | 230,055 | TRH | 193 | 6 |
| 065292-f | Chinook | fall | 2002 | 06/03-09/03 | 10,355 | TRH | 0 | 0 |
| 065298-f | Chinook | fall | 2002 | 06/03-09/03 | 124,602 | TRH | 12 | 3 |
| 065299-f | Chinook | fall | 2002 | 06/03-09/03 | 126,729 | TRH | 6 | 0 |
| 065306-f | Chinook | fall | 2002 | 06/03-09/03 | 124,014 | TRH | 3 | 1 |
| 065307-f | Chinook | fall | 2002 | 06/03-09/03 | 123,263 | TRH | 1 | 3 |
| 065309-y | Chinook | fall | 2002 | 10/01-07/03 | 236,319 | TRH | 1 | 0 |
| shed tag d/ | Chinook | fall | 2002 |  |  |  | 10 | 2 |
| Total fall-run Chinook: |  |  |  |  |  |  | 258 | 21 |
| Coho salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| RM e/ | coho |  | 2001 | 03/17-19/03 | 416,201 | TRH | 226 |  |
| RM e/ | coho |  | 2002 | 03/15-17/04 | 516,906 | TRH | 21 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total coho: | 247 | 0 |

a/ CWT=coded-wire tag.
b/ Tagging site: WCW=Willow Creek Weir; JCW=Junction City Weir.
c/ Release site: TRH=Trinity River Hatchery
d/ Fish with shed CWTs were designated as spring- or fall-race based on the date they were trapped the weirs.
e/ Since 1996, all coho produced at TRH have received a right maxillary clip (RM). Coho less than 54 cm , FL were classified as brood year 2002 and coho greater than 53 cm , FL were classified as brood year 2001. Age cutoff based on fork length distribution.

Ad-clipped fish comprised $22.5 \%(480 / 2,137)$ of the fall Chinook observed at WCW (Appendix 5). Two hundred fifty eight (53.8\%) of the Ad-clipped fall Chinook tagged at WCW were recovered at TRH (Table 3). Of these, the vast majority were 3-year-old fall Chinook released from TRH as yearlings in 2001 (CWT groups 065289).

Incidence of Gill-net Wounds, Hook Scars, and Predator Wounds. Seventy seven (14.9\%) of the 518 spring Chinook trapped at JCW had gill-net wounds. The average size of spring Chinook with gill-net wounds verses without gill net wounds was 67.2 and 58.4 cm FL , respectively. Although subjective, crews noted one fresh hooking scar, seven predator scars, and 16 wounds of unknown origin on spring Chinook at JCW.

One hundred fifty eight (7.4\%) of the 2,137 fall Chinook trapped at WCW had gill-net wounds. The average size of fall Chinook with gill-net wounds verses without gill-net wounds was 70.1 and 64.3 cm . FL respectively. Although subjective, crews at WCW noted 27 ocean hooking scars, and 100 fresh hooking scars on fall Chinook at WCW. Crews also observed predator wounds on 151 of the fall Chinook and an additional 48 had wounds of unknown origin.

## Coho Salmon

Run timing. We trapped the first coho at WCW on 14 September, 2004 (JW 37). Coho trapping peaked during JW 41 when average catch was 84.8 fish/night (Table 4, Figure 10). We trapped 1,009 coho salmon ( 151 grilse and 858 adults) at WCW this season.

Size of Fish Trapped. Coho trapped at WCW ranged from 33 to 87 cm FL and averaged 63.3 cm FL (Figure 11, Appendix 6). The size separating grilse and adult coho was based on the combined length data from coho trapped at WCW and that entered TRH (Figure 11). This year all coho $\leq 53 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were considered grilse. Grilse coho comprised 15.0 and $9.8 \%$ of the coho trapped at WCW and TRH respectively.

Effectively Tagged Fish. Of the 1,009 coho salmon trapped at WCW, 976 were effectively tagged (Appendix 6). To discourage anglers from harvesting coho, all coho received nonreward tags.

Incidence of Tags and Fin Clips. Seventy seven percent $(774 / 1,009)$ of the coho salmon we trapped at WCW (147 grilse and 627 adults) bore right maxillary (RM) clips (Appendix 6). Two hundred forty seven of the project tagged, RM-clipped coho, were recovered at TRH (Table 3).

Incidence of Gill-net Wounds, Hook Scars and Predator Wounds. Forty four (4.4\%) of the 1,009 coho observed at WCW had gill-net wounds. The average size of coho with gill-net wounds verses without gill-net wounds was 67.9 and 63.1 cm . FL respectively. Although subjective, crews at WCW noted 19 fresh hooking scars, 92 predator scars and 22 wounds of unknown origin on adult coho.

Table 4. Weekly summary of coho salmon trapped in the Trinity River at Willow Creek Weir during 2004. a/

| Julian |  |  |  | Nights |  | Trapp |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week | Inclus |  | ates | Trapped | Grilse b/ | Adults | Total | fish/night |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - | 16-Sep | 3 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 3.0 |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - | 23-Sep | 5 | 3 | 24 | 27 | 5.4 |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - | 30-Sep | 5 | 7 | 102 | 109 | 21.8 |
| 40 | 1-Oct | - | 7-Oct | 5 | 27 | 300 | 327 | 65.4 |
| 41 | 8-Oct | - | 14-Oct | 5 | 67 | 357 | 424 | 84.8 |
| 42 | 15-Oct | - | 21-Oct | 4 | 16 | 35 | 51 | 12.8 |
| 43 | 22-Oct | - | 28-Oct | 4 | 17 | 13 | 30 | 7.5 |
| 44 | 29-Oct | - | 4-Nov | 5 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 2.2 |
| 45 | 5-Nov | - | 11-Nov | 5 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 1.8 |
| 46 | 12-Nov | - | 18-Nov | 5 | 6 | 6 | 12 | 2.4 |
| 47 | 19-Nov | - | 25-Nov | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  |  |  |  | 48 | 151 | 858 | 1,009 | 18.8 |
| Mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from 14 September (Julian Week 37) through 22 November (Julian Week 47) of 2004.
b/ Coho salmon <54 cm, FL were considered grilse.


Figure 10. Average catch of coho salmon in the Trinity River at Willow Creek Weir during 2004.




Figure 11. Coho salmon fork lengths (FL) observed at the Willow Creek Weir and Trinity River Hatchery during the 2004-2005 season. The number of fish at each FL is shown as a moving average of five, 1-cm increments. The arrow denotes the size we used to separate grilse and adults for analysis.

## Fall Steelhead

Run Timing. We trapped steelhead all but the last week of trapping at WCW (Table 5, Figure 12). Peak trapping of steelhead occurred during JW 41 when 120 fish/night were trapped. One and a half percent of the steelhead trapped $(31 / 2,041)$ during the season was trapped during the first week, indicating that the trap was installed before the peak of the steelhead run arrived at WCW. We trapped 2,032 adult steelhead at WCW this season. At JCW, less than 6.0 fish/night were trapped throughout the season until JW 40, the last week of trapping, when 16.0 fish/night were trapped. We trapped 173 adult steelhead at JCW this season (Table 6, Figure 13).

Size of Fish Trapped. Steelhead caught at, JCW, WCW, and TRH averaged 57.8, 61.7 and 61.8 cm FL, respectively (Figure 14). Adult steelhead ( $>41 \mathrm{~cm}, \mathrm{FL}$ ) made up $98.3 \%$ and $99.6 \%$ of the steelhead trapped at JCW, WCW respectively.

Effectively Tagged Fish. We trapped 2,032 adult steelhead at WCW and 1,816 of those were effectively tagged (Appendix 7). We detected one tagging mortality, 37 fish were not tagged, and anglers reported removing tags from 178 caught and released fish. Eight hundred ninety two of the effectively tagged adults were reward-tagged, the remainder received non-reward tags. Steelhead were not tagged at JCW.

Incidence of Tags and Fin Clips. We observed Ad-clips on 1,538 (75.3 \%) of the steelhead at WCW, 154 ( $87.5 \%$ ) at JCW, and 5,688 (99.4\%) at TRH (Appendix 8). Additionally, seventeen steelhead at WCW had various other clips (2-adipose plus left maxillary; 5-adipose plus right maxillary; 2-left maxillary, and 8-right maxillary. All steelhead released from TRH have been Ad-clipped prior to release since brood year 1997.

Incidence of Gill-net Wounds, Hook Scars and Predator Wounds. At WCW, 27 of the steelhead trapped had gill-net wounds, 10 had fresh hook wounds, 37 had unknown wounds, and 248 had predator wounds. At JCW, 2 steelhead had gill-net wounds, 2 had wounds of unknown origin and four had predator wounds.

Table 5. Weekly summary of steelhead trapped in the Trinity River at Willow Creek Weir during 2004. a/

| Julian Week | Inclusive dates |  | Nights | Number Trapped |  |  | fish/night |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Trapped | $1 / 2$ lbers b/ | Adults | Total |  |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - 16-Sep | 3 | 0 | 31 | 31 | 10.3 |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - 23-Sep | 5 | 1 | 100 | 101 | 20.2 |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - 30-Sep | 5 | 2 | 371 | 373 | 74.6 |
| 40 | 1-Oct | - 7-Oct | 5 | 0 | 459 | 459 | 91.8 |
| 41 | 8-Oct | - 14-Oct | 5 | 1 | 599 | 600 | 120.0 |
| 42 | 15-Oct | - 21-Oct | 4 | 1 | 267 | 268 | 67.0 |
| 43 | 22-Oct | - 28-Oct | 4 | 3 | 160 | 163 | 40.8 |
| 44 | 29-Oct | - 4-Nov | 5 | 0 | 18 | 18 | 3.6 |
| 45 | $5-\mathrm{Nov}$ | - 11-Nov | 5 | 1 | 18 | 19 | 3.8 |
| 46 | 12-Nov | - 18-Nov | 5 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 1.8 |
| 47 | 19-Nov | - 25-Nov | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Total |  |  | 48 | 9 | 2,032 | 2,041 |  |
| Mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  | 39.4 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from 14 September (Julian Week 37) through 22 November (Julian Week 47) of 2004.
b/ Steelhead < 42 cm , FL were considered $1 / 2$ half-pounders.


Figure 12. Average catch of steelhead in the Trinity River at Willow Creek Weir during 2004.

Table 6. Weekly summary of steelhead trapped in the Trinity River at Junction City Weir during 2004. a/

| Julian |  |  |  | Nights | Num | Trappe |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week | Inclus | e | tes | Trapped | 1/2 lbers b/ | Adults | Total | fish/night |
| 29 | 16-Jul | - | 22-Jul | 2 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 5.5 |
| 30 | 23-Jul | - | 29-Jul | 5 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 4.0 |
| 31 | 30-Jul | - | 5-Aug | 5 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0.8 |
| 32 | 6-Aug | - | 12-Aug | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1.2 |
| 33 | 13-Aug | - | 19-Aug | 5 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1.2 |
| 34 | 20-Aug | - | 26-Aug | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 35 | 27-Aug | - | 2-Sep | high flows |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | 3-Sep | - | 9-Sep | no trapping |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - | 16-Sep | 2 | 1 | 10 | 11 | 5.5 |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - | 23-Sep | 5 | 0 | 20 | 20 | 4.0 |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - | 30-Sep | 5 | 1 | 17 | 18 | 3.6 |
| 40 | 1-Oct | - | 7-Oct | 5 | 1 | 79 | 80 | 16.0 |
| Total |  |  |  | 40 | 3 | 173 | 176 | 4.4 |
| Mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

a/ Trapping at Junction City took place from 21 July (Julian week 29) through 20 August (Julian week 34) and 15 September (Julian week 37) through 7 October (Julian week 40) of 2004. b/ Steelhead $<42 \mathrm{~cm}$, FL were considered $1 / 2$ half-pounders.


Figure 13. Average catch of steelhead in the Trinity River at Junction City Weir during 2004.





Figure 14. Fall-run steelhead fork lengths observed at Junction City and Willow Creek weirs, and Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during the 2004-05 season. The number of fish at each fork length is shown as a moving average of $5,1-\mathrm{cm}$ increments. The arrow denotes the size we used to separate half-pounders and adults for analysis. Steelhead less than or equal to 41 cm were not counted at TRH.

## Brown trout

Capture timing. Brown trout were captured every week of trapping at JCW during the 2004 season (Table 7, Figure 15). The peak weeks of brown trout capture were JW 29 and 30, when an average of 20.0 and 19.2 fish/night were trapped respectively.

Size of Fish Trapped. Brown trout captured this season ranged in size from 34 to 60 cm , FL and averaged 45.3 cm (Table 8, Figure 16). Average size by week of capture was variable. Length frequency analysis suggests that several year classes of brown trout were trapped at JCW in 2004. The absence of brown trout less than 34 cm FL suggests that fish this size are not vulnerable to capture using our standard weir configuration.

Effectively Tagged Fish. At JCW we trapped 256 brown trout, of which 233 were effectively tagged. Twelve brown trout were reported as caught and released by anglers. All of the brown trout at JCW were tagged with non-reward tags. Two brown trout were trapped at WCW and one was tagged with a reward tag.

## Recovery of Tagged Fish

Total Recoveries. Fish tagged at JCW and WCW were recovered from four different sources; at TRH, upper Trinity River spawner surveys, angler returns, and tagging mortalities found on or near the tagging weirs. Length frequencies of spring and fall Chinook, coho, and steelhead tagged at the weirs and subsequently recovered are presented in Appendices 9-12.

Forty-eight percent of the effectively tagged spring Chinook at JCW and $53 \%$ of the fall Chinook at WCW were recovered. Thirty seven percent of the effectively tagged coho, and $37 \%$ of the effectively tagged steelhead from WCW were recovered. The highest number of recoveries for all species occurred at TRH.

## Tag Returns by Anglers

Angler Harvest Regulations. Department of Fish and Game fishing regulations can affect the return of tags each year by limiting harvest. Special quota restrictions were in place during the season, but they did not effect harvest because the quotas were not met (Appendix 13). The adult fall Chinook salmon sport quota for the Trinity River during the 2004-05 season was 1,584 fish, split equally between the lower River (Weitchpec to Cedar Flat) and the upper River (Cedar Flat to Lewiston). Additionally, anglers were allowed to retain adipose-fin-clipped steelhead. The take of coho was prohibited.

Spring Chinook. Anglers returned 10 (4 reward and 6 non-reward) tags from harvested adult spring Chinook tagged at JCW. Anglers returned eleven ( 7 reward and 4 non-reward) tags from harvested grilse spring Chinook tagged at JCW this season (Appendix 9). We estimated harvest rate, based on the return of reward tags, at $8.0 \%$ for grilse and $4.9 \%$ for adults. Anglers

Table 7. Weekly summary of brown trout trapped in the Trinity River at Junction City Weir during 2004. a/

| Julian |  |  |  | Nights | Number Trapped |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Week | Inclusive dates |  |  | Trapped | Total | fish/night |
| 29 | 16-Jul | - | 22-Jul | 2 | 40 | 20.0 |
| 30 | 23-Jul | - | 29-Jul | 5 | 96 | 19.2 |
| 31 | 30-Jul | - | 5-Aug | 5 | 31 | 6.2 |
| 32 | 6-Aug | - | 12-Aug | 5 | 32 | 6.4 |
| 33 | 13-Aug | - | 19-Aug | 5 | 13 | 2.6 |
| 34 | 20-Aug | - | 26-Aug | 1 | 2 | 2.0 |
| 35 | 27-Aug | - | 2-Sep | high flows | 0 |  |
| 36 | 3-Sep | - | 9-Sep | no trapping | 0 |  |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - | 16-Sep | 2 | 3 |  |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - | 23-Sep | 5 | 8 | 1.6 |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - | 30-Sep | 5 | 6 | 1.2 |
| 40 | 1-Oct | - | 7-Oct | 5 | 25 | 5.0 |
| Total |  |  |  | 40 | 256 |  |
| Mean: |  |  |  |  |  | 6.4 |

a/ Trapping at Junction City took place from 21 July (Julian week 29) through 20 August (Julian week 34) and 15 September (Julian week 37) through 7 October (Julian week 40) of 2004.


Figure 15. Average catch of brown trout in the Trinity River at Junction City Weir during 2004.

|  | Julian week of capture |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 |  |
| Fork length | Number of trapping days |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (cm) | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  |
| 34 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 35 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |
| 36 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 4 |
| 37 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 5 |
| 38 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 6 |
| 39 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| 40 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 14 |
| 41 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 15 |
| 42 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| 43 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 16 |
| 44 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 24 |
| 45 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 |
| 46 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 22 |
| 47 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 22 |
| 48 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 2 | 16 |
| 49 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 16 |
| 50 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 | 10 |
| 51 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 11 |
| 52 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4 |
| 53 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7 |
| 54 | 1 | 7 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 8 |
| 55 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 5 |
| 56 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |
| 57 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 2 |
| 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 62 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Totals: | 40 | 96 | 31 | 32 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 25 | 256 |
| Mean FL: | 45.4 | 46.8 | 45.6 | 42.3 | 42.7 | 41.5 | 44.7 | 44.5 | 42.8 | 45.3 | 45.3 |



Figure 16. Fork length distribution of brown trout captured in the Trinity River at the Junction City weir during 2004.
reported releasing three reward-tagged adults and one non-reward-tagged grilse. The catch and release rates for adults was estimated from reward tags alone at $3.6 \%$, and the catch and release rate for grilse was estimated by averaging returns from reward and non-reward tags at $0.4 \%$.

Fall Chinook. Anglers returned tags from 10 grilse ( 7 reward and 3 non-reward tags) and 25 ( 9 reward, 16 non-reward) adult harvested fall Chinook salmon tagged at WCW. Based on the return of reward tags, the estimated harvest rate of fall Chinook upstream of WCW was $1.6 \%$ for adults and $6.3 \%$ for grilse. Anglers reported catch and releasing 10 ( 5 reward and 5 nonreward) adult fall Chinook tagged at WCW this season. Anglers reported catch and releasing an additional 5 ( 2 reward and 3 non-reward) grilse fall Chinook tagged at WCW (Appendix 10). Catch and release rates for fall Chinook upstream of the WCW were estimated using reward tags only at $0.9 \%$ for adults and $1.8 \%$ for grilse.

Coho Salmon. To discourage the harvest of threatened coho salmon, all coho tagged at WCW received non-reward tags. One tag was returned from a harvested adult coho. Two tagged coho salmon (one adult and one grilse) were reported as caught and released by anglers during the season (Appendix 11). Catch and release rates for coho salmon above the WCW were estimated at $0.7 \%$ for grilse and $0.1 \%$ for adults.

Fall Steelhead. Anglers returned 34 tags ( 21 reward and 13 non-reward) from steelhead tagged at WCW. Based on the reward tags returned, we estimated that anglers harvested $2.4 \%$ of the steelhead migrating upstream of WCW. Two of the 21 reward tags returned by anglers were from unmarked steelhead. Anglers returned 178 tags from steelhead reported as caught and released (Appendix 12). Based on the return of reward tags, we estimated that anglers caught and released $10.3 \%$ of the steelhead migrating upstream of the WCW.

## Spawner Surveys

A total of 20 adults and 3 grilse spring Chinook tagged at JCW were subsequently recovered during main-steam spawner surveys (Appendix 9) between TRH and Cedar Flat. Eleven grilse and 100 adult fall Chinook tagged at WCW were recovered during the spawner surveys (Appendix 10). Six grilse and 71 adult coho salmon tagged at WCW were subsequently recovered during the spawner surveys this year (Appendix 11). Coho spawning in the Trinity River (December through February) typically peaks after the cessation of the main-steam spawner surveys, therefore it is likely that the time frame of the spawner surveys (October through December) inhibited full recovery of coho salmon. Six steelhead tagged at WCW were recovered as carcasses during spawner surveys this season (Appendix 12). For additional information on the 2004 spawner survey please refer to Task 4 of this report.

## Trinity River Hatchery

Operation Dates. The fish ladder and trapping facility at TRH operated from September $3^{\text {rd }}$, 2004 (JW 36) through March $15^{\text {th }}, 2005$ (JW 11). The ladder and trap were closed for a two week period from October $12^{\text {th }}$ through October $25^{\text {th }}$ (part of JW 41, all of JW 42 and part of

JW 43). The closure was implemented to allow for separation of the spring and fall runs of Chinook. The ladder is also occasionally closed at the discretion of the hatchery manager for fish health concerns or labor constraints.

Based on CWT analysis JW 41 had considerable representation of both spring and fall Chinook. During JW 41 five hundred and thirty three Chinook entered TRH of which 44 and 63 bore spring and fall CWT's respectively. Therefore, based on proportions of known race CWT's that entered TRH during JW 41 two hundred and nineteen were classified as spring Chinook and 314 were classified as fall Chinook.

Spring Chinook. Based on CWT recoveries, spring Chinook began entering TRH during JW 36 and continued through JW 43 (Figure 17, Table 9). Based upon CWT expansion, we estimated that 5,775 spring Chinook entered TRH (Figure 17). For the purpose of analysis, the 219 spring Chinook which entered TRH during JW 41 were added to the 6,017 Chinook which entered TRH prior to JW 41 for a total of 6,236 spring Chinook.

We recaptured $38.5 \%(196 / 509)$ of effectively tagged spring Chinook from JCW at TRH. The mean FL for effectively tagged JCW Chinook was 59.7 cm , slightly larger than tagged spring Chinook recovered at TRH, which averaged 58.9 cm (Table 10, Appendix 4).

We recovered 1,451 Ad-clipped spring Chinook at TRH, from which we recovered 1,385 CWTs (Table 9). The age structure of TRH spring Chinook based on CWT's was composed of a two ( $15 \%$ ), three ( $35 \%$ ), four ( $49 \%$ ) and five ( $1 \%$ ) year old returns (See Task 2 of this report).

Fall Chinook. Based on the recovery of CWTs, the first fall Chinook entered TRH during JW 37 of 2004 (Table 11). The run peaked during JW 45 when 4,320 Chinook salmon entered the facility, decreasing thereafter until the last Chinook entered during JW 52 (Figure 17, Table 10). Based on CWT expansions, we estimated that 12,799 fall Chinook entered TRH (Figure 17). For the purpose of estimating fall Chinook run-size, the 314 fall Chinook that entered TRH during JW 41 were added to the 13,129 Chinook which entered after JW 41 for a total of 13,443 fall Chinook.

Hatchery recovery of fall Chinook tagged at WCW consisted of 100 grilse and 844 adults. This total represented $45.5 \%(944 / 2,075)$ of those effectively tagged at WCW. The mean FL of effectively tagged Chinook at WCW was similar to WCW-tagged fall Chinook that subsequently entered TRH; 64.7 cm and 65.0 cm , respectively (Table 10, Appendix 5).

We recovered 3,263 Ad-clipped fall Chinook at TRH, from which we recovered 3,128 CWTs (Table 11). The age structure of TRH fall Chinook based on CWT's was composed of a two ( $8 \%$ ), three ( $78 \%$ ), four ( $13 \%$ ) and five ( $1 \%$ ) year old returns (See Task 2 of this report).


Figure 17. Estimated numbers of spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon that entered Trinity River Hatchery during the 2004-05 season, based on expansion of coded-wire tagged fish.

Table 9. Recoveries at Trinity River Hatchery of coded-wire tagged, spring-run Chinook salmon during the 2004-05 season. al

| Coded-wire tag number and release type cl | Brood <br> year | Julian week of entry b/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | $42 \mathrm{~d} /$ | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 |  |
| 065251-f | 1999 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 065252-f | 1999 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 065258-y | 1999 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| 065260-f | 2000 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 |
| 065261-f | 2000 | 10 | 4 | 15 | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |
| 065262-f | 2000 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| 065263-f | 2000 | 11 | 6 | 13 | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 |
| 065264-f | 2000 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 28 |
| 065269-f | 2000 | 14 | 8 | 19 | 17 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65 |
| 065270-f | 2000 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 24 | 17 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 58 |
| 065279-y | 2000 | 96 | 54 | 97 | 113 | 35 | 14 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 411 |
| 065281-f | 2001 | 11 | 7 | 24 | 9 | 9 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 62 |
| 065282-f | 2001 | 13 | 2 | 10 | 13 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| 065283-f | 2001 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 14 | 7 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 37 |
| 065288-y | 2001 | 72 | 51 | 60 | 89 | 61 | 14 |  |  |  |  |  | 347 |
| 065295-f | 2002 | 12 | 13 | 18 | 16 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 74 |
| 065296-f | 2002 | 2 | 12 | 9 | 17 | 15 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 57 |
| 065297-f | 2002 | 2 | 3 | 14 | 21 | 16 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 59 |
| 065308-y | 2002 |  | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| No CWT el |  | 9 | 11 | 14 | 17 | 12 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 66 |
| Weekly totals: |  | 279 | 196 | 326 | 381 | 219 | 47 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Grand Total: |  |  |  | 1,451 |

a/ The fish ladder was open from September 4, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian weeks 36-11).
b/ Entry week was the week that fish were initally sorted, although they may have actually entered the hatchery during the previous sorting week.
c/ Release types are either fingerling (f) or yearling (y).
d/ The hatchery was closed to fish entry this week.
e/ No CWT's were recovered from these Ad-clipped fish. Chinook salmon with shed or lost tags recovered after October 21,2004 (JW 42) were considered fall-run and are shown on Table 11.

Table 10. Total number and numbers of Project-tagged Chinook and coho salmon that entered Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during the 2004-05 season.a/

| Julian Week of entry c/ | Inclusive Dates |  |  | Numbers of Chinook salmon |  |  |  |  | Numbers of coho salmon |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total entering |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { from } \\ & \text { eb/ } \end{aligned}$ | Fall-run from tagging site $\mathrm{b} /$ |  | Total entering | From tagging site |
|  |  |  |  | TRH d/ | WCW | JCW | WCW | JCW | TRH d/ | WCW |
| 36 | 3-Sep | - | 9-Sep | 446 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - | 16-Sep | 710 |  | 30 |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - | 23-Sep | 1,839 |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - | 30-Sep | 1,640 |  | 63 |  | 2 |  |  |
| 40 | 1-Oct | - | 7-Oct | 1,386 |  | 43 | 2 | 8 | 11 |  |
| 41 | 8-Oct | - | 14-Oct | 529 |  | 8 | 2 | 22 | 40 | 2 |
| 42 | 15-Oct | - | 21-Oct | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 43 | 22-Oct | - | 28-Oct | 2,164 |  | 2 | 240 | 49 | 947 | 9 |
| 44 | 29-Oct | - | 4-Nov | 2,650 |  |  | 240 | 11 | 1,228 | 38 |
| 45 | 5-Nov | - | 11-Nov | 4,320 |  |  | 242 | 6 | 2,020 | 60 |
| 46 | 12-Nov | - | 18-Nov | 2,491 |  |  | 146 | 1 | 3,631 | 102 |
| 47 | 19-Nov | - | 25-Nov | 903 |  |  | 49 |  | 1,188 | 29 |
| 48 | 26-Nov | - | 2-Dec | 434 |  |  | 15 |  | 1,073 | 25 |
| 49 | 3-Dec | - | 9-Dec | 92 |  |  | 5 |  | 278 | 5 |
| 50 | 10-Dec | - | 16-Dec | 53 |  |  | 1 |  | 434 | 5 |
| 51 | 17-Dec | - | 23-Dec | 20 |  |  | 2 |  | 50 |  |
| 52 | 24-Dec | - | 31-Dec | 2 |  |  |  |  | 77 |  |
| 1 | 1-Jan | - | 7-Jan |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |
| 2 | 8-Jan | - | 14-Jan |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 3 | 15-Jan | - | 21-Jan |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
| 4 | 22-Jan | - | 28-Jan |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 5 | 29-Jan | - | 4-Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 5-Feb | - | 11-Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 12-Feb |  | 18-Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 19-Feb | - | 25-Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: |  |  |  | 19,679 | 0 | 198 | 944 | 99 | 10,983 | 275 |

a/ The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15,2005 (Julian Week 36-11)
b/ Tagging site: WCW= Willow Creek Weir; JCW= Junction City Weir.
c/ Entry week was the week that fish were initally sorted, although they may have actually entered the hatchery during the previous sorting week.
d/ Numbers shown include tagged fish recovered the same week.

Table 11. Recoveries at Trinity River Hatchery of fall-run Chinook salmon with coded wire tags indicating origin at Trinity River Hatchery during the 2004-05 season.

| Coded-wire tag number and | Brood year | Julian week of entry $\mathrm{a} /$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| release type c/ |  | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | $42 \mathrm{~d} /$ | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 |  |
| 065254-f | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 065255-f | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 065256-f | 1999 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 065257-f | 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 065259-y | 1999 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 4 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| 065265-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 065266-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 065267-f | 2000 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 065268-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 065271-f | 2000 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 13 |
| 065272-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 065273-f | 2000 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 9 |
| 065274-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 065275-f | 2000 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 065276-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 065277-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |
| 065278-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 065643-f | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 065280-y | 2000 |  | 1 | 3 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 111 | 103 | 62 | 12 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 327 |
| 065284-f | 2001 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 12 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| 065285-f | 2001 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 33 |
| 065286-f | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 | 13 | 14 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 41 |
| 065287-f | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 | 11 | 9 | 5 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| 065290-f | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 065291-f | 2001 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 065289-y | 2001 |  |  | 5 | 9 | 21 | 0 | 407 | 454 | 612 | 483 | 184 | 93 | 21 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2,303 |
| 065298-f | 2002 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 27 | 17 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 63 |
| 065299-f | 2002 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 12 | 12 | 7 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 54 |
| 065306-f | 2002 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 14 | 16 | 12 | 10 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 54 |
| 065307-f | 2002 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 11 | 9 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 35 |
| 065309-y | 2002 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 36 |
| No CWT e/ |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 26 | 30 | 39 | 19 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 135 |
|  | Weekly totals: | 2 | 3 | 10 | 28 | 63 | 0 | 693 | 719 | 830 | 560 | 209 | 108 | 22 | 10 | 5 | 1 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Gra | Tota |  | 3,263 |

[^1]e/ No CWT's were recovered from these Ad-clipped fish. Chinook salmon with shed or lost tags recovered prior to October 7,2004 (JW 40 ) were considered spring-run and are shown on Table 9.

Coho Salmon. The first coho entered TRH during JW 40, 2004. The coho run peaked during JW 46 and the last coho entered TRH during JW 4, 2005 (Table 12). We recovered 10,983 coho ( 1,077 grilse and 9,906 adults) at TRH. We recovered 275 WCW-tagged coho ( 21 grilse and 254 adults) at TRH ( $28.2 \%$ of those effectively tagged). The mean FL of effectively tagged coho at WCW was 63.3 cm and the mean FL of WCW-tagged coho recovered at TRH was 65.6 cm (Appendix 6). Coho were not tagged at JCW this year.

Of the 10,983 coho recovered at TRH, 9,896 ( $90.1 \%$ ) were observed to have right maxillary (RM) clips, indicating they were of TRH origin. One thousand seventy one (9.8\%) had no clips. These fish are believed to be naturally produced coho which entered the hatchery or coho which received no or poor clips prior to release from the hatchery. Sixteen other marks were observed on coho which entered TRH this year, including two LM (left maxillary), seven ADRM (Adipose + right maxillary), and seven RMLM (right and left maxillary) clips (Table 12).

Based on length frequency analysis, we apportioned TRH-produced, RM-clipped coho, into two brood years. Coho $\leq 53 \mathrm{~cm}$, FL were considered grilse (age 2) from the 2002 brood year and accounted for $10.8 \%(1,068 / 9,896)$ of the total, the remaining 8,828 were considered adults (age 3), progeny of the 2001 brood year. The 1,071 unmarked coho which entered the hatchery were also considered grilse or adults based on their length (Appendix 14).

Fall Steelhead. Appreciable numbers of steelhead did not enter the hatchery until late October (Table 13). A total of 5,725 adult steelhead ( $>41 \mathrm{~cm}, \mathrm{FL}$ ) entered TRH during the season. A total of 523 steelhead, tagged at WCW, ( $28.8 \%$ of those effectively tagged) also entered TRH this season (Appendix 7). The mean fork length of recovered WCW tagged steelhead at TRH and effectively tagged adult steelhead at WCW were both 61.9 cm .

Ad-clipped adults composed $99.4 \%(5,688 / 5,725)$ of the steelhead that entered TRH this season (Appendix 8). Beginning with the 1997 brood year, all steelhead released from TRH have been Adclipped prior to their release.

Table 12. Recovery of coho salmon that returned to Trinity River Hatchery during the $2004-05$ season. al

Brood year and clip bl

| Julian Week of entry Cl | Inclusive Dates |  | 2001 |  |  |  |  | 2002 |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Noclip | RM | LM | ADRM | RMLM | Noclip | RM |  |
| 40 | 1-Oct | 7-0ct | 1 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| 41 | 8-Oct | 14.0ct | 2 | 37 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 40 |
| 42 | 15-0ct | 21-0ct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 43 | 22-Oct | 28-0ct | 48 | 776 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 120 | 947 |
| 44 | 29-0ct | 4-Nov | 47 | 1,026 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 151 | 1,228 |
| 45 | 5-Nov | 11-Nov | 162 | 1,682 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 169 | 2,020 |
| 46 | 12-Nov | 18-Nov | 350 | 3,073 |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 202 | 3,631 |
| 47 | 19-Nov | 25-Nov | 118 | 936 |  | 1 |  |  | 133 | 1,188 |
| 48 | 26-Nov | 2-Dec | 160 | 741 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 169 | 1,073 |
| 49 | 3 -Dec | $9-$ Dec | 43 | 186 |  |  |  |  | 49 | 278 |
| 50 | 10-Dec | 16-Dec | 108 | 277 |  |  |  | 1 | 48 | 434 |
| 51 | 17-Dec | 23-Dec | 3 | 35 |  |  |  |  | 12 | 50 |
| 52 | 24-Dec | 31-Dec | 18 | 45 |  |  |  |  | 14 | 77 |
| 1 | 1-Jan | 7-Jan | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 2 | 8-Jan | 14-Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 3 | 15-Jan | 21-Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 4 | 22-Jan | 28-Jan |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  | 1,062 | 8,828 | 2 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 1,068 | 10,983 |

al The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15,2005 (Julian weeks 36-11).
b/ Brood year determinations were estimated using lenght frequency analyss; coho less than or equal to 53 cm , fl were considered to be from the 2002 brood year, larger coho from the 2001 brood year. RM=right maxillay;; LM=eet maxillary; ADPM=adipose and right maxillary; RMLM=right and let maxillay.
cl Entry week was the week the fish were initially sorted, although they may have actually entered the hatchery during the previous week.

Table 13. Total number and numbers of Project-tagged steelhead that entered Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during the 2004-2005 season. a/

| Julian Week of entry c | Inclusive Dates |  | Number entering TRH d/ Adults | Recoveries from tagging site $\mathrm{b} /$ WCW |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36 | 3-Sep | - 9-Sep | 10 |  |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - 16-Sep | 5 |  |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - 23-Sep | 1 |  |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - 30-Sep | 0 |  |
| 40 | 1-Oct | - 7-Oct | 7 |  |
| 41 | 8-Oct | - 14-Oct | 2 |  |
| 42 | 15-Oct | - 21-Oct |  |  |
| 43 | 22-Oct | - 28-Oct | 116 | 5 |
| 44 | 29-Oct | - 4-Nov | 40 | 2 |
| 45 | 5-Nov | - 11-Nov | 75 | 3 |
| 46 | 12-Nov | - 18-Nov | 197 | 16 |
| 47 | 19-Nov | - 25-Nov | 131 | 9 |
| 48 | 26-Nov | - 2-Dec | 119 | 7 |
| 49 | 3-Dec | - 9-Dec | 40 | 5 |
| 50 | 10-Dec | - 16-Dec | 565 | 51 |
| 51 | 17-Dec | - 23-Dec | 262 | 28 |
| 52 | 24-Dec | - 31-Dec | 404 | 38 |
| 1 | 1-Jan | - 7-Jan | 552 | 62 |
| 2 | 8-Jan | - 14-Jan | 459 | 55 |
| 3 | 15-Jan | - 21-Jan | 477 | 37 |
| 4 | 22-Jan | - 28-Jan | 542 | 56 |
| 5 | 29-Jan | - 4-Feb | 551 | 39 |
| 6 | 5-Feb | - 11-Feb | 376 | 36 |
| 7 | 12-Feb | - 18-Feb | 274 | 28 |
| 8 | 19-Feb | - 25-Feb | 257 | 25 |
| 9 | 26-Feb | - 4-Mar | 181 | 14 |
| 10 | 5-Mar | - 11-Mar | 63 | 6 |
| 11 | 12-Mar | - 18-Mar | 19 | 1 |
|  |  | Totals: | 5,725 | 523 |

a/ The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian weeks 36-11).
b/ Tagging site: WCW = Willow Creek Weir
c/ Entry week was the week the fish were initially sorted, although they may have actually entered the hatchery during the previous sorting week.
d/ Steelhead less than or equal to 41 cm FL are considered sub-adults and are not counted at TRH.

We tagged and recovered too few grilse salmon (spring and fall Chinook and coho) to generate independent estimates for adults and grilse. Therefore, we combined the numbers of adults and grilse tagged and recovered for calculating the population estimate. We stratified the estimate based on the ratio of adults and grilse observed WCW for fall Chinook, coho and steelhead. For spring Chinook we stratified the estimate based on the ratio of adults and grilse observed at JCW and TRH combined.

## Spring Chinook Salmon

We estimated 16,147 ( 13,218 adults and 2,929 grilse) spring Chinook migrated into the Trinity River basin upstream of JCW. Based on the Poisson Approximation, the $95 \%$ confidence interval for the run-size estimate was $14,085-18,635$ spring Chinook salmon (Table 14). We estimated that the spawning escapement above JCW was 12,565 adult fish, including 5,251 adult spring Chinook that entered TRH (Table 15). This year's run-size estimate is $15 \%$ below the 24 year average spring Chinook run-size of 18,903 . Estimated spring Chinook run-size has ranged from 2,381 fish in 1991 to 62,692 fish in 1988 (Appendix 15). Anglers caught and kept an estimated $653(4.9 \%)$ of the adults from the spring run. Additionally, anglers caught and harvested an estimated 236 ( $8.0 \%$ ) of the grilse from the spring run (Table 15).

## Fall Chinook Salmon

We estimated that 29,534 (24,310 adults and 5,224 grilse) fall Chinook migrated into the Trinity River basin upstream of WCW. Based on the Normal Approximation, the $95 \%$ confidence interval for the fall Chinook run-size estimate upstream of WCW was 27,74731,379 (Table 14). We estimated the Trinity River fall Chinook spawner escapement, upstream of WCW, was 23,929 adult fish, including 12,384 adult fall Chinook that entered TRH (Table 15). We estimated that anglers harvested 327 (6.3\%) grilse and 381 ( $1.6 \%$ ) adult fall Chinook. The estimated total fall Chinook run-size, upstream of WCW, has ranged from 9,207 fish in 1991 to 147,888 fish in 1986 (Appendix 16). This year's fall Chinook estimated run-size of 29,534 fish is $32 \%$ less than the mean fall Chinook run-size since 1977 of 43,297 fish.

## Coho Salmon

We estimated 38,882 ( 33,063 adults and 5,819 grilse) coho migrated upstream of WCW. Based on the Poisson Approximation, the $95 \%$ confidence interval for the coho run-size estimate upstream of WCW was $34,646-43,881$ fish (Table 14). The spawning escapement estimate for coho upstream of WCW this year was 33,023 adult fish, 9,906 of which entered TRH (Table 15). Estimated coho salmon run-size, upstream of WCW, has ranged from 59,079 fish in 1987 to 852 fish in 1994 (Appendix 17). The mean run-size since 1977 is 17,778 fish. This year's coho estimate was 1.2 times larger than the long term average. We estimate that anglers caught and harvested $40(0.12 \%)$ adult and zero grilse coho salmon migrating upstream of WCW (Table 15).

Table 14. Run-size estimates and confidence limits for Trinity River basin spring and fall-run Chinook and coho salmon, and adult fall-run steelhead during the 2004-2005 season.

| Species/race | Area of Trinity River basin for run size estimate | Stratum a/ | Trinity River Hatchery recoveries |  |  | Run-size estimate d/ | Confidence limits$1-p=0.95$ | Confidence limit estimator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Number effectively tagged b/ | Number examined for tags c/ | Number of tags in sample |  |  |  |
| Chinook | Upstream of | Grilse | 238 | 985 | 92 |  |  |  |
|  | Junction City Weir | Adults | 271 | 5,251 | 104 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total | 509 | 6,236 | 196 | 16,147 | 14,085-18,635 | Poisson Approximation |
| Fall-run | Upstream of | Grilse | 363 | 1,059 | 100 |  |  |  |
| Chinook | Willow Creek Weir | Adults | 1,712 | 12,384 | 844 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total | 2,075 | 13,443 | 944 | 29,534 | 27,747-31,379 | Normal Approximation |
| Coho | Upstream of | Grilse | 147 | 1,077 | 21 |  |  |  |
|  | Willow Creek Weir | Adults | 829 | 9,906 | 254 |  |  |  |
|  |  | Total | 976 | 10,983 | 275 | 38,882 | 34,646-43,881 | Poisson Approximation |
| Fall-run steelhead | Upstream of Willow Creek Weir | Adults | 1,816 | 5,725 | 523 | 19,855 | 18,269-21,511 | Normal Approximation |

a/ Stratum: Grilse = two year old salmon, Adults = three years old or older, Steelhead adults were fish greater than 41 cm FL.
b/ The number of effectively tagged fish was corrected for tagging mortalities, fish not tagged and fish which had their tags removed (caught and released).
c/ Numbers of spring and fall-run Chinook were estimated from expansion of coded-wire-tag recoveries at Trinity River Hatchery, coho and steelhead numbers were actual recoveries.
d/ Estimates for grilse and adult spring-run Chinook salmon were based on proportioning the total run size by the ratio of grilse to adults observed at Junction City Weir and Trinity River Hatchery combined. Estimates for grilse and adult fall-run Chinook and coho salmon were based on proportioning the total run size by the ratio of grilse to adults observed at the Willow Creek Weir.

Table 15. Estimates of Trinity River basin spring and fall-run Chinook and coho salmon, and adult fall-run steelhead run size, angler harvest, and spawner escapements during the 2004-2005 season.

| Species/ race | Area of Trinity River basin for run size estimate | Stratum a/ | Run-size estimate | Angler Harvest |  | Spawner Escapement |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Harvest rate b/ | Number of fish cl | Natural d/ | Trinity River Hatchery | Total |
| Spring-run | Upstream of | Grilse | 2,929 | 0.080 | 236 | 1,708 | 985 | 2,693 |
| Chinook | Junction City Weir | Adults | 13,218 | 0.049 | 653 | 7,314 | 5,251 | 12,565 |
|  |  | Total | 16,147 |  | 888 | 9,022 | 6,236 | 15,258 |
| Fall-run | Upstream of | Grilse | 5,224 | 0.063 | 327 | 3,839 | 1,059 | 4,898 |
| Chinook | Willow Creek Weir | Adults | 24,310 | 0.016 | 381 | 11,545 | 12,384 | 23,929 |
|  |  | Total | 29,534 |  | 708 | 15,383 | 13,443 | 28,826 |
| Coho | Upstream of | Grilse | 5,819 | 0 | 0 | 4,742 | 1,077 | 5,819 |
|  | Willow Creek Weir | Adults | 33,063 | 0.001 | 40 | 23,117 | 9,906 | 33,023 |
|  |  | Total | 38,882 |  | 40 | 27,859 | 10,983 | 38,842 |
| Fall-run adult | Upstream of | Natural | 4,817 | 0.010 | 48 | 4,732 | 37 | 4,769 |
| steelhead | Willow Creek Weir | Hatchery | 15,038 | 0.027 | 413 | 8,937 | 5,688 | 14,625 |
|  |  | Total | 19,855 |  | 461 | 13,669 | 5,725 | 19,394 |

a/ Stratum: Grilse = two year old salmon, Adults = three years old or older, Steelhead adults were fish greater than 41 cm FL .
b/ Harvest rates were based on the return of reward tags, except for coho, which were based on return of non-reward tags.
c/ Calculated as the run size times the harvest rate.
d/ Calculated as run size minus angler harvest minus hatchery escapement.
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## Adult Fall Steelhead

We estimated 19,855 adult fall-run steelhead migrated upstream of WCW this season. The $95 \%$ confidence interval for our estimate, based on the Normal Approximation, was 18,26921,511 adult steelhead (Table 14). The adult steelhead spawning escapement was composed of 4,769 naturally produced fish and 14,625 steelhead of TRH origin. We estimate anglers harvested 48 wild and 413 TRH-produced steelhead (Table 15).

Intermittent fall steelhead run-size estimates made since 1980 have ranged from 37,276 in 1989 to 2,972 in 1998 (Appendix 18). Mean run-size for fall adult steelhead, for years in which we have estimates, is 11,454 fish. This years run-size estimate, the fourth highest on record, of 19,855 adult fall-run steelhead is $72 \%$ higher than the historical average.

## DISCUSSION

Both runs of Chinook that we monitor, spring and fall, were estimated to have had run-sizes below the long term averages this season. The coho salmon and steelhead run-sizes were estimated to have been above the historical averages. Although the Chinook runs were below average this year all of these runs have experienced fairly good returns since 1995 (Appendices 15-18), with the exception of fall Chinook in 2002, which fell victim to the large adult fish kill in the lower Klamath River.

The "fall fishery" flows released this season interrupted our trapping operations at JCW and prevented an earlier installation at WCW. It is unknown how these breaks in our trapping duration may have biased our estimates. We also noticed a slightly earlier arrival time for fall Chinook at JCW and TRH which suggests that the fall fishery flows did induce fall Chinook to migrate upstream out of the lower Klamath River. The consequence of this action is still not fully understood. Historically spring and fall Chinook spawning was spatially separated. Spatial separation no longer exists due to the construction of Lewiston and Trinity Dams. We are concerned that earlier run-timing for fall Chinook may cause a temporal overlap between spawning spring and fall Chinook salmon, both at TRH and in the wild. This racial mixing may lead to genetic changes in both populations that could result in intermediate life history traits such as run and spawn timing that will lead to greater difficulty in maintaining two distinct races of Chinook salmon.

Due to late installation of both weirs we did not capture the beginning of the spring run at the JCW or the beginning of the fall run at the WCW. At the current JCW location we are unable to trap prior to late June or early July when flows recede below 800cfs. Historically, we fished JCW beginning in May and observed peak numbers of spring Chinook in late May and early June. However, in these years spring flow releases from Lewiston Dam were much lower than under the current flow schedule. If a change in our trapping effectiveness (percentage of the run trapped) has occurred, a bias to our estimates may result. We investigated how a change in trapping duration and coincident lowered number of fish trapped may influence our run-size estimates. We calculated run-size estimates for six years where we had data from trapping in May and June through September and compared these data to recalculated estimates excluding
the number of spring Chinook trapped in May and June. The partial season estimates were not significantly different from the whole season estimates (Sinnen and Knechtle 2004), although the recalculated estimates did produce a small positive bias. This assumes that the fish's migration timing is independent of the two flow regimes. Ongoing research in the basin may aid in our understanding of adult fish migration timing and the influence of various flow regimes.

Unaccounted tagging mortality creates a positive bias in all mark-recapture studies (Hankin 2001). We attempt to account for tagging mortalities through recovery of tagged fish found dead at the weirs or in carcass surveys, although we can not be sure that all tagging mortalities are accounted for. Most of our tagging mortalities from WCW are observed during the early part of the season when water temperatures are high (near $22^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ). We believe that tagging mortality is not a constant rate and is a function of water temperature. This postulation leads to difficulty in applying a potential tagging mortality rate for the season. Hankin (2001) concluded that tagging mortality could substantially positively bias our estimates. Using Hankin's example: if $90 \%$ of untagged fish passing WCW survive to arrive at TRH (assuming that they are otherwise programmed to arrive at that destination), but only $75 \%$ of WCWtagged fish survive to arrive at TRH, then the approximate positive proportional bias would be almost $30 \%$. We have attempted to partially address this concern through our tagging protocols at the weirs. Fish are not tagged if deemed in poor condition, if they have already spawned, or if water temperatures exceed $21^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Tagging and recapture operations for adult spring and fall Chinook and coho salmon, and adult fall steelhead in the Trinity River basin should be continued during the migration season, using the capture sites near Willow Creek and Junction City.
2. An alternate weir site for the Junction City area should be investigated. The current site does not allow for trapping at flows that exceed approximately 800 cfs. Current releases from Lewiston Dam do not subside to this level until late mid July which is after spring Chinook have already begun migrating to the upper Trinity basin. Ideally, we should commence trapping in mid to late May.
3. Continue to trap five (instead of four) nights-per-week with mid-day weir openings at the weirs. Preliminary data indicates that our trapping efficiency has increased using the five-day schedule, while reducing numbers of fish "stacking up" downstream of the weir.
4. Conduct snorkel surveys upstream of the weirs for several miles to recover any tagging mortalities.
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Appendix 1. List of Julian weeks and their calendar date equivalents.

| Julian Week | Inclusive dates |  |  | Julian Week | Inclusive dates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1-Jan | - | 7-Jan | 27 | 2-Jul | - | 8-Jul |
| 2 | 8-Jan | - | 14-Jan | 28 | 9-Jul | - | 15-Jul |
| 3 | 15-Jan | - | 21-Jan | 29 | 16-Jul | - | 22-Jul |
| 4 | 22-Jan | - | 28-Jan | 30 | 23-Jul | - | 29-Jul |
| 5 | 29-Jan | - | 4-Feb | 31 | 30-Jul | - | 5-Aug |
| 6 | 5-Feb | - | 11-Feb | 32 | 6-Aug | - | 12-Aug |
| 7 | 12-Feb | - | 18-Feb | 33 | 13-Aug | - | 19-Aug |
| 8 | 19-Feb | - | 25-Feb | 34 | 20-Aug | - | 26-Aug |
| 9/a | 26-Feb | - | 4-Mar | 35 | 27-Aug | - | 2-Sep |
| 10 | 5-Mar | - | 11-Mar | 36 | 3-Sep | - | 9-Sep |
| 11 | 12-Mar | - | 18-Mar | 37 | 10-Sep | - | 16-Sep |
| 12 | 19-Mar | - | 25-Mar | 38 | 17-Sep | - | 23-Sep |
| 13 | 26-Mar | - | 1-Apr | 39 | 24-Sep | - | 30-Sep |
| 14 | 2-Apr | - | 8-Apr | 40 | 1-Oct | - | 7-Oct |
| 15 | 9-Apr | - | 15-Apr | 41 | 8-Oct | - | 14-Oct |
| 16 | 16-Apr | - | 22-Apr | 42 | 15-Oct | - | 21-Oct |
| 17 | 23-Apr | - | 29-Apr | 43 | 22-Oct | - | 28-Oct |
| 18 | 30-Apr | - | 6-May | 44 | 29-Oct | - | 4-Nov |
| 19 | 7-May | - | 13-May | 45 | 5-Nov | - | 11-Nov |
| 20 | 14-May | - | 20-May | 46 | 12-Nov | - | 18-Nov |
| 21 | 21-May | - | 27-May | 47 | 19-Nov | - | 25-Nov |
| 22 | 28-May | - | 3-Jun | 48 | 26-Nov | - | 2-Dec |
| 23 | 4-Jun | - | 10-Jun | 49 | 3-Dec | - | 9-Dec |
| 24 | 11-Jun | - | 17-Jun | 50 | 10-Dec | - | 16-Dec |
| 25 | 18-Jun | - | 24-Jun | 51 | 17-Dec | - | 23-Dec |
| 26 | 25-Jun | - | 1-Jul | $52 \mathrm{~b} /$ | 24-Dec | - | 31-Dec |

a/ Eight day week in each leap year.
b/ Eight day week every year.

| ${ }^{\mathrm{FL}}$ (cme | 1999 |  |  | 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2001 |  |  |  | 2002 |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 65251-f | 65252-f | 65258-y | 65260-f | 65261-f | 65262-f | 65263-f | 65264-f | 65269-f | 65270-f | 65279-y | 65281-f | 65282-f | 65283-f | 65288-y | 65295-f | 65296-f | 65297-f | 65308-y |  |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 5 |
| 44 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{0}^{1}$ | 1 2 |  | 0 | 2 |
| 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 12 |
| 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 15 |
| 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 10 | 1 5 | 3 9 | 2 | ${ }_{23}^{16}$ |
| 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 7 | 6 | 6 |  | 20 |
| 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 9 | 5 | 5 |  | 22 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 |  | 19 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | ${ }^{6}$ | 5 | 2 |  | 17 |
| 55 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 3 4 | 5 8 | 5 1 | 4 |  | 18 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 4 |  | 17 |
| 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 |  | 10 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 0 | 18 | 1 | 2 | 4 |  | 26 |
| 60 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 27 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 36 |
| 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 13 |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| 62 63 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1 | ${ }_{1}$ | 1 | 19 |  |  |  |  | 29 31 |
| 64 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 26 |  |  |  |  | 39 |
| 65 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 3 | 10 | 1 | 1 | 34 |  |  |  |  | 50 |
| 66 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 27 |  |  |  |  | 43 |
| 67 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 25 |  |  |  |  | 45 |
| 68 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 8 11 | 5 5 | 1 | 5 0 | 23 18 |  |  |  |  | 44 |
| 70 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 17 |  |  |  |  | 44 54 |
| 71 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 18 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 15 |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| 72 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 28 | 2 | 2 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  | 46 |
| 73 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 42 |
| 74 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 31 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 50 |
| 75 |  |  | 0 | 0 1 | 1 | 3 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 1 | 23 28 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| 76 77 |  |  | 0 | ${ }_{0}^{1}$ | 2 | 0 | 4 2 | 0 2 | 4 3 | 1 | 28 30 | ${ }_{1}^{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 45 44 |
| 78 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  | 43 |
| 79 |  |  | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 39 |
| 80 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 3 | ${ }_{2}$ | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 21 | 0 | 2 | ${ }_{2}$ | ${ }_{1}$ |  |  |  |  | 44 |
| 81 82 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 2 | ${ }_{0}^{1}$ | 4 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 7 | 15 12 | 0 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 29 |
| 82 83 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 15 |  | 1 | ${ }_{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 32 27 |
| 84 |  |  | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 4 | $1 /$ |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 37 |
| 85 |  |  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 7 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |
| 86 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 0 | ${ }_{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 10 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 24 |
| 87 88 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 2 2 | ${ }_{0}^{1}$ | 0 1 | 0 2 | 3 2 | 2 3 | 7 10 |  |  | 0 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 21 |
| 89 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 21 |
| 90 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14 |
| 91 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 92 93 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 1 | 0 2 | 0 | 3 0 | 2 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8 |
| 94 |  |  | 1 | ${ }_{0}$ | 0 | 1 | ${ }_{0}$ | 0 | 1 | 1 | ${ }_{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 95 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 96 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 97 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 98 98 |  |  |  | ${ }_{1}$ | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{1} 28$ |
| Totals: Mean | 1 97.0 | 1 78.0 | 14 85.3 | 82.2 | 35 80.6 | 16 79.6 | 81.0 | 81.2 | 81.1 | 58 82.0 | ${ }_{76.3}^{411}$ | 68.7 | 69.9 | 70.4 | 64.8 | 51.7 | 57 51.5 | 52.6 | 15.3 | 1,385 70.2 |
| a/ The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian Week 36-11). $b /$ Age at release: $f=$ fingerlings, $y=$ yearlings. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| FL (cm) | Total Trapped | Ad-clips b/ | Effective Tags c/ | TRH Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | 1 |  |  |  |
| 39 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
| 40 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 41 | 3 |  | 3 |  |
| 42 | 6 |  | 6 | 2 |
| 43 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| 44 | 11 | 2 | 11 | 2 |
| 45 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 2 |
| 46 | 15 | 3 | 15 | 2 |
| 47 | 22 | 3 | 22 | 8 |
| 48 | 27 | 5 | 27 | 10 |
| 49 | 22 | 1 | 22 | 11 |
| 50 | 22 | 4 | 21 | 8 |
| 51 | 27 | 3 | 27 | 15 |
| 52 | 19 | 2 | 19 | 8 |
| 53 | 21 | 4 | 21 | 14 |
| 54 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 5 |
| 55 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| 56 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 57 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 5 |
| 58 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 2 |
| 59 | 10 | 2 | 10 | 7 |
| 60 | 13 | 3 | 13 | 8 |
| 61 | 16 | 2 | 16 | 5 |
| 62 | 18 | 5 | 17 | 8 |
| 63 | 17 | 5 | 17 | 5 |
| 64 | 14 | 1 | 14 | 7 |
| 65 | 18 | 8 | 16 | 10 |
| 66 | 12 | 2 | 12 | 5 |
| 67 | 16 | 4 | 15 | 5 |
| 68 | 15 | 6 | 15 | 3 |
| 69 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 3 |
| 70 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 4 |
| 71 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 3 |
| 72 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 73 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 2 |
| 74 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 4 |
| 75 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 2 |
| 76 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 2 |
| 77 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 3 |
| 78 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 79 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 80 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 1 |
| 81 | 9 | 2 | 9 | 2 |
| 82 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| 83 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 84 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| 85 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 86 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 87 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 88 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 89 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 90 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 91 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 92 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 93 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 94 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 95 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 96 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 97 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 98 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 99 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 100 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 101 |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 518 | 93 | 509 | 196 |
| Mean FL: | 59.7 | 61.3 | 59.7 | 58.9 |
| Total grilse d/: | 240 | 32 | 238 | 92 |
| Total adults: | 278 | 61 | 271 | 104 |

a/ Trapping at Junction City took place from July 21 through August 20 (Julian Weeks 29-34) and September 15 through October 7 (Julian Weeks 37-40). Chinook trapped prior to Julian week 38 were considered spring Chinook.
b/ Ad-clip = Adipose fin clipped fish
c/ Number of effectively tagged fish excludes fish that were not tagged, tagging mortalities, and fish that had their tags removed (caught and released).
d/ Spring-run Chinook salmon less than or equal to 56 cm FL were considered grilse.

| FL (cm) | Total Trapped | Ad-clips b/ | Effective Tags c/ | TRH Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| 41 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| 42 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 43 | 13 | 4 | 13 | 3 |
| 44 | 23 | 1 | 23 | 6 |
| 45 | 21 | 3 | 19 | 5 |
| 46 | 22 | 5 | 22 | 7 |
| 47 | 26 | 7 | 25 | 10 |
| 48 | 40 | 8 | 39 | 8 |
| 49 | 37 | 7 | 37 | 9 |
| 50 | 44 | 8 | 41 | 10 |
| 51 | 45 | 8 | 43 | 10 |
| 52 | 36 | 5 | 33 | 12 |
| 53 | 31 | 4 | 30 | 8 |
| 54 | 27 | 6 | 26 | 9 |
| 55 | 18 | 5 | 17 | 6 |
| 56 | 33 | 5 | 32 | 12 |
| 57 | 32 | 9 | 32 | 10 |
| 58 | 36 | 8 | 36 | 18 |
| 59 | 46 | 12 | 46 | 25 |
| 60 | 55 | 17 | 51 | 23 |
| 61 | 90 | 30 | 87 | 46 |
| 62 | 104 | 29 | 103 | 57 |
| 63 | 119 | 25 | 117 | 74 |
| 64 | 138 | 37 | 136 | 70 |
| 65 | 125 | 37 | 122 | 55 |
| 66 | 132 | 30 | 128 | 76 |
| 67 | 100 | 24 | 96 | 51 |
| 68 | 94 | 25 | 92 | 55 |
| 69 | 83 | 21 | 78 | 48 |
| 70 | 73 | 17 | 73 | 45 |
| 71 | 48 | 11 | 47 | 25 |
| 72 | 48 | 11 | 47 | 24 |
| 73 | 31 | 8 | 28 | 13 |
| 74 | 30 | 3 | 29 | 14 |
| 75 | 31 | 3 | 31 | 15 |
| 76 | 27 | 6 | 25 | 10 |
| 77 | 27 | 2 | 26 | 13 |
| 78 | 27 | 1 | 26 | 7 |
| 79 | 21 | 3 | 20 | 5 |
| 80 | 19 | 2 | 18 | 7 |
| 81 | 22 | 4 | 22 | 5 |
| 82 | 18 | 3 | 18 | 3 |
| 83 | 25 | 5 | 25 | 8 |
| 84 | 11 | 5 | 11 | 4 |
| 85 | 12 | 3 | 11 | 3 |
| 86 | 10 | 3 | 10 | 2 |
| 87 | 13 | 2 | 12 | 6 |
| 88 | 13 | 1 | 13 | 2 |
| 89 | 10 | 0 | 9 | 0 |
| 90 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 91 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 1 |
| 92 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| 93 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| 94 | 4 |  | 4 | 1 |
| 95 | 3 |  | 3 | 0 |
| 96 | 4 |  | 4 | 0 |
| 97 | 4 |  | 4 | 0 |
| 98 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 99 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 |
| 100 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 101 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 102 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 103 | 0 |  | 0 |  |
| 104 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 105 |  |  |  |  |
| 106 |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 2,137 | 480 | 2,075 | 944 |
| Mean FL: | 64.7 | 64.2 | 64.7 | 65.0 |
| Total grilse d/: | 378 | 68 | 363 | 100 |
| Total adults: | 1,759 | 412 | 1,712 | 844 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from September 14 through November 22 (Julian Weeks 37-47). All Chinook trapped were considered fall Chinook
b/ Ad-clip = Adipose fin clipped fish.
c/ Number of effectively tagged fish excludes fish that were not tagged, tagging mortalities, and fish that had their tags removed (caught and released). d/ Fall-run Chinook salmon less than or equal to 54 cm FL were considered grilse.

Appendix 6. Fork length (FL) distribution of coho salmon trapped and tagged at the Willow Creek Weir during the 2004-05 season. a/

| FL (cm) | Total Trapped | RM-clips b/ | Effective Tags c/ | TRH Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 33 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 34 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| 36 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| 37 | 6 | 5 | 6 |  |
| 38 | 10 | 10 | 10 |  |
| 39 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 |
| 40 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 0 |
| 41 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 0 |
| 42 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 3 |
| 43 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 1 |
| 44 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 4 |
| 45 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 3 |
| 46 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 3 |
| 47 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 1 |
| 48 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| 49 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 50 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 51 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 52 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 1 |
| 53 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 55 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| 56 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 1 |
| 57 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 2 |
| 58 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| 59 | 19 | 16 | 18 | 6 |
| 60 | 10 | 6 | 9 | 4 |
| 61 | 30 | 24 | 29 | 7 |
| 62 | 35 | 29 | 35 | 12 |
| 63 | 47 | 35 | 45 | 9 |
| 64 | 60 | 46 | 56 | 9 |
| 65 | 73 | 54 | 72 | 21 |
| 66 | 84 | 64 | 81 | 22 |
| 67 | 87 | 57 | 84 | 25 |
| 68 | 105 | 74 | 104 | 37 |
| 69 | 72 | 57 | 67 | 24 |
| 70 | 77 | 57 | 74 | 24 |
| 71 | 51 | 31 | 50 | 20 |
| 72 | 33 | 19 | 33 | 5 |
| 73 | 29 | 21 | 28 | 12 |
| 74 | 14 | 10 | 14 | 9 |
| 75 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 76 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 77 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 78 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 80 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 84 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 87 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Totals: | 1009 | 774 | 976 | 275 |
| Mean FL: | 63.3 | 62.2 | 63.3 | 65.6 |
| Total grilse d/: | 151 | 147 | 147 | 21 |
| Total adults: | 858 | 627 | 829 | 254 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from September 14 through November 22 (Julian Weeks 37-47).
b/ RM-clip = Right maxillary clipped fish.
c/ Number of effectively tagged fish excludes fish that were not tagged, tagging mortalities, and fish that had their tags removed (caught and released). d/ Coho salmon less than or equal to 53 cm FL were considered grilse.
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Appendix 7. Fork length (FL) distribution of fall-run steelhead trapped and tagged in the Trinity River at the Willow Creek and Junction City weirs, and recovered at Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during the 2004-2005 season.

| FL (cm) | Willow Creek Weir a/ |  |  |  |  | Junction City Weir a/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Trapped | Ad-clips b/ | Other-clips c/ | Effective Tags d/ | TRH Recoveries f/ | Total Trapped | Ad-clips b/ |
| 33 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 37 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 38 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 39 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 40 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 41 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 42 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |
| 43 | 4 | 3 |  | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 44 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 45 | 2 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 46 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 47 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 48 | 2 | 0 |  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 49 | 2 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 50 | 10 | 4 |  | 9 | 0 | 5 | 4 |
| 51 | 12 | 5 |  | 12 | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| 52 | 4 | 2 |  | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 |
| 53 | 19 | 13 |  | 15 | 3 | 11 | 10 |
| 54 | 48 | 35 |  | 39 | 9 | 7 | 6 |
| 55 | 59 | 46 | 1 | 45 | 9 | 13 | 10 |
| 56 | 83 | 69 | 1 | 72 | 20 | 14 | 13 |
| 57 | 114 | 93 | 0 | 97 | 30 | 15 | 14 |
| 58 | 141 | 116 | 0 | 122 | 36 | 13 | 13 |
| 59 | 149 | 122 | 1 | 135 | 44 | 16 | 11 |
| 60 | 189 | 149 | 1 | 166 | 48 | 18 | 15 |
| 61 | 186 | 145 | 2 | 167 | 53 | 9 | 8 |
| 62 | 178 | 134 | 2 | 166 | 47 | 8 | 7 |
| 63 | 136 | 96 | 1 | 127 | 38 | 5 | 5 |
| 64 | 150 | 113 | 3 | 134 | 45 | 5 | 5 |
| 65 | 113 | 80 | 1 | 100 | 31 | 1 | 1 |
| 66 | 83 | 60 | 0 | 74 | 28 | 4 | 4 |
| 67 | 77 | 54 | 0 | 72 | 22 | 5 | 3 |
| 68 | 77 | 52 | 2 | 71 | 16 | 3 | 3 |
| 69 | 42 | 33 | 0 | 37 | 10 | 1 | 1 |
| 70 | 52 | 38 | 1 | 51 | 15 | 1 | 1 |
| 71 | 25 | 18 | 0 | 24 | 4 | 2 | 2 |
| 72 | 27 | 19 | 1 | 26 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 73 | 12 | 10 |  | 11 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 74 | 10 | 9 |  | 10 | 1 |  |  |
| 75 | 8 | 4 |  | 7 |  |  |  |
| 76 | 6 | 5 |  | 6 |  |  |  |
| 77 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 78 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 79 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 80 | 2 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |
| 81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 2,040 | 1,544 | 17 | 1,816 | 523 | 176 | 154 |
| Mean FL: | 61.7 | 61.6 | 63.2 | 61.9 | 61.9 | 57.8 | 57.7 |
| Total 1/2 pounders e/: | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Total adults: | 2,032 | 1,539 | 17 | 1,816 | 523 | 173 | 151 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from September 14 through November 22 (Julian Weeks 37-47) and at Junction City from July 21 through August 20 (Julian Weeks 29-34) and September 15 through October 7 (Julian Weeks 38-40).
b/ Ad clips= Adipose fin clipped fish.
c/ Other clips include: 2-ADLM (adipose fin and left maxillary clip); 5-ADRM (adipose fin and right maxillary clip); 2-LM (left maxillary clip) and 8RM (right maxillary clip).
d/ Number of effectively tagged fish excludes fish that were not tagged, tagging mortalities, and fish that had their tags removed (caught and released).
e/ Steelhead less than or equal to 41 cm FL were considered half pounders. Only adults were counted at TRH.
f/ The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian Weeks 36-11).

Appendix 8. Fork Length (FL) distribution of Ad-clipped and non-clipped fall-run steelhead trapped in the Trinity River at Willow Creek and Junction

| FL (cm) | Recovery Site |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Willow Creek Weir al |  |  | Junction City Weir a/ |  | Trinity River Hatchery b/ |  |
|  | Unmarked | Ad-clips c/ | Other-clips d/ | Unmarked | Ad-clips c/ | Unmarked | Ad-clips c/ |
| 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 33 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 35 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 36 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 37 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 38 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 39 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 40 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| 41 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| 42 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  | 4 |
| 43 | 1 | 3 |  |  | 0 |  | 9 |
| 44 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 16 |
| 45 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 11 |
| 46 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 47 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 48 | 2 | 0 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| 49 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| 50 | 6 | 4 |  | 1 | 4 | 1 | 14 |
| 51 | 7 | 5 |  | 0 | 5 | 1 | 27 |
| 52 | 2 | 2 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 | 41 |
| 53 | 6 | 13 |  | 1 | 10 | 1 | 57 |
| 54 | 13 | 35 |  | 1 | 6 | 3 | 105 |
| 55 | 12 | 46 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 159 |
| 56 | 14 | 68 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 232 |
| 57 | 21 | 93 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 332 |
| 58 | 25 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 368 |
| 59 | 26 | 122 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 1 | 427 |
| 60 | 40 | 148 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 495 |
| 61 | 41 | 143 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 495 |
| 62 | 42 | 134 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 480 |
| 63 | 39 | 96 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 426 |
| 64 | 34 | 113 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 407 |
| 65 | 32 | 80 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 311 |
| 66 | 23 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 279 |
| 67 | 23 | 54 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 208 |
| 68 | 24 | 51 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 194 |
| 69 | 9 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 148 |
| 70 | 14 | 37 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 145 |
| 71 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 75 |
| 72 | 8 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 63 |
| 73 | 2 | 10 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 51 |
| 74 | 1 | 9 |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| 75 | 4 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| 76 | 1 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 17 |
| 77 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 6 |
| 78 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| 79 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 80 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| 81 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 82 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 83 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Totals: | 486 | 1,537 | 17 | 22 | 154 | 37 | 5,688 |
| Mean FL: | 61.8 | 61.6 | 63.2 | 58.5 | 57.7 | 60.3 | 61.8 |
| Total $1 / 2$ pounders e/: | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Total adults: | 483 | 1,532 | 17 | 22 | 151 | 37 | 5,688 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from September 14 through November 22 (Julian Weeks 37-47) and at Junction City from July 21 through August 20 (Julian Weeks 29-34) and September 15 through October 7 (Julian Weeks 38-40)
b/ The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian Weeks 36-11).
c/ Ad clips= Adipose fin clipped fish.
d/ Other clips include: 2-ADLM (adipose fin and left maxillary clip); 5-ADRM (adipose fin and right maxillary clip); 2-LM (left maxillary clip) and 8-RM (right maxillary clip).
e/ Steelhead less than or equal to 41 cm FL were considered half pounders. Only adults were counted at TRH.

Appendix 9 . Fork Length (FL) distribution of spring-run Chinook salmon tagged at Junction City Weir and subsequently recovered during the 20042005 season. a/

| FL (cm) | Total Tagged | Recoveries |  |  |  |  |  | Total Recoveries | \% Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tag Morts b/ | Carcass c/ Recoveries | TRH d/ Recoveries | Angler Released e/ | Angler Harvest f/ | Angler Found Tags g/ |  |  |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 39 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 40 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 41 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 42 | 6 | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 33.3 |
| 43 | 7 | 0 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 14.3 |
| 44 | 11 | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 18.2 |
| 45 | 10 | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 20.0 |
| 46 | 15 | 0 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 26.7 |
| 47 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 8 |  | 1 |  | 9 | 40.9 |
| 48 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 10 |  | 2 |  | 12 | 44.4 |
| 49 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 11 |  | 0 |  | 11 | 50.0 |
| 50 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 2 |  | 11 | 50.0 |
| 51 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 1 |  | 16 | 59.3 |
| 52 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 3 |  | 12 | 63.2 |
| 53 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 |  | 14 | 66.7 |
| 54 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 |  | 7 | 46.7 |
| 55 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 50.0 |
| 56 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 57 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 |  | 7 | 77.8 |
| 58 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 | 50.0 |
| 59 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 70.0 |
| 60 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 |  | 8 | 61.5 |
| 61 | 16 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 |  | 8 | 50.0 |
| 62 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 1 |  | 11 | 64.7 |
| 63 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 3 |  | 9 | 52.9 |
| 64 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 8 | 57.1 |
| 65 | 17 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 0 |  | 12 | 70.6 |
| 66 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 50.0 |
| 67 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  | 6 | 37.5 |
| 68 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 6 | 40.0 |
| 69 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 3 | 42.9 |
| 70 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 4 |  | 0 |  | 5 | 71.4 |
| 71 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 5 | 55.6 |
| 72 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 66.7 |
| 73 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 33.3 |
| 74 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 57.1 |
| 75 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 |  | 4 | 57.1 |
| 76 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 3 | 42.9 |
| 77 | 6 |  | 0 | 3 |  | 0 |  | 3 | 50.0 |
| 78 | 3 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 79 | 5 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 40.0 |
| 80 | 8 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 25.0 |
| 81 | 9 |  | 2 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 4 | 44.4 |
| 82 | 9 |  |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 11.1 |
| 83 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 84 | 4 |  |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 50.0 |
| 85 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 86 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 87 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 88 | 3 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 89 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 90 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 91 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 92 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| 93 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| 94 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 95 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| 96 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| 97 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| 98 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| 99 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | - |
| 100 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 101 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grilse: h/ | 240 | 1 | 3 | 92 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 108 | 45.0 |
| Adults: | 275 | 1 | 20 | 104 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 138 | 50.2 |
| Total: | 515 | 2 | 23 | 196 | 4 | 21 | 0 | 246 | 47.8 |
| a/ Trapping at Junction City took place from July 21 through August 20 (Julian Weeks 29-34) and September 15 through October 7 (Julian Weeks 37-40). |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b/ Tagged fish found dead and unspawned within 30 days of tagging. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c/ Fish recovered in upper Trinity River spawner surveys. <br> d/ TRH = Trinity River Hatchery. The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian Weeks 36-1 <br> e/ Fish reported as caught and released by anglers. <br> f/ Fish reported as harvested by anglers. <br> $\mathrm{g} /$ Tags found on dead fish or found unattached. <br> $\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{Grilse}$ were considered fish less than or equal to 56 cm FL. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Appendix 10 . Fork Length (FL) distribution of fall-run Chinook salmon tagged at Willow Creek Weir and subsequently recovered during the

| FL (cm) | Total Tagged | Recoveries |  |  |  |  |  | Total Recoveries | \% <br> Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Carcass c/ Recoveries | TRH d/ Recoveries | Angler Released e/ | Angler Harvest f/ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Angler } \\ \text { Found Tags g/ } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 40 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 41 | 5 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 20.0 |
| 42 | 5 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 40.0 |
| 43 | 13 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 5 | 38.5 |
| 44 | 23 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 7 | 30.4 |
| 45 | 20 |  | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 |  | 9 | 45.0 |
| 46 | 22 |  | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 31.8 |
| 47 | 25 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | 1 |  | 11 | 44.0 |
| 48 | 40 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 2 |  | 12 | 30.0 |
| 49 | 37 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 0 | 1 |  | 11 | 29.7 |
| 50 | 44 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 2 |  | 16 | 36.4 |
| 51 | 43 |  | 0 | 10 | 0 | 2 |  | 12 | 27.9 |
| 52 | 34 |  | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 |  | 15 | 44.1 |
| 53 | 31 |  | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 |  | 9 | 29.0 |
| 54 | 26 |  | 1 | 9 | 0 | 0 |  | 10 | 38.5 |
| 55 | 17 |  | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 41.2 |
| 56 | 32 |  | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 |  | 13 | 40.6 |
| 57 | 32 |  | 2 | 10 | 0 | 0 |  | 12 | 37.5 |
| 58 | 36 |  | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 |  | 18 | 50.0 |
| 59 | 46 |  | 2 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 60.9 |
| 60 | 53 |  | 3 | 23 | 2 | 0 |  | 28 | 52.8 |
| 61 | 87 |  | 1 | 46 | 0 | 3 |  | 50 | 57.5 |
| 62 | 103 |  | 8 | 57 | 0 | 2 |  | 67 | 65.0 |
| 63 | 117 |  | 3 | 74 | 0 | 2 |  | 79 | 67.5 |
| 64 | 137 |  | 6 | 70 | 1 | 2 |  | 79 | 57.7 |
| 65 | 123 |  | 8 | 55 | 1 | 1 |  | 65 | 52.8 |
| 66 | 130 |  | 7 | 76 | 2 | 0 |  | 85 | 65.4 |
| 67 | 96 |  | 7 | 51 | 0 | 4 |  | 62 | 64.6 |
| 68 | 93 |  | 6 | 55 | 1 | 0 |  | 62 | 66.7 |
| 69 | 78 |  | 3 | 48 | 0 | 0 |  | 51 | 65.4 |
| 70 | 73 |  | 1 | 45 | 0 | 1 |  | 47 | 64.4 |
| 71 | 47 |  | 2 | 25 | 0 | 1 |  | 28 | 59.6 |
| 72 | 47 |  | 1 | 24 | 0 | 3 |  | 28 | 59.6 |
| 73 | 30 |  | 3 | 13 | 2 | 2 |  | 20 | 66.7 |
| 74 | 29 |  | 4 | 14 | 0 | 1 |  | 19 | 65.5 |
| 75 | 31 |  | 4 | 15 | 0 | 1 |  | 20 | 64.5 |
| 76 | 25 |  | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0 |  | 11 | 44.0 |
| 77 | 26 |  | 1 | 13 | 0 | 0 |  | 14 | 53.8 |
| 78 | 26 |  | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 8 | 30.8 |
| 79 | 20 |  | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 |  | 11 | 55.0 |
| 80 | 19 |  | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 |  | 11 | 57.9 |
| 81 | 22 |  | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 27.3 |
| 82 | 18 |  | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 38.9 |
| 83 | 25 |  | 3 | 8 | 0 | 1 |  | 12 | 48.0 |
| 84 | 11 |  | 0 | 4 | 0 |  |  | 4 | 36.4 |
| 85 | 12 |  | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 5 | 41.7 |
| 86 | 10 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 20.0 |
| 87 | 12 |  | 0 | 6 |  |  |  | 6 | 50.0 |
| 88 | 13 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 30.8 |
| 89 | 10 |  | 3 | 0 |  |  |  | 3 | 30.0 |
| 90 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 91 | 5 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 20.0 |
| 92 | 5 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 20.0 |
| 93 | 5 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 40.0 |
| 94 | 4 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 25.0 |
| 95 | 3 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 96 | 4 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 97 | 4 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 25.0 |
| 98 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 99 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 100 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 101 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 102 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 103 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | , |
| 104 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 105 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 106 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| Grilse: $\mathrm{h} /$ | 370 | 2 | 11 | 100 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 128 | 34.6 |
| Adults: | 1,724 | 0 | 100 | 844 | 10 | 25 | 1 | 980 | 56.8 |
| Total: | 2,094 | 2 | 111 | 944 | 15 | 35 | 1 | 1,108 | 52.9 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from September 14 through November 22 (Julian Weeks 37-47).
b/ Tagged fish found dead and unspawned within 30 days of tagging.
c/ Fish recovered in upper Trinity River spawner surveys.
d/ TRH = Trinity River Hatchery. The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian Weeks 36-11).
e/ Fish reported as caught and released by anglers.
$\mathrm{f} /$ Fish reported as harvested by anglers.
$\mathrm{g} /$ Tags found on dead fish or found unattached.
$\mathrm{h} / \mathrm{Grilse}$ were considered fish less than or equal to 54 cm FL.

Appendix 11. Fork Length (FL) distribution of coho salmon tagged at Willow Creek Weir and subsequently recovered during the 2004-05 season a /.

|  | Recoveries |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FL (cm) | Total Tagged | Tag Morts b/ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Carcass } \\ \text { Recoveries c/ } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TRH d/ Recoveries | Angler Released e/ | Angler Harvest f/ | Angler Found Tags g/ | Total Recoveries | \% <br> Recoveries |
| 33 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 34 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 35 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 36 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 37 | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 38 | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 39 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 33.3 |
| 40 | 12 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 41 | 8 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 42 | 21 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 14.3 |
| 43 | 14 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 3 | 21.4 |
| 44 | 15 |  | 1 | 4 |  |  |  | 5 | 33.3 |
| 45 | 11 |  | 0 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 4 | 36.4 |
| 46 | 15 |  | 0 | 3 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 20.0 |
| 47 | 7 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 14.3 |
| 48 | 4 |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 25.0 |
| 49 | 5 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 40.0 |
| 50 | 4 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 75.0 |
| 51 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 52 | 5 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 20.0 |
| 53 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 54 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | - |
| 55 | 3 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 56 | 6 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 16.7 |
| 57 | 6 |  | 0 | 2 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 33.3 |
| 58 | 4 |  | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 50.0 |
| 59 | 19 |  | 0 | 6 | 1 |  |  | 7 | 36.8 |
| 60 | 9 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |  | 4 | 44.4 |
| 61 | 29 |  | 1 | 7 |  |  |  | 8 | 27.6 |
| 62 | 35 |  | 3 | 12 |  |  |  | 15 | 42.9 |
| 63 | 45 |  | 4 | 9 |  |  |  | 13 | 28.9 |
| 64 | 56 |  | 5 | 9 |  |  |  | 14 | 25.0 |
| 65 | 73 | 1 | 7 | 21 |  |  |  | 29 | 39.7 |
| 66 | 82 | 1 | 4 | 22 |  | 1 |  | 28 | 34.1 |
| 67 | 85 | 1 | 9 | 25 |  |  |  | 35 | 41.2 |
| 68 | 104 | 0 | 10 | 36 |  |  |  | 46 | 44.2 |
| 69 | 68 | 1 | 5 | 25 |  |  |  | 31 | 45.6 |
| 70 | 74 | 0 | 4 | 24 |  |  |  | 28 | 37.8 |
| 71 | 51 | 1 | 4 | 20 |  |  |  | 25 | 49.0 |
| 72 | 33 |  | 8 | 5 |  |  |  | 13 | 39.4 |
| 73 | 28 |  | 2 | 12 |  |  |  | 14 | 50.0 |
| 74 | 14 |  | 2 | 9 |  |  |  | 11 | 78.6 |
| 75 | 5 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 80.0 |
| 76 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 77 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 78 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 79 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 80 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 81 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 82 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 83 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 84 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 85 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 86 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 87 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| Grilse: $\mathrm{h} /$ | 148 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 18.9 |
| Adults: | 835 | 5 | 71 | 254 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 332 | 39.8 |
| Total: | 983 | 5 | 77 | 275 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 360 | 36.6 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from September 14 through November 22 (Julian Weeks 37-47).
b/ Tagged fish found dead and unspawned within 30 days of tagging.
c/ Fish recovered in upper Trinity River spawner surveys.
d/ TRH = Trinity River Hatchery. The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian Weeks 36-11).
e/ Fish reported as caught and released by anglers.
$\mathrm{f} /$ Fish reported as harvested by anglers.
$\mathrm{g} /$ Tags found on dead fish or found unattached.
$\mathrm{h} /$ Grilse were considered fish less than or equal to 53 cm FL.

Appendix 12 . Fork Length (FL) distribution of fall-run steelhead tagged at Willow Creek Weir and subsequently recovered during the 2004-05 season. a/

| FL (cm) | Recoveries |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total Recoveries | \% <br> Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Tagged | Tag Morts b/ | Carcass Recoveries cl | TRH d/ Recoveries | Angler Released e/ | Angler Harvest $f /$ | Angler Found Tags g/ |  |  |
| 42 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 43 | 4 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 25.0 |
| 44 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 45 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 46 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 47 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 48 | 2 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 49 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 50 | 10 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 10.0 |
| 51 | 12 |  |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |  | 4 | 33.3 |
| 52 | 4 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 53 | 19 |  |  | 3 | 4 | 0 |  | 7 | 36.8 |
| 54 | 47 |  |  | 9 | 8 | 0 |  | 17 | 36.2 |
| 55 | 57 |  |  | 9 | 12 | 1 |  | 22 | 38.6 |
| 56 | 80 |  |  | 20 | 8 | 1 |  | 29 | 36.3 |
| 57 | 113 |  | 1 | 30 | 16 | 3 |  | 50 | 44.2 |
| 58 | 137 |  | 1 | 36 | 15 | 1 |  | 53 | 38.7 |
| 59 | 147 |  | 1 | 44 | 12 | 1 |  | 58 | 39.5 |
| 60 | 185 |  | 1 | 48 | 19 | 5 |  | 73 | 39.5 |
| 61 | 183 | 1 | 1 | 53 | 15 | 1 |  | 71 | 38.8 |
| 62 | 177 |  | 0 | 47 | 11 | 4 |  | 62 | 35.0 |
| 63 | 135 |  | 1 | 38 | 8 | 4 |  | 51 | 37.8 |
| 64 | 148 |  |  | 45 | 14 | 1 |  | 60 | 40.5 |
| 65 | 110 |  |  | 31 | 10 | 1 |  | 42 | 38.2 |
| 66 | 82 |  |  | 28 | 8 | 1 |  | 37 | 45.1 |
| 67 | 76 |  |  | 22 | 4 | 1 |  | 27 | 35.5 |
| 68 | 75 |  |  | 16 | 4 | 1 |  | 21 | 28.0 |
| 69 | 40 |  |  | 10 | 3 | 1 |  | 14 | 35.0 |
| 70 | 52 |  |  | 15 | 1 | 2 |  | 18 | 34.6 |
| 71 | 25 |  |  | 4 | 1 | 0 |  | 5 | 20.0 |
| 72 | 27 |  |  | 7 | 1 | 0 |  | 8 | 29.6 |
| 73 | 11 |  |  | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 4 | 36.4 |
| 74 | 10 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 | 10.0 |
| 75 | 8 |  |  |  | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 12.5 |
| 76 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 16.7 |
| 77 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 78 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 79 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 80 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 81 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| 82 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | - |
| Adults: | 1,995 | 1 | 6 | 523 | 178 | 34 | 0 | 742 | 37.2 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from September 14 through November 22 (Julian Weeks 37-47).
b/ Tagged fish found dead and unspawned within 30 days of tagging.
c/ Fish recovered in upper Trinity River spawner surveys.
d/ TRH = Trinity River Hatchery. The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 - March 15, 2005 (Julian Weeks 36-11).
e/ Fish reported as caught and released by anglers.
$\mathrm{f} /$ Fish reported as harvested by anglers.
$\mathrm{g} /$ Tags found on dead fish or found unattached.

Appendix 13. Summary of California Fish and Game Commission regulations that affected salmonid harvest in the Trinity River during the 2004-2005 season. ${ }^{\text {a/ }}$

| Body of Water | Open Season and Special Regulations ${ }^{\text {b/ }}$ | Daily Bag Limit (if Different from general bag limits in subsection 7.50(b)(91.1)(D))*. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6. Trinity River and Tributaries. |  |  |
| a. Trinity River main stem from 250 feet below Lewiston Dam to Old Lewiston bridge. | Last Saturday in Apr. through Sept.15. Only artificial flies with barbless hooks may be used. | 0 |
| b. Trinity River main stem from Old Lewiston bridge to the Highway 299 West bridge at Cedar Flat. | All Year | 1 hatchery trout or hatchery steelhead. Salmon Quota Area. Also see subsection (b)(91.1)(C)**. |
| c. Canyon Creek above the falls located about four miles above the wilderness area boundary. | Last Saturday in Apr. through Nov. 15. | 2 |
| d. Trinity River main stem from the Highway 299 West bridge at Cedar Flat downstream to the Hawkins Bar Bridge (Road to Denny) | Dec. 1 through Aug 31. | See subsection (b)(91.1)(D)* |
| e. New River main stem from the mouth upstream to the confluence of the East Fork. | Sept 15 through Nov 15 only artifical lures with barbless hooks may be used. | 0 |
| f. Trinity River main stem from Hawkins Bar Bridge (Road to Denny) to the confluence with the Klamath River. | All Year | 1 hatchery trout or hatchery steelhead. Salmon Quota Area. Also see subsection (b)(91.1)(C)***. |
| g. Trinity River South Fork downstream from the mouth of Grouse Creek. | Fourth Saturday in May through Mar. 31. | 1 hatchery trout or 1 hatchery steelhead or 1 brown trout. 0 king salmon |
| h. Trinity River South Fork from the mouth of Grouse Creek to the South Fork Trinity River bridge at Hyampom. | Nov. 1. through Mar. 31. | 1 hatchery trout or 1 hatchery steelhead or 1 brown trout. 0 king salmon |
| i. Hayfork Creek main stem, from Highway 3 bridge in Hayfork downstream to the mouth. | Fourth Saturday in May through Mar. 31. Only artificial lures with barbless hooks may be used. | 0 |
| *(b)(91.1)(D) In anadromous waters of the Trinity River basin, except for those with special bag limits provided above, the daily trout/salmon bag limit is three king salmon, but no more than one king salmon over 22 inches total length, and 1 hatchery trout or 1 brown trout or 1 hatchery steelhead. No more than 4 king salmon over 22 inches total length may be retained in any 7 consecutive days. No more than 12 king salmon may be possessed, of which no more than 4 may be over 22 inches total length. |  |  |
| **(b)(91.1)(C)(c)(ii) No salmon over 22 inches total length may be retained after $50 \%$ of the basin quota has been taken in the Klamath River basin above Highway 96 bridge at Weitchpec. Exception: King salmon over 22 inches total length may be retained from the Old Lewiston Bridge to the mouth of Indian Creek when the adult fall-run king salmon spawning escapement at Trinity River Hatchery exceeds 4,800 fish. |  |  |
| ***(b)(91.1)(C)(f)(i) No salmon over 22 inches total length may be retained after $50 \%$ of the basin quota has been taken in the Klamath River basin above the Highway 96 bridge at Weitchpec. |  |  |
| (b)(91.1)(E) All anadromous waters of the Trinity River basin are closed to all fishing all year except those listed above. |  |  |

a/. From State of California, Fish and Game Commission, California Code of Regulations for 2004, Title 14. Natural Resources, Division 1. Fish and Game Commission-Department of Fish and Game, Supplemental regulations, Section 7.50(b)(91.1).
b/. The 2004 Klamath River basin quota is 4,700 king salmon over 22 inches total length.

| FL (cm) | Unmarked | Right maxillary clip b/ | Other <br> Clips c/ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 23 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 24 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 25 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 26 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 27 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 28 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 29 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 30 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 31 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 32 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 33 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 34 |  | 4 |  | 4 |
| 35 |  | 7 |  | 7 |
| 36 | 1 | 15 |  | 16 |
| 37 | 0 | 35 |  | 35 |
| 38 | 0 | 55 |  | 55 |
| 39 | 0 | 91 |  | 91 |
| 40 | 1 | 110 |  | 111 |
| 41 | 2 | 128 |  | 130 |
| 42 | 1 | 123 |  | 124 |
| 43 | 0 | 114 |  | 114 |
| 44 | 0 | 96 |  | 96 |
| 45 | 1 | 83 |  | 84 |
| 46 | 0 | 53 |  | 53 |
| 47 | 0 | 57 |  | 57 |
| 48 | 0 | 27 |  | 27 |
| 49 | 1 | 18 |  | 19 |
| 50 | 0 | 13 |  | 13 |
| 51 | 0 | 5 |  | 5 |
| 52 | 2 | 16 |  | 18 |
| 53 | 0 | 15 |  | 15 |
| 54 | 0 | 10 |  | 10 |
| 55 | 2 | 13 |  | 15 |
| 56 | 2 | 15 |  | 17 |
| 57 | 6 | 39 |  | 45 |
| 58 | 4 | 31 |  | 35 |
| 59 | 5 | 63 |  | 68 |
| 60 | 7 | 83 | 1 | 91 |
| 61 | 12 | 115 | 1 | 128 |
| 62 | 25 | 222 | 0 | 247 |
| 63 | 30 | 274 | 1 | 305 |
| 64 | 44 | 439 | 4 | 487 |
| 65 | 56 | 539 | 1 | 596 |
| 66 | 65 | 712 | 1 | 778 |
| 67 | 88 | 877 | 1 | 966 |
| 68 | 110 | 994 | 1 | 1,105 |
| 69 | 105 | 907 | 3 | 1,015 |
| 70 | 130 | 924 | 0 | 1,054 |
| 71 | 91 | 773 | 0 | 864 |
| 72 | 79 | 591 | 1 | 671 |
| 73 | 70 | 459 | 0 | 529 |
| 74 | 52 | 313 | 0 | 365 |
| 75 | 37 | 180 | 1 | 218 |
| 76 | 22 | 130 |  | 152 |
| 77 | 10 | 64 |  | 74 |
| 78 | 5 | 37 |  | 42 |
| 79 | 4 | 11 |  | 15 |
| 80 | 0 | 8 |  | 8 |
| 81 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |
| 82 |  | 2 |  | 2 |
| 83 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 84 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 85 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 86 |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 87 |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| Totals: | 1,071 | 9,896 | 16 | 10,983 |
| Mean FL: | 68.8 | 65.6 | 66.3 | 65.9 |

a/ The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian Weeks 36-11).
b/ Beginning with the 1994 brood, all coho salmon reared at Trinity River Hatchery received a right maxillary clip prior to release as yearlin! c/ Other clips include: 7 ADRM (adipose fin clip and right maxillary clip); 2 LM (left maxillary clip) and 7 RMLM (right and left maxillary clips

Appendix 15. Spring-run Chinook salmon run-size, spawner escapement and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Junction City Creek Weir from 1977 through 2004.
Run-size estimate


a/ The 1978 sport harvest of spring-run Chinook was limited by a salmon fishing closure beginning 25 August 1978
b/ The sport harvest of adult spring-run Chinook was limited by fishing closures to the taking of Chinook salmon greater than or equal to 56 cm total length during these years. The closures took effect 22 September in 1985, 5 November 1992, 9 October 1994,. The Trinity River was subject to seasonal closures during the $1995-00$ seasons, commencing 9 September in the lower river. Various periods of opening and closures (seasons) were instituted along the river through November 30 .

Appendix 16. Fall-run Chinook salmon run-size, spawner escapement and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek Weir from 1977 through 2004

| Year | Run-size estimate |  |  |  |  | Spawner escapements |  |  |  |  |  | Angler harvest |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grilse |  | Adults |  | Total | Natural |  |  | Trinity River Hatchery |  |  | Grilse | Adults | Total |
|  | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 14,318 | 43.5\% | 18,596 | 56.5\% | 32,914 | 9,737 | 13,501 | 23,238 | 2,177 | 2,035 | 4,212 | 2,404 | 3,060 | 5,464 |
| 1978 | 6,037 | 14.0\% | 37,086 | 86.0\% | 43,123 | 4,712 | 31,052 | 35,764 | 1,325 | 6,034 | 7,359 | Fishing | sure a/ | 0 |
| 1979 | 5,665 | 35.0\% | 10,520 | 65.0\% | 16,185 | 3,936 | 8,028 | 11,964 | 964 | 1,335 | 2,299 | 765 | 1,157 | 1,922 |
| 1980 | 21,549 | 62.7\% | 12,797 | 37.3\% | 34,346 | 16,837 | 7,700 | 24,537 | 2,256 | 4,099 | 6,355 | 2,456 | 998 | 3,454 |
| 1981 | 8,366 | 28.6\% | 20,884 | 71.4\% | 29,250 | 5,906 | 15,340 | 21,246 | 1,004 | 2,370 | 3,374 | 1,456 | 3,174 | 4,630 |
| 1982 | 14,938 | 52.2\% | 13,653 | 47.8\% | 28,591 | 8,149 | 9,274 | 17,423 | 4,235 | 2,058 | 6,293 | 2,554 | 2,321 | 4,875 |
| 1983 | 1,240 | 4.7\% | 25,138 | 95.3\% | 26,378 | 853 | 17,284 | 18,137 | 271 | 5,494 | 5,765 | 116 | 2,360 | 2,476 |
| 1984 | 4,575 | 34.8\% | 8,556 | 65.2\% | 13,131 | 3,416 | 5,654 | 9,070 | 766 | 2,166 | 2,932 | 393 | 736 | 1,129 |
| 1985 | 53,062 | 81.6\% | 11,954 | 18.4\% | 65,016 | 29,454 | 9,217 | 38,671 | 18,166 | 2,583 | 20,749 | 5,442 | 154 b/ | 5,596 |
| 1986 | 27,506 | 18.6\% | 120,382 | 81.4\% | 147,888 | 20,459 | 92,548 | 113,007 | 3,609 | 15,795 | 19,404 | 3,438 | 12,039 | 15,477 |
| 1987 | 9,325 | 8.9\% | 95,287 | 91.1\% | 104,612 | 5,949 | 71,920 | 77,869 | 2,453 | 13,934 | 16,387 | 923 | 9,433 | 10,356 |
| 1988 | 18,113 | 20.3\% | 71,309 | 79.7\% | 89,422 | 10,626 | 44,616 | 55,242 | 4,752 | 17,352 | 22,104 | 2,735 | 9,341 | 12,076 |
| 1989 | 2,991 | 6.4\% | 43,631 | 93.6\% | 46,622 | 2,543 | 29,445 | 31,988 | 239 | 11,132 | 11,371 | 209 | 3,054 | 3,263 |
| 1990 | 634 | 6.3\% | 9,358 | 93.7\% | 9,992 | 241 | 7,682 | 7,923 | 371 | 1,348 | 1,719 | 22 | 328 | 350 |
| 1991 | 681 | 7.4\% | 8,526 | 92.6\% | 9,207 | 382 | 4,867 | 5,249 | 205 | 2,482 | 2,687 | 94 | 1,177 | 1,271 |
| 1992 | 2,932 | 20.7\% | 11,232 | 79.3\% | 14,164 | 2,563 | 7,139 | 9,702 | 211 | 3,779 | 3,990 | 158 | 314 b/ | 472 |
| 1993 | 3,381 | 32.2\% | 7,104 | 67.8\% | 10,485 | 2,473 | 5,898 | 8,371 | 736 | 815 | 1,551 | 172 | 391 b/ | 563 |
| 1994 | 7,494 | 34.2\% | 14,430 | 65.8\% | 21,924 | 2,505 | 10,906 | 13,411 | 4,442 | 3,264 | 7,706 | 547 | 260 b/ | 807 |
| 1995 | 9,892 | 9.4\% | 95,833 | 90.6\% | 105,725 | 9,262 | 77,876 | 87,138 | 76 | 15,178 | 15,254 | 554 | 2,779 b/ | 3,333 |
| 1996 | 5,072 | 9.1\% | 50,574 | 90.9\% | 55,646 | 4,478 | 42,646 | 47,124 | 249 | 6,411 | 6,660 | 345 | 1,517 b/ | 1,862 |
| 1997 | 3,767 | 17.6\% | 17,580 | 82.4\% | 21,347 | 2,845 | 11,507 | 14,352 | 820 | 5,387 | 6,207 | 102 | 686 b/ | 788 |
| 1998 | 2,307 | 5.3\% | 40,882 | 94.7\% | 43,189 | 1,974 | 24,460 | 26,434 | 192 | 14,296 | 14,488 | 141 | 2,126 b/ | 2,267 |
| 1999 | 6,583 | 35.6\% | 11,933 | 64.4\% | 18,516 | 4,154 | 6,753 | 10,907 | 2,027 | 5,037 | 7,064 | 402 | $143 \mathrm{c} /$ | 545 |
| 2000 | 3,163 | 5.7\% | 52,310 | 94.3\% | 55,473 | 1,964 | 24,880 | 26,844 | 1,028 | 26,018 | 27,046 | 171 | 1,412 d/ | 1,583 |
| 2001 | 1,214 | 2.1\% | 55,895 | 97.9\% | 57,109 | 914 | 36,152 | 37,066 | 204 | 17,971 | 18,175 | 96 | 1,772 d/ | 1,868 |
| 2002 | 3,812 | 21.0\% | 14,344 | 79.0\% | 18,156 | 2,566 | 10,310 | 12,876 | 1,078 | 3,475 | 4,553 | 168 | 559 d/ | 727 |
| 2003 | 1,547 | 2.4\% | 62,815 | 97.6\% | 64,362 | 758 | 31,195 | 31,953 | 634 | 29,752 | 30,386 | 155 | 1,867 d/ | 2,022 |
| 2004 | 5,224 | 17.7\% | 24,310 | 82.3\% | 29,534 | 3,839 | 11,545 | 15,384 | 1,059 | 12,384 | 13,443 | 327 | 381 d/ | 708 |

Trinity River Fall-run Chinook Salmon estimates Upstream of Willow Creek Weir

a/ The 1978 sport harvest of fall-run Chinook was essentially eliminated by a salmon fishing closure beginning 25 August 1978.
b/ The sport harvest of adult fall-run Chinook was limited by fishing closures to the taking of Chinook salmon greater than or equal to 56 cm total length during these years.
The closures took effect 22 September 1985, 5 November 1992, 9 October 1993, and 3 October 1994. The Trinity River was subject to seasonal closures during the 1995-
' 98 seasons, commencing 9 September in the lower river. Various periods of openings and closures (seasons) were instituted along the river through November 30 .
c/ The 1999 sport harvest of Trinity River fall-run Chinook was managed with a quota system. In 1999, the quota was 957 adult fall-run Chinook.
d/ The 2001-2004 sport harvest of Trinity River fall-run Chinook was managed with a quota system. The quota for adult fall-run Chinook salmon was 9,834 in 2001; 6,926 in $2002 ; 10,800$ in 2003 and 4,700 in 2004.

Appendix 17. Coho salmon run-size, spawner escapement and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek Weir from 1977 through 2004

| Year | Run-size estimate |  |  |  |  | Spawner escapements |  |  |  |  |  | Angler harvest |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grilse |  | Adults |  |  | Natural |  |  | Trinity River Hatchery |  |  | Grilse | Adults | Total |
|  |  |  | Total | Grilse | Adults | Total | Grilse | Adults | Total |  |  |  |
|  | Number | Percent |  |  | Number | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977 | 3,106 | 80.5\% | 752 | 19.5\% | 3,858 | 1,756 | 25 | 1,781 | 1,230 | 698 | 1,928 | 120 | 29 | 149 |
| 1978 | 6,685 | 73.2\% | 2,447 | 26.8\% | 9,132 | 4,309 | 1,168 | 5,477 | 2,376 | 1,279 | 3,655 | Fishin | sure a/ | 0 |
| 1979 | 9,067 | 78.0\% | 2,557 | 22.0\% | 11,624 | 5,567 | 1,695 | 7,262 | 2,793 | 742 | 3,535 | 707 | 120 | 827 |
| 1980 | 2,499 | 41.0\% | 3,595 | 59.0\% | 6,094 | 954 | 1,817 | 2,771 | 1,545 | 1,778 | 3,323 |  |  | 0 |
| 1981 | 6,144 | 56.0\% | 4,826 | 44.0\% | 10,970 | 3,486 | 1,995 | 5,481 | 1,994 | 2,529 | 4,523 | 664 | 302 | 966 |
| 1982 | 2,021 | 17.5\% | 9,508 | 82.5\% | 11,529 | 1,158 | 5,097 | 6,255 | 823 | 3,975 | 4,798 | 40 | 436 | 476 |
| 1983 | 536 | 27.2\% | 1,435 | 72.8\% | 1,971 | 295 | 788 | 1,083 | 192 | 514 | 706 | 49 | 133 | 182 |
| 1984 | 15,208 | 77.2\% | 4,486 | 22.8\% | 19,694 | 6,188 | 2,971 | 9,159 | 7,727 | 1,134 | 8,861 | 1,293 | 381 | 1,674 |
| 1985 | 9,216 | 23.7\% | 29,717 | 76.3\% | 38,933 | 4,798 | 21,586 | 26,384 | 4,237 | 7,549 | 11,786 | 181 | 582 b/ | 763 |
| 1986 | 18,909 | 67.6\% | 9,063 | 32.4\% | 27,972 | 13,034 | 6,247 | 19,281 | 5,402 | 2,589 | 7,991 | 473 | 227 | 700 |
| 1987 | 7,253 | 12.3\% | 51,826 | 87.7\% | 59,079 | 3,975 | 28,398 | 32,373 | 2,865 | 20,473 | 23,338 | 413 | 2,955 | 3,368 |
| 1988 | 2,731 | 7.0\% | 36,173 | 93.0\% | 38,904 | 1,850 | 22,277 | 24,127 | 743 | 12,073 | 12,816 | 138 | 1,823 | 1,961 |
| 1989 | 290 | 1.5\% | 18,462 | 98.5\% | 18,752 | 208 | 13,274 | 13,482 | 77 | 4,893 | 4,970 | 5 | 295 | 300 |
| 1990 | 412 | 10.6\% | 3,485 | 89.4\% | 3,897 | 234 | 1,981 | 2,215 | 173 | 1,462 | 1,635 | 5 | 42 | 47 |
| 1991 | 265 | 2.9\% | 8,859 | 97.1\% | 9,124 | 164 | 6,163 | 6,327 | 98 | 2,590 | 2,688 | 3 | 106 | 109 |
| 1992 | 2,378 | 23.0\% | 7,961 | 77.0\% | 10,339 | 1,168 | 5,565 | 6,733 | 1,210 | 2,372 | 3,582 | 0 | 24 | 24 |
| 1993 | 573 | 10.2\% | 5,048 | 89.8\% | 5,621 | 416 | 3,024 | 3,440 | 93 | 2,024 | 2,117 | 64 | 0 | 64 |
| 1994 | 613 | 71.9\% | 239 | 28.1\% | 852 | 453 | 105 | 558 | 160 | 134 | 294 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1995 | 634 | 3.9\% | 15,477 | 96.1\% | 16,111 | 370 | 10,680 | 11,050 | 264 | 4,503 | 4,767 | 0 | 294 | 294 |
| 1996 | 1,269 | 3.5\% | 35,391 | 96.5\% | 36,660 | 1,149 | 25,308 | 26,457 | 120 | 9,835 | 9,955 | 0 | 248 | $248 \mathrm{c} /$ |
| 1997 | 5,951 | 75.0\% | 1,984 | 25.0\% | 7,935 | 5,038 | 1,097 | 6,135 | 871 | 887 | 1,758 | 42 | 0 | $42 \mathrm{c} /$ |
| 1998 | 2,471 | 19.8\% | 10,009 | 80.2\% | 12,480 | 1,494 | 5,995 | 7,489 | 977 | 4,014 | 4,991 | 0 | 0 | $0 \mathrm{c} /$ |
| 1999 | 623 | 11.3\% | 4,912 | 88.7\% | 5,535 | 234 | 1,696 | 1,930 | 389 | 3,118 | 3,507 | 0 | 98 | $98 \mathrm{c} /$ |
| 2000 | 5,486 | 35.3\% | 10,046 | 64.7\% | 15,532 | 4,560 | 6,585 | 11,145 | 926 | 3,461 | 4,387 | 0 | 0 | $0 \mathrm{c} /$ |
| 2001 | 3,670 | 11.4\% | 28,470 | 88.6\% | 32,140 | 2,644 | 18,715 | 21,359 | 1,026 | 9,755 | 10,781 | 0 | 0 | $0 \mathrm{c} /$ |
| 2002 | 1,709 | 10.7\% | 14,307 | 89.3\% | 16,016 | 1,006 | 7,812 | 8,818 | 703 | 6,495 | 7,198 | 0 | 0 | $0 \mathrm{c} /$ |
| 2003 | 3,501 | 12.4\% | 24,651 | 87.6\% | 28,152 | 2,038 | 14,255 | 16,293 | 1,463 | 10,396 | 11,859 | 0 | 0 | $0 \mathrm{c} /$ |
| 2004 | 5,819 | 15.0\% | 33,063 | 85.0\% | 38,882 | 4,742 | 23,117 | 27,859 | 1,077 | 9,906 | 10,983 | o | 40 | 40 cl |

Trinity River Coho Salmon Run-size Estimates Upstream of Willow Creek Weir

a/ The 1978 sport harvest of coho was essentially eliminated by a salmon fishing closure beginning 25 August 1978
b/ The 1985 sport harvest of adult coho was limited by a closure for the taking salmon greater than or equal to 56 cm total length beginning 22 September 1985 .
c/ The 1996-'04 sport fishery was closed to the take of coho salmon.

Appendix 18. Fall-run adult steelhead run-size, spawner escapement and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek Weir from 1977 through 2004.


## Trinity River Adult Fall-run Steelhead Run-size Estimates Upstream of Willow Creek Weir


a/ Adult steelhead are greater than 41 centimeters, fork length
b/ Trinity River Hatchery-produced steelhead.
c/ Naturally produced steelhead.
d/ The natural spawner escapement reflects an overestimate due to the unknown number of fish harvested by anglers upstream of Willow Creek Weir
e/ Harvest was limited to hatchery produced fish only. Hatchery fish are those with an adipose fin-clip.

Appendix 19. Flow in cubic feet per second in the Trinity River at USGS guage (11530000) in Hoopa from August 20th through December 3rd 2004.


Appendix 20. Flow in cubic feet per second in the Trinity River at USGS guage (11525500) near Lewiston from July 9th through December 3rd 2004.


Appendix 21. Daily minimum, maximum, and average temperatures in degrees Celsius recorded at the Willow Creek weir trapping site from September 17th through November 19th 2004.


# ANNUAL REPORT <br> TRINITY RIVER BASIN SALMON AND STEELHEAD MONITORING PROJECT 2004-05 SEASON 

TASK 2
SURVIVAL AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FISHERIES AND SPAWNER ESCAPEMENTS MADE BY CHINOOK SALMON PRODUCED AT TRINITY RIVER HATCHERY
by
Wade Sinnen


#### Abstract

Recovery of marked spring-run (spring) and fall-run (fall) Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) at Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) was conducted between 7 September, 2004 and 15 March, 2005. Of the 19,679 Chinook salmon that entered TRH, we recovered 4,721 adipose fin-clipped (AD) Chinook salmon, $24.0 \%$ of the total. Of these, coded-wire tags (CWT) were recovered from 1,385 spring Chinook and 3,128 fall Chinook salmon.

We estimated that 2,761 marked (AD+CWT) spring Chinook returned to the Trinity River upstream of the Junction City Weir (JCW) and 6,351 marked fall Chinook returned to the Trinity River upstream of the Willow Creek Weir (WCW) during the 2004-05 season.

Run-size, in-river angler harvest, and spawner escapements of marked TRH spring and fall Chinook salmon for the 1999 through 2002 brood years (BY's) are presented. Complete returns are only available for both runs of fish from the 1999 brood year. These fish have reached age five and are considered to have completed their life cycle. Chinook return rates for the completed 1999 BY ranged from $1.7 \%$ to $2.2 \%$ for spring Chinook fingerling CWT groups and $0.30 \%$ to $0.55 \%$ for fall Chinook fingerlings. Returns of spring Chinook released as yearlings was estimated at $3.2 \%$, while fall Chinook yearlings returned at a rate of $2.0 \%$.

Based on estimated total spring Chinook run-size above Junction City Weir and fall Chinook run-size above Willow Creek Weir, we estimate that the hatchery produced portion of these two runs was $70.1 \%$ and $87.9 \%$ respectively.

Returns of BY 1999-2000 Trinity River Hatchery-produced fall Chinook were negatively impacted by a fish kill in the lower Klamath River that occurred in fall, 2002.


## TASK OBJECTIVES

To determine relative return rates and the contribution to spawning escapement and the fisheries made by Chinook salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery, and to evaluate experimental hatchery management practices aimed at increasing adult returns, while reducing competition among wild fish.

## INTRODUCTION

During the period of 7 September, 2004 through 15 March, 2005, the California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG) Trinity River Project recaptured Chinook salmon returning to Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) from previously marked brood years (BY's). Marked Chinook (AD+CWT) were identified by an adipose fin-clip (AD). These fish were implanted with a binary coded-wire tag (CWT) prior to their release from TRH as either smolts or yearlings. Both spring-run (spring) and fall-run (fall) Chinook were representatively marked at a rate of approximately $25 \%$. Prior to 1995 , the CDFG was responsible for the coded-wire tagging program at TRH. Beginning in 1995, the coded-wire tagging program at TRH has been conducted by the Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries Department. Due to the change in responsibilities, the Department will no longer report on the juvenile tagging effort at TRH. Our efforts are directed at the recovery of these coded-wire tagged fish and analyzing the information derived from their recovery. This study is a continuation of previous studies conducted by the CDFG and is reliant on data presented in Sinnen 2000, 2002, 2004a, 2004b and 2005.

## METHODS

We examined all salmon entering TRH for fin-clips and Project tags (also part of TASK 1). The heads from AD-clipped salmon were retained for later coded-wire tag removal and decoding.

The information needed to estimate the numbers of salmon of a specific CWT group that returned to the Trinity River basin, and contributed to the fisheries and spawner escapement are; 1) total run-size, 2) angler harvest rate, 3) proportion of the run comprised of marked fish, and 4) proportion of CWT groups recovered at TRH. Independent estimates of spring and fall Chinook run-size and angler harvest rates for each race of Chinook are required. Methods to determine total run-size and angler harvest rate estimates were presented in "TASK 1" of this report.

To estimate the numbers of the salmon above a specific weir site with a CWT, we used the equation:

$$
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT}}=\frac{\mathrm{NW}_{\text {ADclip }}}{\mathrm{NW}} \mathrm{X} \mathrm{NH}_{\mathrm{NH} H_{\text {ADclip }}}^{\mathrm{NHT}} \mathrm{X} \quad \mathrm{~N}_{\text {run-size estimate }}
$$

where, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT}}=$ estimated number of the specific species of salmon above the weir with a CWT; $\mathrm{NW}_{\text {ADclip }}=$ number of salmon observed at the weir with an AD clip; $\mathrm{NW}=$ total number of salmon observed at the respective weir; $\mathrm{NH}_{\mathrm{ADCWT}}=$ number of salmon observed at TRH with an AD clip and a CWT; $\mathrm{NH}_{\text {ADclip }}=$ total number of AD-clipped salmon observed at TRH; and $\mathrm{N}_{\text {run-size }}$ estimate $=$ run-size estimate.

Using the various CWT groups recovered at TRH, we estimated the fraction of the population upstream of the weir with a specific CWT with the equation:

$$
\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}=\frac{\mathrm{NH}_{\mathrm{CWT} \mathrm{group}}}{\mathrm{NH}_{\mathrm{ADCWT}}}
$$

where, $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}=$ fraction of the salmon population with a specific CWT code; and $\mathrm{NH}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}=$ number of salmon observed at TRH with a specific CWT code.

We estimated the total number of Chinook salmon upstream of the weir with a specific CWT code with the equation:

$$
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT}} \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \mathrm{~F}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}
$$

where, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}=$ estimated total number of salmon of a specific CWT group.
The estimated number of fish from each CWT group caught in the Trinity River sport fishery upstream of the weir was then estimated by the equation:

$$
\mathrm{SF}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }} \mathrm{X} \quad \mathrm{~N}_{\text {harvest rate estimate }}
$$

where, $\mathrm{SF}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}=$ number of salmon of a specific CWT group caught in the Trinity River sport fishery; and $\mathrm{N}_{\text {harvest rate estimate }}=$ harvest rate estimate.

We estimated the total number of fish of a specific CWT code group available to the spawner escapement by the equation:

$$
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { escapement }}=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}-\mathrm{SF}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}
$$

where, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { escapement }}=$ the total number of salmon of a specific CWT group available to the spawner escapement.
The estimated number of salmon of specific CWT code group available to natural spawner escapement was:

$$
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { natural escapement }}=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { escapement }}-\mathrm{NH}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}
$$

where, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { natural ssapement }}=$ the estimated number of a specific CWT group contributing to natural spawning escapement.

As stated above, estimating the total return of individual CWT groups depends on a basin runsize estimate. In evaluating the return of CWT hatchery Chinook, we normally report on the individual year's return along with a summary of each CWT group throughout their five-year life cycle.

Run size estimates for spring and fall Chinook are calculated for the Trinity River upstream of the JCW (river km [RKM] 137.1) and the WCW (RKM 36.4), respectively.

In this report, we present estimated contribution rates of TRH-produced Chinook salmon to total spring and fall Chinook run-sizes. This is accomplished by expanding each of the individual CWT estimated run-sizes, by its corresponding hatchery expansion factor (total releases represented by each CWT release group/CWT'ed fish released). In doing this, we assume that marked fish are representative of their unmarked counterparts.

## RESULTS

## Coded-wire tag recovery

We recovered 4,721 AD-clipped Chinook at TRH this season, of which we recovered CWT's from 1,385 spring Chinook and 3,128 fall Chinook (Table 1). The remaining 208 AD-clipped fish had either shed their CWT (140) or the CWT was lost or unreadable (68). Chinook without CWT's were classified as either spring- or fall-run based on their date of entry into TRH. Fish which entered the hatchery prior to 11 October were considered spring Chinook, while Chinook entering after 23 October were considered fall fish. Recovered spring Chinook CWT's were composed of 20 release groups from the 1999 through 2002 BY's. Recovered fall Chinook with CWT's were from 32 groups representing the 1999 through 2002 BY's (Table 1).

| Release data |  |  |  |  |  |  | Recovery data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CWT a/ | Egg | Brood | Date | Size |  |  | Males |  | Females |  | Total No. |
| code | source | year |  | Number | (No./lb) | Site | No. | FLb/ | No. | FL b/ |  |
| Spring-run chinook salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065251 | TRH | 1999 | 06/1-07/00 | 49,421 | 40.8 | TRH | 1 | 97.0 | 0 | ---- | 1 |
| 065252 | TRH | 1999 | 06/1-07/00 | 51,993 | 40.8 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 1 | 78.0 | 1 |
| 065253 | TRH | 1999 | 06/1-07/00 | 46,966 | 50.6 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 0 | ---- | 0 |
| 065258 | TRH | 1999 | 10/03-06/00 | 129,919 | 10.3 | TRH | 9 | 88.7 | 5 | 79.2 | 14 |
| 065260 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 33,049 | 33.3 | TRH | 8 | 89.6 | 17 | 77.2 | 25 |
| 065261 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 32,621 | 33.3 | TRH | 14 | 85.0 | 21 | 77.7 | 35 |
| 065262 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 24,480 | 33.3 | TRH | 5 | 87.4 | 11 | 76.0 | 16 |
| 065263 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 34,385 | 33.3 | TRH | 13 | 88.2 | 27 | 77.5 | 40 |
| 065264 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 31,587 | 42.0 | TRH | 8 | 84.4 | 20 | 79.9 | 28 |
| 065269 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 52,491 | 33.3 | TRH | 27 | 86.8 | 38 | 77.1 | 65 |
| 065270 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 52,580 | 42.0 | TRH | 24 | 85.6 | 34 | 79.5 | 58 |
| 065279 | TRH | 2000 | 10/1-10/01 | 99,304 | 7.9 | TRH | 157 | 80.1 | 254 | 74.0 | 411 |
| 065281 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 89,482 | 39.0 | TRH | 20 | 71.4 | 42 | 67.4 | 62 |
| 065282 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 89,978 | 39.0 | TRH | 16 | 73.8 | 26 | 67.5 | 42 |
| 065283 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 73,788 | 45.0 | TRH | 15 | 72.8 | 22 | 68.8 | 37 |
| 065288 | TRH | 2001 | 10/10-16/02 | 104,627 | 8.3 | TRH | 191 | 65.7 | 156 | 63.7 | 347 |
| 065295 | TRH | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 89,284 | 44.5 | TRH | 74 | 51.7 | 0 | ---- | 74 |
| 065296 | TRH | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 84,568 | 44.5 | TRH | 57 | 51.5 | 0 | ---- | 57 |
| 065297 | TRH | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 70,902 | 44.5 | TRH | 59 | 52.6 | 0 | ---- | 59 |
| 065308 | TRH | 2002 | 10/1-7/03 | 106,139 | 11.4 | TRH | 13 | 45.3 | 0 | ---- | 13 |
| Lost CWT c/ e/ No CWT d/ e/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 | 69.4 | 14 | 70.3 | 25 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 29 | 64.8 | 19 | 68.3 | 48 |
|  |  |  |  | Spring-run c | ook salmo | otals: | 751 |  | 707 |  | 1,458 |
| Fall-run chinook salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065254 | TRH | 1999 | 06/1-07/00 | 44,654 | 79.4 | TRH | 2 | 93.5 | 0 | ---- | 2 |
| 065255 | TRH | 1999 | 06/1-07/00 | 42,549 | 79.4 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 1 | 84.0 | 1 |
| 065256 | TRH | 1999 | 06/1-07/00 | 43,565 | 90.5 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 1 | 91.0 | 1 |
| 065257 | TRH | 1999 | 06/1-07/00 | 50,533 | 90.5 | TRH | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | ---- | 1 |
| 065259 | TRH | 1999 | 10/03-06/00 | 296,892 | 14.7 | TRH | 9 | 91.7 | 11 | 84.2 | 20 |
| 065265 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 32,795 | 56.5 | TRH | 4 | 90.8 | 4 | 81.5 | 8 |
| 065266 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 33,806 | 56.5 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 2 | 79.5 | 2 |
| 065267 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 34,852 | 56.5 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 4 | 80.0 | 4 |
| 065268 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 33,240 | 86.0 | TRH | 1 | 77.0 | 7 | 76.0 | 8 |
| 065271 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 54,867 | 56.5 | TRH | 4 | 86.3 | 9 | 81.4 | 13 |
| 065272 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 36,035 | 56.5 | TRH | 2 | 88.0 | 2 | 86.5 | 4 |
| 065273 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 57,444 | 56.5 | TRH | 2 | 91.0 | 7 | 73.3 | 9 |
| 065274 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 32,096 | 56.5 | TRH | 3 | 90.3 | 4 | 86.5 | 7 |
| 065275 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 64,250 | 56.5 | TRH | 2 | 84.5 | 6 | 77.5 | 8 |
| 065276 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 27,159 | 56.5 | TRH | 4 | 87.8 | 2 | 89.5 | 6 |
| 065277 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 56,582 | 86.0 | TRH | 2 | 84.0 | 10 | 79.0 | 12 |
| 065278 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 34,183 | 86.0 | TRH | 2 | 89.0 | 5 | 79.2 | 7 |
| 065643 | TRH | 2000 | 06/6-06/13/01 | 25,007 | 86.0 | TRH | 3 | 90.3 | 2 | 77.5 | 5 |
| 065280 | TRH | 2000 | 10/1-10/10/01 | 216,593 | 12.3 | TRH | 156 | 84.0 | 171 | 77.7 | 327 |
| 065284 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 119,555 | 71.0 | TRH | 10 | 71.7 | 17 | 69.5 | 27 |
| 065285 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 114,119 | 71.0 | TRH | 13 | 68.9 | 20 | 67.8 | 33 |
| 065286 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 126,135 | 86.0 | TRH | 17 | 70.4 | 24 | 68.3 | 41 |
| 065287 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 121,607 | 86.0 | TRH | 18 | 69.7 | 16 | 68.4 | 34 |
| 065289 | TRH | 2001 | 10/10-16/02 | 230,055 | 13.5 | TRH | 1,181 | 67.0 | 1,122 | 64.7 | 2,303 |
| 065290 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 10,234 | 126.0 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 2 | 68.0 | 2 |
| 065291 | TRH | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 8,269 | 126.0 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 1 | 66.0 | 1 |
| 065292 | TRH | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 10,355 | 105.5 | TRH | 0 | ---- | 0 | ---- | 0 |
| 065298 | TRH | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 124,602 | 76.0 | TRH | 63 | 50.7 | 0 | --- | 63 |
| 065299 | TRH | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 126,729 | 76.0 | TRH | 52 | 50.1 | 2 | 52.5 | 54 |
| 065306 | TRH | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 124,014 | 84.5 | TRH | 54 | 50.3 | 0 | ---- | 54 |
| 065307 | TRH | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 123,263 | 84.5 | TRH | 35 | 50.6 | 0 | ---- | 35 |
| 065309 | TRH | 2002 | 10/1-7/03 | 236,319 | 16.7 | TRH | 35 | 45.8 | 1 | 65.0 | 36 |
| Lost CWT c/e/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 64.5 | 23 | 66.3 | 43 |
| No CWT d/e/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 51 | 64.1 | 41 | 67.5 | 92 |
|  |  |  |  | Fall-run chinook salmon totals: |  |  | 1,746 |  | 1,517 |  | 3,263 |

a/ CWT = Coded-wire tag.
b/ FL = Mean fork length in cm .
c/ CWT lost during recovery.
d/ No CWT was detected.
e/ Assigned as either spring-run or fall-run chinook based on entry date into Trinity River Hatchery

Run-size, angler harvest, and escapement of coded-wire tagged salmon

## Spring-run Chinook salmon

Based on estimated total Chinook run-size above JCW, the AD-clip rate of spring Chinook at JCW, the estimated angler harvest rate, and recovery of spring-run CWT fish at TRH, we estimated that 2,761 CWT'ed spring Chinook salmon returned to the Trinity River above JCW during the 2004-05 season. An estimated 148 of these fish were harvested by anglers during the season. Escapement of CWT'ed spring Chinook was divided between 1,385 fish recovered at TRH and 1,228 estimated to have spawned in natural areas (Table 2).

The year's run of CWT'd spring Chinook was composed of 405 (14.7\%) age 2, 973 (35.2\%) age $3,1,355(49.0 \%)$ age 4 and 32 (1.2\%) age 5 fish (Table2).

## 1999 brood year

Four spring Chinook CWT groups from the 1999 BY completed their life cycle this season, having reached the age of five. Estimated in-river age five returns occurred for three of the four groups. We estimated 32 fish returned from these groups (Table 3), with the majority of returns from the yearling release group, 065258. Cumulative return rates, expressed as a percentage of release numbers, ranged from $1.7 \%$ to $2.9 \%$ and averaged $2.26 \%$ for the groups released as fingerlings and $3.3 \%$ for the group released as yearlings (Table 3). Thus, yearlings returned at a rate approximately 1.5 that of their fingerling released counterparts. The fingerling groups experienced their best returns as age three fish, while the yearling group returned at its highest rate as age four fish.

## 2000 brood year

Spring Chinook from the 2000 brood year will complete their life cycle next year. To date, fish from this brood have returned through age four. Chinook from this brood have experienced good return rates thus far. The fingerling release groups, 065251,065252 , and 065253 have all surpassed return rates of $1.3 \%$ through age four (Table 3). The yearling group, 065258, has also performed well, returning at a rate over 2\%. Similar to BY 1999 releases, fingerlings have experienced their highest returns at age three. Yearlings also experienced their highest return as age three fish.

2001 brood year
Three fingerling release groups, 065281,065281 , and 065283 and one yearling release group, 065288, have returned as age two and three-year-old fish thus far. Returns to date for all of these groups are well behind returns from the 1999 and 2000 BY groups. Return rates are less than $0.8 \%$ for all of the groups through age three (Table 3). Spring Chinook from these groups will be returning as four- and five-year-olds during 2005 and 2006 respectively.

Table 2. Run-size, angler harvest, and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatchery produced, coded-wire tagged, spring and fall chinook salmon returning to the Trinity River during the 2004-05 season.

| Run-size estimates a/ |  | Harvest rates b/ |  | TRH Ads With | $\begin{gathered} \text { \%o } \\ \text { Weir } \end{gathered}$ | Ad+CWT <br> Run-size <br> estimates e/ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Grilse | Adults | CWTs c/ | Ads d/ |  |
| Spring Chinook (JCW) | 16,147 | 8.0\% | 4.9\% | 0.95 | 17.95\% | 2,761 |
| Fall Chinook (WCW) | 29,534 | 6.3\% | $1.6 \%$ | 0.96 | 22.46\% | 6,351 |



| Fall-run chinook salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 065254 | 99 | 5 | 2 | 0.1\% | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 065255 | 99 | 5 | 1 | $0.0 \%$ | 2 | O | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 065256 | 99 | 5 | 1 | $0.0 \%$ | 2 | O | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 065257 | 99 | 5 | 1 | $0.0 \%$ | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 065259 | 99 | 5 | 20 | $0.6 \%$ | 41 | 1 | 20 | 20 | 40 |
| 065265 | 00 | 4 | 8 | $0.3 \%$ | 16 | O | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| 065266 | 00 | 4 | 2 | $0.1 \%$ | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 065267 | 0 O | 4 | 4 | $0.1 \%$ | 8 | O | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 065268 | OO | 4 | 8 | $0.3 \%$ | 16 | O | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| 065271 | OO | 4 | 13 | 0.4\% | 26 | O | 13 | 13 | 26 |
| 065272 | OO | 4 | 4 | $0.1 \%$ | 8 | O | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 065273 | 0 O | 4 | 9 | $0.3 \%$ | 18 | O | 9 | 9 | 18 |
| 065274 | OO | 4 | 7 | 0.2\% | 14 | O | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| 065275 | OO | 4 | 8 | $0.3 \%$ | 16 | O | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| 065276 | OO | 4 | 6 | $0.2 \%$ | 12 | O | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| 065277 | 0 O | 4 | 12 | 0.4\% | 24 | O | 12 | 12 | 24 |
| 065278 | 0 O | 4 | 7 | 0.2\% | 14 | O | 7 | 7 | 14 |
| 065280 | 0 O | 4 | 327 | 10.5\% | 664 | 11 | 327 | 326 | 653 |
| 065643 | 0 O | 4 | 5 | $0.2 \%$ | 10 | O | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 065284 | 01 | 3 | 27 | 0.9\% | 55 | 1 | 27 | 27 | 54 |
| 065285 | 01 | 3 | 33 | 1.1\% | 67 | 1 | 33 | 33 | 66 |
| 065286 | 01 | 3 | 41 | $1.3 \%$ | 83 | 1 | 41 | 41 | 82 |
| 065287 | 01 | 3 | 34 | $1.1 \%$ | 69 | 1 | 34 | 34 | 68 |
| 065289 | 01 | 3 | 2,303 | 73.6\% | 4,676 | 75 | 2,303 | 2,298 | 4,601 |
| 065290 | 01 | 3 | 2 | 0.1\% | 4 | O | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 065291 | 01 | 3 | 1 | $0.0 \%$ | 2 | O | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 065292 | 02 | 2 | O | 0.0\% | 0 | 0 | O | 0 | O |
| 065298 | 02 | 2 | 63 | $2.0 \%$ | 128 | 8 | 63 | 57 | 120 |
| 065299 | 02 | 2 | 54 | $1.7 \%$ | 110 | 7 | 54 | 49 | 103 |
| 065306 | 02 | 2 | 54 | $1.7 \%$ | 110 | 7 | 54 | 49 | 103 |
| 065307 | 02 | 2 | 35 | $1.1 \%$ | 71 | 4 | 35 | 32 | 67 |
| 065309 | 02 | 2 | 36 | 1.2\% | 73 | 5 | 36 | 32 | 68 |
|  |  |  | 3,128 | 100\% | 6,351 | 125 | 3,128 | 3,098 | 6,226 |

a/ Run-size estimates are upstream of either Willow Creek weir (WCW) or Junction City weir (JCW) and are inclusive of the entire run (hatchery produced and naturally produced).
b/ In-river angler harvest rates are based on the return of reward tags.
c/ A portion of all chinook released from Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) are coded-wire tagged and
identified with an adipose (Ad) fin-clip. The fraction shown are those fish with an adipose fin-clip
that also contained a coded-wire tag (CWT), including those lost during recovery.
d) The observed percentage of Ad-clipped Chinook at respective weir sites.
e/ The estimated run of chinook that were coded-wire tagged.

Table 3. Run-size, percent return, in-river sport catch and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatchery-produced, coded-wire-tagged spring-run chinook salmon returning to the Trinity River upstream of Junction City Weir during the period 2001 through 2004.

a/ CWT = coded-wire tag.
b/ Chinook salmon released during June were smolts, those released in October were yearlings.
c/ TRH = Trinity River Hatchery.
d/ Totals are presented only for brood year 1999. These fish have reached five years of age and are considered to have completed their life cycle.
e/ The term "adults" includes chinook aged three through five.

Table 3. (continued) Run-size, percent return, in-river sport catch and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatchery-produce coded-wire-tagged spring-run chinook salmon returning to the Trinity River upstream of Junction City Weir during the period 2001 through 2004.

| Release data |  |  |  |  | Estimated returns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CWT a/ | Brood year | Date b/ | Number | Site | Age | Runsize | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { release } \end{gathered}$ | River harvest | Spawning escapement |  |  |
| code |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRH cl | Natural | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065264 | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 31,587 | TRH | 2 | 33 | 0.1045 | 1 | 13 | 19 | 32 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 386 | 1.222 | 17 | 152 | 217 | 369 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 56 | 0.1773 | 3 | 28 | 25 | 53 |
| 065269 | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 52,491 | TRH | 2 | 73 | 0.1391 | 2 | 29 | 42 | 71 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 834 | 1.5888 | 36 | 328 | 470 | 798 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 130 | 0.2477 | 6 | 65 | 58 | 123 |
| 065270 | 2000 | 06/6-13/01 | 52,580 | TRH | 2 | 45 | 0.0856 | 1 | 18 | 26 | 44 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 567 | 1.0784 | 25 | 223 | 319 | 542 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 116 | 0.2206 | 6 | 58 | 52 | 110 |
| 065279 | 2000 | 10/1-10/01 | 99,304 | TRH | 2 | 45 | 0.0453 | 1 | 18 | 26 | 44 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1,126 | 1.1339 | 49 | 443 | 634 | 1,077 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 819 | 0.8247 | 40 | 411 | 368 | 779 |
| 065281 | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 89,482 | TRH | 2 | 5 | 0.0056 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 124 | 0.1386 | 6 | 62 | 56 | 118 |
| 065282 | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 89,978 | TRH | 2 | 20 | 0.0222 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 20 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 84 | 0.0934 | 4 | 42 | 38 | 80 |
| 065283 | 2001 | 06/3-10/02 | 73,788 | TRH | 2 | 5 | 0.0068 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 74 | 0.1003 | 4 | 37 | 33 | 70 |
| 065288 | 2001 | 10/10-16/02 | 104,627 | TRH | 2 | 43 | 0.0411 | 0 | 17 | 26 | 43 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 692 | 0.6614 | 34 | 347 | 311 | 658 |
| 065295 | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 89,284 | TRH | 2 | 148 | 0.1658 | 12 | 74 | 62 | 136 |
| 065296 | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 84,568 | TRH | 2 | 114 | 0.1348 | 9 | 57 | 48 | 105 |
| 065297 | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 70,902 | TRH | 2 | 118 | 0.1664 | 9 | 59 | 49 | 108 |
| 065308 | 2002 | 10/1-7/03 | 106,139 | TRH | 2 | 26 | 0.0245 | 2 | 13 | 11 | 24 |

## a/ CWT = coded-wire tag.

b/ Chinook salmon released during June were smolts, those released in October were yearlings.
c/ TRH = Trinity River Hatchery.
d/ Totals are presented only for brood year 1999. These fish have reached five years of age and are considered to have completed their life cycle.
e/ The term "adults" includes chinook aged three through five.

## 2002 brood year

Four release groups (3 fingerling and 1 yearling) from the 2002 BY returned as two-year-olds this season. Return rates for all these groups, through age 2, appear average as compared to the previous three brood years (Table 3). Spring Chinook from this BY are expected to return as three through five-year-olds during the next three years.

## Fall-run Chinook salmon

Based on estimated total Chinook run-size above WCW, the ad-clip rate of fall Chinook at WCW, the estimated angler harvest rate, and recovery of fall-run CWT fish at TRH, we estimated that 6,351 CWT'ed fall Chinook salmon returned to the Trinity River above WCW during the 2004-05 season. We estimated that anglers harvested 125 CWT'ed fall Chinook. Escapement of CWT'ed fall Chinook was divided between 3,128 fish recovered at TRH and 3,098 estimated to have spawned naturally this season (Table 2).

The fall Chinook CWT run was composed of 491 (7.7\%) age 2, 4,956 (78.0\%) age 3, 853 ( $13.4 \%$ ) age 4 fish, and 51 ( $0.8 \%$ ) age 5 fish (Table 2).

## 1999 brood year

The BY 1999 releases were composed of four fingerling and one yearling group and have completed their life cycle this season, having reached the age of five. Return rates for fingerling releases ranged between .033 and $.055 \%$ (Table 4). The yearling groups, 065259 returned at a rate of $1.97 \%$, which is approximately 4.5 times that of the fingerling group average. All Chinook from the 1999 BY experienced their highest returns as three-year-old fish (Table 4). It must be noted that a large adult fish kill in the lower Klamath River in 2002 may have severely limited the returning number of our age three fall Chinook from 1999 BY groups (CDFG, 2003).

## 2000 brood year

The 2000 BY is represented by fourteen CWT groups, of which thirteen are fingerling groups and one a yearling group. Through age four returns, the yearling group, 065280 has returned at a rate of $2.5 \%$, approximately 3 times that of the fingerling return groups. The fingerling groups have returned at a rate ranging between 0.4 and $0.9 \%$. Returns of both release types were greatest last year as age three fish. Similar to BY 1999 returns, the fish kill also affected this BY, except that age two fish were lost. Fish released from this BY are expected to return as five-year-olds during the 2005 season.

## 2001 brood year

Returns of 2001 BY fall Chinook are complete through age 3 only. Seven release groups (6 fingerling and 1 yearling) have returned to date as two and three-year-old fish (Table 4). The yearling group, 065289 , has experienced the best returns to date, over $2 \%$ through age 3 . The

Table 4. Run-size, percent return, in-river sport catch, and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatcheryproduced, coded-wire-tagged fall-run chinook salmon returning to the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek Weir during the period 2001 through 2004.


## a/ CWT = coded-wire tag.

b/ Chinook salmon released during June were smolts, those released in October were yearlings.
c/ TRH = Trinity River Hatchery.
d/ Totals are presented only for brood year 1999. These fish have reached five years of age and are considered to have completed their life cycle.
e/ The term "adults" includes chinook aged three through five.

Table 4. (continued) Run-size, percent return, in-river sport catch, and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatchery-produced, coded-wire-tagged fall-run chinook salmon returning to the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek Weir during the period 2001 through 2004.

| Release data |  |  |  |  | Estimated returns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CWT a/ code | Brood year | Date b/ | Number | Site | Age | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Run- } \\ & \text { size } \end{aligned}$ | \% of release | River harvest | Spawning escapement |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRH c/ | Natural | Total |
| $065274$ | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 32,096 | TRH | 2 | 33 | 0.103 | 1 | 14 | 18 | 32 |
| 065275 | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 64,250 | TRH | 3 4 | 213 14 | 0.664 0.044 | 6 0 | $\begin{array}{r} 117 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ 7 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r}207 \\ 14 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 55 | 0.086 | 2 | 23 | 29 | 52 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 385 | 0.599 | 11 | 211 | 163 | 374 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 16 |  | 0 | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| 065276 | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 27,159 | TRH | 2 | 26 | 0.096 | 1 | 11 | 14 | 25 |
| 065277 | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 56,582 | TRH | 3 | 228 | 0.840 | 7 | 125 | 96 | 221 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 12 | 0.044 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 12 | 0.021 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 162 | 0.286 | 5 | 89 | 68 | 157 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 24 | 0.042 | 0 | 12 | 12 | 24 |
| 065278 | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 34,183 | TRH | 2 | 24 | 0.070 | 1 | 13 | 13 | 26 |
| 065643 | 2000 | 06/06-13/01 | 25,007 | TRH | 3 | 111 | 0.325 | 3 | 61 | 47 | 108 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 14 | 0.041 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 7 | 0.028 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 149 | 0.596 | 4 | 82 | 63 | 145 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 10 | 0.040 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 10 |
| 065280 | 2000 | 10/01-10/01 | 216,593 | TRH | 2 | 130 | 0.060 | 6 | 55 | 69 | 124 |
| 065284 | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 119,555 | TRH | 3 | 4,420 | 2.041 | 131 | 2,424 | 1,865 | 4,289 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 664 | 0.307 | 11 | 327 | 328 | 655 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 24 | 0.020 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 55 |  | 1 | 27 | 27 | 54 |
| 065285 | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 114,119 | TRH | 2 | 24 | 0.020 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 22 |
| 065286 | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 126,135 | TRH | 3 | 67 | 0.056 | 1 | 33 | 33 | 66 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 24 | 0.019 | 2 | 13 | 9 | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 83 | 0.066 | 1 | 41 | 41 | 82 |
| 065287 | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 121,607 | TRH | 2 | 27 | 0.022 | 3 | 15 | 9 | 24 |
| 065289 | 2001 | 10/10-16/02 | 230,055 | TRH | 3 | 69 |  | 1 | 34 | 34 | 68 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 137 | 0.060 | 14 | 75 | 48 | 123 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,676 | 2.033 | 75 | 2,303 | 2,312 | 4,615 |
| 065290 | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 10,234 | TRH | 2 | 2 | 0.020 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 065291 | 2001 | 06/03-10/02 | 8,269 | TRH | 3 | 4 | 0.039 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | o | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 0.024 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 065292 | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 10,355 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065298 | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 124,602 | TRH | 2 | 128 | 0.103 | 8 | 63 | 57 | 120 |
| 065299 | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 126,729 | TRH | 2 | 110 | 0.087 | 7 | 54 | 49 | 103 |
| 065306 | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 124,014 | TRH | 2 | 110 | 0.089 | 7 | 54 | 49 | 103 |
| 065307 | 2002 | 06/3-9/03 | 123,263 | TRH | 2 | 71 | 0.058 | 4 | 35 | 32 | 67 |
| 065309 | 2002 | 10/1-7/03 | 236,319 | TRH | 2 | 73 | 0.031 | 5 | 36 | 33 | 69 |

## a/ CWT = coded-wire tag.

b/ Chinook salmon released during June were smolts, those released in October were yearlings.
c/ TRH = Trinity River Hatchery.
d/ Totals are presented only for brood year 1999. These fish have reached five years of age and are considered
to have completed their life cycle.
e/ The term "adults" includes chinook aged three through five.
fingerling groups have not returned in significant numbers through age 3, none have surpassed $0.1 \%$ returns to date. Fish from both release groups should return as four and five-year-old fish in 2005 and 2006, respectively.

2002 brood year
Six CWT groups ( 5 fingerling and 1 yearling) from the 2002 BY returned as two-year-olds during the 2004 season (Table 4). Age 2 return rates were highest for the fingerling groups, with the exception of CWT group 065290, a small release group with no estimated returns, as compared to the yearling group, 065309. Chinook from this Brood will be returning as adults the next three years.

## The contribution of hatchery produced Chinook to total estimated run-size

The contribution of hatchery-produced spring and fall Chinook to the overall Trinity River basin run-size estimates for the two races of Chinook are presented in Table 5. We estimate that the 2004-05 run of spring Chinook was composed of the 11,324 Chinook of TRH origin. This represents $70.1 \%(11,324 / 16,147)$ of the total estimated run upstream of JCW. The fall run, upstream of WCW, was estimated to be composed of 25,956 TRH-produced Chinook, which represents $87.9 \%(25,956 / 29,534)$ of the total estimated run.

## DISCUSSION

Since CWT estimates are based, in part, on the overall run-size estimates for each race of Chinook, CWT estimates are subject to the precision and potential biases associated with the mark-recapture estimates performed under Task 1 of this report. The potential impact of this would be most relevant in regard to the number of fish estimated to have spawned in "natural" areas. This is due to the fact that hatchery recoveries are actual counts, while CWT'd fish estimated to have spawned naturally are the remaining estimated number of fish after hatchery CWT's and angler harvest are subtracted from the overall CWT estimate.

Two other potential biases that could distort our CWT run-size estimates are vulnerability of capture and run-timing. Assumptions of our CWT estimates include equal probability of capture for hatchery and wild fish and capture of Chinook throughout the entire run. The second assumption, due to trapping constraints at JCW which preclude operating our weir there until late June, may affect our spring-run Chinook CWT estimates.

In-river return rates for the completed 1999 BY were exceptionally good for both spring and fall Chinook fingerling and yearling releases. Spring Chinook return rates for 1999 BY releases were the highest observed during the past 14 years for both release types (Appendix 1). Fall Chinook return rates for 1999 BY releases were above average for both release types (Appendix 2), however, return rates (above WCW) may have been substantially higher had fall Chinook from this BY not experienced large losses as age three fish during the 2002 lower Klamath River
fish kill. Data collected during the kill event (CDFG, 2003) indicated that large numbers of Trinity River bound fall Chinook died in the lower Klamath. Conversely, no CWT's were collected from dead Trinity River Hatchery origin spring Chinook, indicating these fish had migrated above the "kill zone" prior to the event occurring.

The overall contribution of hatchery-produced Chinook to total run-sizes (Table 5) was very high this year. Hatchery-produced spring Chinook composed an estimated 70.1\% $(11,324 / 16,147)$ of the run upstream of Junction City weir. The contribution of hatcheryproduced fall Chinook was even greater, composing $87.9 \%(25,956 / 29,534)$ of the run upstream of Willow Creek weir. Thus, of the total 45,681 spring and fall Chinook estimated above respective weir sites, only 8,401 of these were estimated to be of natural origin.

The estimated hatchery contribution rates to overall spring and fall Chinook run-sizes are relatively high. As mentioned previously, run-size estimates may have potential bias (see TASK I), which under most scenarios would tend to be positive. However, this bias should not affect hatchery contribution rates since total CWT run-size is based on AD clip rates observed at either JCW or WCW, times total estimated runs above these sites. Thus, even if total run-size was adjusted lower, the AD clip rate would remain the same, resulting in the same hatchery contribution rates. If, however, hatchery produced fish are more vulnerable to capture or their run-timing coincides with dates of weir operations (i.e spring Chinook at JCW) more than their wild counterparts at the weirs, the estimated contribution of hatchery fish could be biased.

Another rough method to validate hatchery-produced Chinook contribution rates is to examine $A D$ clip rates at TRH and the weirs. If it is assumed that the AD clip rate at TRH is representative of the hatchery population, then the AD clip rates observed at the weirs would theoretically represent a fraction of the TRH population. Therefore, simple division of the AD clip rates observed at both weir sites by the AD rate at TRH would produce a hatchery contribution rate. The AD clip rates observed at the weirs and TRH during the 2004-05 season are the following: spring Chinook (JCW) $18.0 \%$; fall Chinook (WCW) $22.5 \%$; TRH springs $24.0 \%$; TRH falls $24.1 \%$. Performing the calculations results in a contribution rate of $75.0 \%$ for spring Chinook and $93.4 \%$ for fall Chinook. These are slightly higher than our reported rates, but within 7\%.

Table 5. Estimated run-size, angler harvest, and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatchery-produced, spring and fall chinook salmon expanded for unmarked releases (hatchery multiplier) returning to the Trinity River during the 2004-05 season. a/

| CWT code b/ | BY c/ | Age | TRH expansion factor d/ | Run size | Expanded run-size e/ | Angler harvest | Expanded angler harvest | Spawning escapement |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Expanded |  | Expanded |  | Expanded |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRH f/ | TRH | Natural | natural | Total | total |
| Spring-run chinook salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065251 | 99 | 5 | 6.7 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 13 |
| 065252 | 99 | 5 | 6.4 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 12 |
| 065253 | 99 | 5 | 6.2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065258 | 99 | 5 | 2.9 | 28 | 82 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 41 | 13 | 37 | 27 | 78 |
| 065260 | 00 | 4 | 4.2 | 50 | 211 | 2 | 10 | 25 | 105 | 23 | 95 | 48 | 200 |
| 065261 | 00 | 4 | 4.2 | 70 | 295 | 3 | 14 | 35 | 147 | 32 | 133 | 67 | 280 |
| 065262 | 00 | 4 | 4.2 | 32 | 135 | 2 | 7 | 16 | 67 | 14 | 61 | 30 | 128 |
| 065263 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 80 | 324 | 4 | 16 | 40 | 162 | 36 | 146 | 76 | 308 |
| 065264 | 00 | 4 | 4.5 | 56 | 253 | 3 | 12 | 28 | 126 | 25 | 114 | 53 | 240 |
| 065269 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 130 | 527 | 6 | 26 | 65 | 263 | 59 | 238 | 124 | 501 |
| 065270 | 00 | 4 | 4.5 | 116 | 523 | 6 | 26 | 58 | 262 | 52 | 236 | 110 | 498 |
| 065279 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 819 | 3,317 | 40 | 163 | 411 | 1,665 | 368 | 1,490 | 779 | 3,154 |
| 065281 | 01 | 3 | 4.1 | 124 | 507 | 6 | 25 | 62 | 254 | 56 | 229 | 118 | 482 |
| 065282 | 01 | 3 | 4.2 | 84 | 351 | 4 | 17 | 42 | 176 | 38 | 158 | 80 | 334 |
| 065283 | 01 | 3 | 4.1 | 74 | 303 | 4 | 15 | 37 | 151 | 33 | 137 | 70 | 288 |
| 065288 | 01 | 3 | 4.1 | 692 | 2,810 | 34 | 138 | 347 | 1,409 | 311 | 1,263 | 658 | 2,672 |
| 065295 | 02 | 2 | 4.1 | 148 | 607 | 12 | 48 | 74 | 303 | 62 | 255 | 136 | 558 |
| 065296 | 02 | 2 | 4.1 | 114 | 467 | 9 | 37 | 57 | 234 | 48 | 196 | 105 | 430 |
| 065297 | 02 | 2 | 4.1 | 118 | 484 | 9 | 39 | 59 | 242 | 50 | 203 | 109 | 445 |
| 065308 | 02 | 2 | 4.0 | 26 | 105 | 2 | 8 | 13 | 52 | 11 | 44 | 24 | 96 |
|  |  |  |  | 2,765 | 11,324 | 148 | 605 | 1,385 | 5,672 | 1,232 | 5,047 | 2,617 | 9,189 |


| Fall-run chinook salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 065254 | 99 | 5 | 10.8 | 4 | 44 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 22 | 4 | 43 |
| 065255 | 99 | 5 | 10.8 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 22 |
| 065256 | 99 | 5 | 10.8 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 22 |
| 065257 | 99 | 5 | 11.0 | 2 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 22 |
| 065259 | 99 | 5 | 2.9 | 41 | 117 | 1 | 2 | 20 | 58 | 20 | 58 | 40 | 115 |
| 065265 | 00 | 4 | 4.2 | 16 | 68 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 33 | 8 | 33 | 16 | 67 |
| 065266 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 4 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 16 |
| 065267 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 8 | 33 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 4 | 16 | 8 | 32 |
| 065268 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 16 | 67 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 33 | 8 | 33 | 16 | 66 |
| 065271 | 00 | 4 | 4.2 | 26 | 110 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 54 | 13 | 54 | 26 | 108 |
| 065272 | 00 | 4 | 4.2 | 8 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 17 | 4 | 17 | 8 | 33 |
| 065273 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 18 | 74 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 36 | 9 | 37 | 18 | 73 |
| 065274 | 00 | 4 | 4.0 | 14 | 58 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 28 | 7 | 28 | 14 | 57 |
| 065275 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 16 | 66 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 32 | 8 | 33 | 16 | 65 |
| 065276 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 12 | 50 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 24 | 6 | 24 | 12 | 49 |
| 065277 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 24 | 100 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 49 | 12 | 50 | 24 | 99 |
| 065278 | 00 | 4 | 4.1 | 14 | 59 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 29 | 7 | 29 | 14 | 58 |
| 065643 | 00 | 4 | 4.5 | 664 | 2,981 | 11 | 48 | 327 | 1,468 | 326 | 1,465 | 653 | 2,933 |
| 065280 | 00 | 4 | 4.0 | 10 | 41 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 40 |
| 065284 | 01 | 3 | 4.1 | 55 | 224 | 1 | 4 | 27 | 110 | 27 | 111 | 54 | 221 |
| 065285 | 01 | 3 | 4.3 | 67 | 290 | 1 | 5 | 33 | 143 | 33 | 143 | 66 | 286 |
| 065286 | 01 | 3 | 4.0 | 83 | 337 | 1 | 5 | 41 | 166 | 41 | 166 | 82 | 332 |
| 065287 | 01 | 3 | 4.1 | 69 | 284 | 1 | 5 | 34 | 139 | 34 | 140 | 68 | 279 |
| 065289 | 01 | 3 | 4.0 | 4,676 | 18,797 | 75 | 302 | 2,303 | 9,258 | 2,298 | 9,237 | 4,601 | 18,495 |
| 065290 | 01 | 3 | 4.1 | 4 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 16 |
| 065291 | 01 | 3 | 4.0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 065292 | 02 | 2 | 3.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065298 | 02 | 2 | 4.1 | 128 | 526 | 8 | 33 | 63 | 258 | 57 | 235 | 120 | 493 |
| 065299 | 02 | 2 | 4.0 | 110 | 442 | 7 | 28 | 54 | 217 | 49 | 197 | 103 | 414 |
| 065306 | 02 | 2 | 4.2 | 110 | 456 | 7 | 29 | 54 | 224 | 49 | 204 | 103 | 428 |
| 065307 | 02 | 2 | 4.1 | 71 | 294 | 4 | 19 | 35 | 145 | 32 | 131 | 67 | 276 |
| 065309 | 02 | 2 | 4.0 | 73 | 295 | 5 | 19 | 36 | 145 | 33 | 132 | 69 | 277 |
|  |  |  |  | 6,353 | 25,956 | 125 | 511 | 3,128 | 12,779 | 3,100 | 12,666 | 6,228 | 25,444 |

[^2]
## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Coded-wire tagging and release of smolt and yearling Chinook salmon, and the monitoring of adult salmon returns at Trinity River Hatchery should be continued in 2005-06.
2. Monitor the annual TRH-produced Chinook salmon contribution rates to the overall runs to determine the relative status of naturally produced Chinook salmon in the Trinity basin.
3. Continue spawner carcass surveys (Task IV) in the upper Trinity River to evaluate straying of TRH produced fish.
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Appendix 1. Percent return of Trinity River Hatchery produced, coded-wire tagged, spring-run Chinook salmon, brood years 1986-1999. al

|  | Fingerling releases |  |  |  | Yearling releases |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brood <br> year | Number <br> released | Number of <br> returns | Percent <br> return |  | Number <br> released | Number of <br> returns | Percent <br> return |
| 1986 | 197,113 | 103 | $0.052 \%$ |  | 101,030 | 1,960 | $1.940 \%$ |
| 1987 | 185,718 | 208 | $0.112 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1988 | 181,698 | 84 | $0.046 \%$ |  | 98,820 | 112 | $0.113 \%$ |
| 1989 | 186,413 | 7 | $0.004 \%$ |  | 102,555 | 176 | $0.172 \%$ |
| 1990 | 196,908 | 479 | $0.243 \%$ |  | 94,639 | 82 | $0.087 \%$ |
| 1991 | 198,277 | 297 | $0.150 \%$ |  | 110,797 | 68 | $0.061 \%$ |
| 1992 | 215,038 | 2,766 | $1.286 \%$ |  | 109,856 | 1,272 | $1.158 \%$ |
| 1993 | 222,056 | 1,125 | $0.507 \%$ |  | 111,525 | 958 | $0.859 \%$ |
| 1994 | 113,236 | 202 | $0.178 \%$ |  | 113,491 | 513 | $0.452 \%$ |
| 1995 | 196,211 | 450 | $0.229 \%$ |  | 101,934 | 1,581 | $1.551 \%$ |
| 1996 | 222,950 | 743 | $0.333 \%$ |  | 112,464 | 312 | $0.277 \%$ |
| 1997 | 209,155 | 1,834 | $0.877 \%$ |  | 147,507 | 4,471 | $3.031 \%$ |
| 1998 | 176,968 | 845 | $0.477 \%$ |  | 137,602 | 2,186 | $1.589 \%$ |
| 1999 | 148,380 | 3,372 | $2.273 \%$ |  | 129,919 | 4,288 | $3.301 \%$ |
|  |  | Average: | $0.483 \%$ |  |  |  | Average: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $1.122 \%$ |  |


a/ Based on estimated returns upstream of Junction City Weir. No estimate was produced in 1995, therefore returns of age 2 through 5 chinook from that brood year are hatchery returns only. Does not include ocean harvest or in-river harvest below Junction City Weir.

Appendix 2. Percent return of Trinity River Hatchery produced, coded-wire tagged, fall-run Chinook salmon, brood years 1986-1999. al

| Brood year | Fingerling releases |  |  | Yearling releases |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number released | Number of returns | Percent return | Number released | Number of returns | Percent return |
| 1986 | 393,955 | 292 | 0.074\% | 153,700 | 4,899 | 3.187\% |
| 1987 | 172,980 | 129 | 0.075\% | 92,300 | 418 | 0.453\% |
| 1988 | 194,197 | 138 | 0.071\% | 143,934 | 796 | 0.553\% |
| 1989 | 201,622 | 21 | 0.010\% | 143,978 | 174 | 0.121\% |
| 1990 |  |  |  | 103,040 | 166 | 0.161\% |
| 1991 | 206,416 | 937 | 0.454\% | 115,300 | 517 | 0.448\% |
| 1992 | 192,032 | 2,503 | 1.303\% | 108,894 | 5,369 | 4.930\% |
| 1993 | 201,032 | 158 | 0.079\% | 110,336 | 798 | 0.723\% |
| 1994 | 216,563 | 374 | 0.173\% | 113,124 | 756 | 0.668\% |
| 1995 | 216,051 | 285 | 0.132\% | 110,327 | 3,106 | 2.815\% |
| 1996 | 217,981 | 445 | 0.204\% | 112,746 | 394 | 0.349\% |
| 1997 | 216,772 | 1,707 | 0.787\% | 313,080 | 11,396 | 3.640\% |
| 1998 | 184,781 | 292 | 0.158\% | 334,726 | 7,173 | 2.143\% |
| 1999 | 181,301 | 693 | 0.382\% | 296,892 | 5,833 | 1.965\% |
|  |  | Averag | 0.300\% |  | Average: | 1.583\% |

Fall Chinook return percentages

a/ Based on estimated returns upstream of Willow Creek Weir. Does not include ocean harvest or in-river harvest below Willow Creek Weir.
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#### Abstract

Project personnel marked 520,847 coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) from the 2003 brood year with a right maxillary (RM) clip prior to their release from Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) in March of 2005. These fish are expected to return as two and three-year-old fish during the 200506 and 2006-07 seasons respectively.

An estimated 38,882 coho returned to the Trinity River, upstream of the Willow Creek Weir (WCW), during the 2004-05 season. We estimated the TRH-produced component of this run to be 29,827 ( $76.7 \%$ ) fish. An estimated 40 adult hatchery-produced coho were harvested by sport anglers this season. Spawning escapement of TRH-produced coho was divided between 9,903 fish which entered TRH and 19,884 fish estimated to have spawned outside of the hatchery facility.

TRH-produced coho from the 2001 brood year are considered to have completed their life cycle this year. An estimated 27,500 coho from the 2001 brood year returned to the Trinity River basin, upstream of Willow Creek weir, the past two seasons. This represents $6.61 \%$ of the 416,201 marked coho yearlings released from TRH in March of 2003. Estimated TRH-produced coho returns from the 2002 brood year are complete for age two returns only. An estimated 5,665 coho have returned thus far, representing $1.10 \%$ of the number released.


## TASK OBJECTIVES

To determine the relative return rates and contributions to spawning escapement and the fisheries made by naturally and hatchery-produced coho in the Trinity River basin.

## INTRODUCTION

Coho salmon are propagated at Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) as mitigation for lost habitat/coho production upstream of Lewiston Dam. The Trinity River Project, an element of CDFG, is responsible for marking coho prior to their release from the hatchery facility and estimation of the naturally- and hatchery-produced components of coho salmon returning to the Trinity River basin, upstream of Willow Creek Weir (WCW). Beginning with the 1994 brood year, all coho salmon reared at TRH have received a right maxillary (RM) clip prior to release. Prior to the 1994 brood year, a portion of the coho production was coded-wire tagged similar to the Chinook marking program at TRH. With the advent of coho becoming listed as a threatened species pursuant to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) in 1994, the CDFG began a program to mark $100 \%$ of the hatchery production so that a more thorough analysis of hatchery and natural stocks could be accomplished.

## METHODS

There are two phases involved in this task; marking all coho produced at TRH and estimating coho run-size, harvest, and escapement of TRH- and naturally-produced coho salmon returning to the Trinity basin. The latter phase is partially accomplished under TASK 1 of this report. In this section we present release and recovery data that is used to estimate the hatchery- and naturally-produced component of the 2004-05 coho run above WCW. Data compilation and analysis is reliant upon previously reported data in Sinnen and Null, 2002, Sinnen and Moore, 2000, and Sinnen, 2004a, 2004b, 2005.

## Marking at Trinity River Hatchery

Marking of coho is performed by CDFG personnel in marking sheds which are placed on top of the raceways at TRH. The sheds are moved along raceways with a fork lift, utilizing slots in each shed for this purpose. Raceways are segregated with removable barriers to isolate clipped coho from un-marked fish.

Coho are anaesthetized with carbon dioxide and their have their right maxillary (RM) bone removed with a pair of sharp surgical scissors. Marked fish are tallied with a manual counter and returned to hatchery ponds. Observed mortalities of marked coho are counted and subtracted from the daily effectively tagged total.

To determine overall marking accuracy, we examine a sample of the marked coho just prior to their release into the river. These fish are anaesthetized with carbon dioxide, measured to the nearest millimeter ( mm ) fork length (FL), and checked for quality of the maxillary clip. If more than $3 / 4$ of the bone was excised it is considered a good clip; less than that is considered a poor clip. We estimate the total number of coho effectively marked by multiplying the percent of fish with good clips by the total number we tallied as marked.

## TRH-produced coho run-size, escapement, and in-river harvest

To estimate the contribution of TRH-produced coho to run-size, escapement and in-river angler harvest above Willow Creek Weir (WCW), the following information is required:

1. Marking of coho production released from TRH.
2. Recovery totals of marked and unmarked coho returning to TRH.
3. Total coho run-size above WCW.
4. The percentage of marked coho salmon observed at WCW.
5. In-river angler harvest rates on coho above WCW.
6. Specific age class determinations.

The assumptions underlying the validity of run-size estimates are discussed under TASK 1 of this report. Additionally, we assume that coho right-maxillary-marks do not regenerate and that the mark is recognizable.

To estimate the TRH-produced component of the run above WCW, we used the equation:
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{RM}}=\frac{\mathrm{NW}_{\text {RM }}}{\mathrm{NW}} \times \mathrm{N}_{\text {Cohorun }}$
where $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{RM}}=$ The estimated number of coho salmon above Willow Creek weir with a right maxillary clip; $\mathrm{NW}_{\mathrm{RM}}=$ The number of coho salmon observed at Willow creek weir that were right-maxillary clipped; $\mathrm{NW}=$ The total number of coho salmon observed at Willow creek weir; $\mathrm{N}_{\text {Cohorun }}=$ Total estimated run of coho salmon above Willow Creek weir. To estimate the number of un-marked coho salmon above the weir we used the equation:
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{N}}=\mathrm{N}_{\text {Cohorun }}-\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{RM}}$
where, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{N}}=$ The estimated number of naturally produced coho above Willow Creek weir.
The size separating grilse and adult coho is determined using length frequency analysis using WCW and TRH data sets. The number of grilse and adults in the coho run was determined by multiplying the proportion of each observed at WCW times the total run-size estimate. The number of right maxillary-clipped coho for each age strata is estimated by multiplying the ratio
of marked to unmarked coho observed at Willow Creek weir times the total age stratified runsize estimate. The remaining coho are considered naturally produced. Coho harvest rate estimates are developed using angler tag return data presented in Task 1. Harvest rates are applied to the age stratified coho run to produce a harvest estimate. The estimate is apportioned to either RM clipped or naturally produced coho based on tag returns. Coho escapement is determined by the following equation:
$\mathrm{N}_{\text {escapement }}=\mathrm{N}_{\text {Cohorun }}-\mathrm{H}_{\text {coho }}$
where, $\mathrm{H}_{\text {coho }}=$ The estimated number of coho salmon harvested by anglers upstream of Willow Creek weir. Escapement is divided into Trinity River Hatchery escapement and natural escapement. Hatchery escapement is a direct count of RM clipped and unmarked coho that entered TRH, while natural escapement is estimated by the following equation:
$\mathrm{N}_{\text {Naturalescapement }}=\mathrm{N}_{\text {escapement }}-\mathrm{N}_{\text {TRHescapement }}$
where $\mathrm{N}_{\text {Naturalescapement }}=$ The estimated number of coho salmon above Willow Creek weir estimated to have spawned in natural areas; $\mathrm{N}_{\text {TRHescapement }}=$ the number of coho salmon that entered TRH. All estimates are stratified by grilse and adults and by RM marked and unmarked coho salmon.

## RESULTS

## Marking

Staff personnel marked (RM clips) approximately 521,170 2003 BY coho, representing the entire production at TRH. We began marking coho in late December, 2004 and finished in early March, 2005.

We performed a quality control check to determine our clipping effectiveness for coho in each raceway on March 4-5, 2005. We measured and examined approximately $2 \%$ of the coho in each raceway. The percentage of coho with proper clips ranged from $99.8 \%$ to $100 \%$ and averaged $99.96 \%$ for the 11,167 fish examined. We also recorded 96 post clip mortalities. Therefore, we estimate that 520,847 coho were effectively clipped and released (Table 1). These fish ranged in size from 75 to 265 mm , fork length (FL), with a range of mean lengths from 151 to 159 mm , FL. All BY 2003 coho were volitionally released from TRH March 15-18, 2005.

Table 1. Clipping totals and quality control data for 2003 brood year coho salmon reared at

Trinity River Hatchery and released March 14-18, 2005.

| Pond <br> number | Number <br> counted/ <br> clipped | Post- <br> Clipping <br> mortalitites | Number <br> examined <br> post clip | Number <br> without <br> clip | Qumber <br> $\%$ unclip | Number <br> effectively <br> clipped | Total <br> not clipped <br> at release | number <br> released | FL (mm) <br> range | FL (mm) <br> Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F1\&2 | 67,740 | 49 | 1,390 | 1 | $0.07 \%$ | 67,642 | 49 | 67,691 | $85-230 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 150.6 |
| F3\&4 | 55,569 | 9 | 1,291 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 55,560 | 0 | 55,560 | $88-247 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 151.7 |
| G1\&2 | 68,606 | 14 | 1599 | 2 | $0.13 \%$ | 68,506 | 86 | 68,592 | $82-265 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 152.4 |
| G3\&4 | 66,226 | 1 | 1,341 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 66,225 | 0 | 66,225 | $75-233 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 148.4 |
| H1\&2 | 61,919 | 5 | 1,333 | 2 | $0.15 \%$ | 61,821 | 93 | 61,914 | $100-254 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 156.0 |
| H3\&4 | 69,426 | 12 | 1,417 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 69,414 | 0 | 69,414 | $91-2201 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 152.7 |
| I1\&2 | 66,060 | 2 | 1,347 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 66,058 | 0 | 66,058 | $110-240 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 155.7 |
| I3\&4 | 65,624 | 4 | 1,449 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ | 65,620 | 0 | 65,620 | $119-255 \mathrm{~mm}$ | 158.6 |
| Totals: | 521,170 | 96 | 11,167 | 5 | $0.04 \%$ | 520,847 | 227 | 521,074 |  | 153.3 |

## Contribution of TRH-produced coho salmon to escapement and in-river sport fisheries

Total (natural and TRH-produced) coho run-size for the 2004-05 season, above WCW, was estimated at 38,882 fish (TASK 1), of which 5,819 were grilse (age 2) and 33,063 were adults (age 3). Age classes were determined using length frequency analysis. The size separating grilse and adults was 53 cm , FL (TASK 1). Therefore all coho $\leq 53 \mathrm{~cm}$, FL were considered grilse and larger fish adults.

The percentage of right maxillary-clipped (RM) coho observed at WCW was $97.4 \%(147 / 151)$ for grilse salmon and $73.1 \%$ (627/858) for adults. The overall marked coho total observed at WCW for the 2004-05 season was $76.7 \%$ (774/1,009). Therefore, we estimate that the 2004-05 coho run was composed of 9,055 naturally-produced fish and 29,827 TRH-produced fish (Table 2.).

Based on one angler tag return, we estimated that 40 adult RM clipped coho were harvested by anglers upstream of Willow Creek weir this year. The sport take of coho, a state and federally listed threatened species on the Trinity River, has been prohibited since 1995; however, some fish are occasionally harvested by unknowledgeable anglers due to mistaken identity or a lack of knowledge concerning the closure.

Table 2. Run-size, in-river sport catch, and spawner escapement estimates for naturally- and

TRH-produced coho salmon, upstream of Willow Creek Weir for the 2004-05 return year.

|  |  |  |  |  | Spawning escapement |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Strata | BY a/ | Age b/ | Run-size | Angler harvest | TRH c/ | Natural |
| Naturally | 02 | 2 | 154 | 0 | 9 | 145 |
| Produced | 01 | 3 | 8,901 | 0 | 1,071 | 7,830 |
|  |  | Totals: | 9,055 | 0 | 1,080 | 7,975 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRH | 02 | 2 | 5,665 | 0 | 1,068 | 4,597 |
| Produced | 01 | 3 | 24,162 | 40 | 8,835 | 15,287 |
|  |  | Totals: | 29,827 |  | 9,903 | 19,884 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grand totals: |  |  | 38,882 |  | 10,983 |

[^3]Based on age three coho run-size estimates presented above (Table 2) and age two estimates provided last year, the percent return for BY 2001, TRH-produced coho was $6.61 \%$ (Table 3). Coho from the 2001 BY have reached three years of age and are considered to have completed their life cycle. The estimated return of two- year-old 2002 BY coho was $0.80 \%$. These fish will return during the 2005-06 season as three-year-olds.

Spawning escapement of 2001 BY, TRH-produced coho consisted of 10,284 (37.5\%) fish that entered TRH and $17,176(62.5 \%)$ fish estimated to have spawned in natural areas (Table 3).

Estimated escapement of TRH-produced, two-year-old coho from the 2002 brood year was 1,068 ( $18.9 \%$ ) hatchery spawners and 4,597 ( $81.1 \%$ ) fish estimated to have spawned in natural areas (Table 3).

Table 3. Run-size, percent return, in-river angler harvest and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatchery-produced coho salmon returning to the Trinity River upstream of the

Willow Creek Weir during the period 2003 through 2004.

| Release Data |  |  |  |  | Estimated Returns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clip a/ $\begin{gathered}\text { Brood } \\ \text { Year }\end{gathered}$ |  | Date | Number b/ | Site | Age c/ | Run-size | $\%$ of release | River harvest | Spawning Escapement |  |  |
|  |  | TRH d/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | Natural | Total |
| RM | 01 |  | 3/17-19/03 | 416,201 | TRH | 2 | 3,338 | 0.80 | 0 | 1,449 | 1,889 | 3,338 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 24,162 | 5.81 | 40 | 8,835 | 15,287 | 24,122 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Totals: | 27,500 | 6.61 | 40 | 10,284 | 17,176 | 27,460 |
| RM | 02 | 3/15-18/04 | 516,906 | TRH | 2 | 5,665 | 1.10 | 0 | 1,068 | 4,597 | 5,665 |

a/ Identifying clip. Beginning with the 1994 brood year, all coho salmon released from Trinity River Hatchery received right maxillary (RM) clips.
b/ Number of marked (RM) coho estimated released.
c/ Age classes are determined using length frequency analysis.
d/ TRH= Trinity River Hatchery.

## DISCUSSION

Since estimation of TRH-produced contribution rates to overall coho run-size, escapement and harvest are directly related to the total coho run-size estimates produced under Task 1 of this report, it must be noted that the information presented under Task 3 is generally only moderately rigorous, statistically speaking, due to low numbers of coho marked at WCW. This season however we trapped over 1,000 coho. The total coho run-size estimate of 38,882 fish, produced under task 1 of this report, had confidence intervals ( $1-\mathrm{p}=0.95$ ) within $13 \%$, which is substantially better than previous year estimates which had confidence intervals ranging from 20 to $35 \%$. Another source of potential bias, not trapping through the entire run, did not appear to be substantial this season. Trapping CPUE (Task 1. Table 4, Figure 10) at WCW indicated that the majority of coho had passed the weir prior to its removal in late Novenber. Since our efforts represent the majority of work to quantify the hatchery vs. wild runs and survival and contribution rates of returning coho, we feel it is important to present the available information. It must be noted that any bias in coho run-size estimates would be reflected in natural areas since the number entering the hatchery are actual counts.

The percent return of 2001 BY coho, estimated at $6.61 \%$, is the highest return rate over the last eight years (Appendix 1). Return rates have ranged from a low of $1.30 \%$ for BY 1996 coho to $6.61 \%$ for BY 2001 coho. Since coho are raised to slightly larger than yearling size (spawned in late November through early January and released in March of the following year) it would seem reasonable that survival rates could potentially be high. Return rates of coho to the Trinity basin,
unlike chinook salmon, are in theory minimally affected by ocean and in-river commercial and sport harvest, since the take of coho has been prohibited in these fisheries since 1994. The Native American gill-net fisheries may harvest substantial numbers of coho, but it is doubtful that this harvest rate approaches historical harvest rates for all combined fisheries (ocean, commercial, in-river and gill-net).

In all but two years the estimated the number of hatchery-produced coho that have spawned in natural areas has surpassed those that entered TRH (Appendix 1). This indicates that TRHproduced coho stray at substantial rates. Our mainstem carcass surveys (Task 4) have demonstrated that, similar to TRH-produced Chinook, TRH-produced coho do spawn outside of the facility and that coho carcass recoveries are greatest in areas near TRH. This season we recovered 2,319 coho in the mainstem Trinity River. Of these, 1,069 (46.1\%) were RM clipped.

Despite potential run estimate biases, coho trends, based on trapping data at Willow Creek weir, indicate that coho runs returning to the upper Trinity basin are heavily supported by TRH production. The past eight seasons of trapping data (years in which all TRH-produced coho have been $100 \%$ marked) have consistently shown that the marked percentage of coho observed at the weir has been substantial, 77 to $94 \%$ of the total observed (appendix 2 ). This season we estimated that approximately $76.7 \%$ of the run was composed of TRH-produced coho, the lowest TRH contribution rate observed to date.
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Appendix 1. Run-size, harvest and spawner escapement estimates for right maxillary clipped, Trinity River Hatchery-produced coho salmon returning to the Trinity River, upstream of Willow Creek weir, brood years 1994-2001.

| Release data |  |  |  | Return data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Brood } \\ & \text { year } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Effective |  |  | Age | Run-size | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { release } \end{gathered}$ | In-river harvest | Spawner Escapement |  |  |
|  | Date | Number | Site |  |  |  |  | TRH | Natural | Total |
| 1994 | 3/17-21/96 | 72,311 | TRH | 2 | 970 | 1.34\% | 0 | 105 | 865 | 970 |
|  |  |  | TRH | 3 | 1,732 | 2.40\% | 0 | 867 | 865 | 1,732 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 2,702 | 3.74\% | 0 | 972 | 1,730 | 2,702 |
| 1995 | 3/17-21/97 | 580,880 | TRH | 2 | 5,552 | 0.96\% | 39 | 858 | 4,655 | 5,513 |
|  |  |  | TRH | 3 | 9,008 | 1.55\% | 0 | 3,899 | 5,109 | 9,008 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 14,560 | 2.51\% | 39 | 4,757 | 9,764 | 14,521 |
| 1996 | 3/16-20/98 | 513,663 | TRH | 2 | 2,340 | 0.46\% | 0 | 969 | 1,371 | 2,340 |
|  |  |  | TRH | 3 | 4,357 | 0.85\% | 86 | 3,015 | 1,256 | 4,271 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 6,697 | 1.30\% | 86 | 3,984 | 2,627 | 6,611 |
| 1997 | 3/15-22/99 | 517,196 | TRH | 2 | 592 | 0.11\% | 0 | 381 | 211 | 592 |
|  |  |  | TRH | 3 | 9,704 | 1.88\% | 0 | 3,407 | 6,297 | 9,704 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 10,296 | 1.99\% | 0 | 3,788 | 6,508 | 10,296 |
| 1998 | 3/15-20/00 | 493,233 | TRH | 2 | 5,289 | 1.07\% | 0 | 916 | 4,373 | 5,289 |
|  |  |  | TRH | 3 | 25,395 | 5.15\% | 0 | 9,625 | 15,770 | 25,395 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 30,684 | 6.22\% | 0 | 10,541 | 20,143 | 30,684 |
| 1999 | 3/15-22/01 | 512,986 | TRH | 2 | 3,373 | 0.66\% | 0 | 1,024 | 2,349 | 3,373 |
|  |  |  | TRH | 3 | 13,849 | 2.70\% | 0 | 6,409 | 7,440 | 13,849 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 17,222 | 3.36\% | 0 | 7,433 | 9,789 | 17,222 |
| 2000 | 3/17-19/02 | 524,238 | TRH | 2 | 1,571 | 0.30\% | 0 | 688 | 883 | 1,571 |
|  |  |  | TRH | 3 | 20,721 | 3.95\% | 0 | 9,730 | 10,991 | 20,721 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 22,292 | 4.25\% | 0 | 10,418 | 11,874 | 22,292 |
| 2001 | 3/17-19/03 | 416,201 | TRH | 2 | 3,338 | 0.80\% | 0 | 1,449 | 1,889 | 3,338 |
|  |  |  | TRH | 3 | 24,162 | 5.80\% | 40 | 8,835 | 15,287 | 24,122 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 27,500 | 6.60\% | 40 | 10,284 | 17,176 | 27,460 |
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Appendix 2. Naturally and Trinity River Hatchery-produced coho salmon run-size, in-river angler harvest and spawner escapment estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek Weir for 1997-2004.

| Year | Strata | Run-size Estimate |  |  | Spawner Escapement |  |  |  |  |  | Angler harvest |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Natural |  |  | Trinity River Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Grilse | Adults | Total | Grilse | Adults | Total | Grilse | Adults | Total | Grilse | Adults | Total |
| 1997 | Natural | 399 | 252 | 651 | 383 | 232 | 615 | 13 | 20 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
|  | TRH | 5,552 | 1,732 | 7,284 | 4655 | 865 | 5520 | 858 | 867 | 1725 | 39 | 0 | 39 |
| 1998 | Natural | 131 | 1,001 | 1,132 | 123 | 886 | 1,009 | 8 | 115 | 223 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 2,340 | 9,008 | 11,348 | 1,371 | 5,109 | 6,480 | 969 | 3,899 | 4,868 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1999 | Natural | 31 | 555 | 586 | 23 | 440 | 463 | 8 | 103 | 111 | 0 | 12 | 12 |
|  | TRH | 592 | 4,357 | 4,949 | 211 | 1,266 | 1,477 | 381 | 3,015 | 3,396 | 0 | 86 | 86 |
| 2000 | Natural | 197 | 342 | 539 | 187 | 288 | 475 | 10 | 54 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 5,289 | 9,704 | 14,993 | 4,373 | 6,297 | 10,670 | 916 | 3,407 | 4,323 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2001 | Natural | 298 | 3,075 | 3,373 | 296 | 2,945 | 3,241 | 2 | 130 | 132 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 3,373 | 25,395 | 28,768 | 2,349 | 15,770 | 18,119 | 1,024 | 9,625 | 10,649 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2002 | Natural | 138 | 458 | 596 | 123 | 372 | 495 | 15 | 86 | 101 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 1,571 | 13,849 | 15,420 | 883 | 7,440 | 8,323 | 688 | 6,409 | 7,097 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2003 | Natural | 163 | 3,930 | 4,093 | 149 | 3,264 | 3,413 | 14 | 666 | 680 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 3,338 | 20,721 | 24,059 | 1,889 | 10,991 | 12,880 | 1,449 | 9,730 | 11,179 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2004 | Natural | 154 | 8,901 | 9,055 | 145 | 7,830 | 7,975 | 9 | 1,071 | 1,080 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 5,665 | 24,162 | 29,827 | 4,597 | 15,287 | 19,884 | 1,068 | 8,835 | 9,903 | 0 | 40 | 40 |
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#### Abstract

Employees of the California Department of Fish and Game's (CDFG) Trinity River Project (TRP), in cooperation with the Yurok Tribe, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and U.S. Forest Service (USFS) conducted a salmon spawner survey of the Upper Trinity River from September $7^{\text {th }}, 2004$ through January $20^{\text {th }}, 2005$. The survey focused on the mainstem Trinity River from the upper most available anadromous spawning area at Lewiston Dam (river section \#1) and continued downstream to the Cedar Flat recreation area (river section \#10), a total of 101.6 kms . The survey did not include any tributaries that may have been used for spawning. During the survey 4,825 Chinook (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) and 2,029 coho salmon (O. kisutch) carcasses were observed. Carcass numbers and density were the most numerous in the uppermost reach. Carcass numbers and density generally decreased from Lewiston Dam to Cedar Flat.

Spring and fall Chinook salmon carcasses were recovered during the spawning season. Recovery of spring Chinook carcasses out numbered fall Chinook carcasses until Julian week 43 (October $22^{\text {nd }}$ ). After this time, fall Chinook became the dominate run recovered during the survey. Coho salmon were recovered starting on October 18th (Julian week 42) and peaked during Julian week 48 (November $26^{\text {th }}-$ December $2^{\text {nd }}$ ).


Fork length averaged 74.7 cm (range: 33-105 cm) and 72.1 cm (range: $31-108 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) for spring and fall Chinook respectively. Adult Chinook made up $89.9 \%$ of the spring and $89.8 \%$ of the fall Chinook observed. Coho salmon fork lengths averaged 68.2 cm (range: $35-91 \mathrm{~cm}$ ). Coho adults represented $96.4 \%$ of all coho recovered during the survey.

Adult male to female ratios of recovered spring Chinook, fall Chinook and coho salmon were 0.47 : $1 ; 0.62$ : 1 ; and $0.80: 1$ respectively.

Estimated female pre-spawn mortality of spring and fall Chinook was $8.5 \%$ and $5.1 \%$, respectively. Coho female pre-spawn mortality was estimated at $15.4 \%$.

Based on the recovery of adipose-fin-clipped Chinook, an estimated $32.5 \%$ of the spring-run and $49.6 \%$ of the fall-run carcasses observed in the mainstem survey were of hatchery origin. Based on the recovery of right-maxillary clipped coho, an estimated $46.1 \%$ of the observed carcasses were of hatchery origin.

## OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the size, sex composition, and hatchery component among the naturally spawning populations in the mainstem Trinity River.
2. To determine the incidence of pre-spawning mortality among naturally spawning Chinook and coho salmon in the mainstem Trinity River.
3. To determine the distribution of the naturally spawning populations of Chinook and coho salmon within the mainstem Trinity River.

## INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Fish \& Game's (CDFG) Trinity River Project (TRP) in cooperation with the Yurok Tribe (YT) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USWFS) conducted a carcass and redd survey in the mainstem Trinity River. The survey was funded through the Trinity River Restoration Program (TRRP). The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) also participated in the survey using internal funding. USFS participation was limited to enumerating redds in the uppermost reach (Lewiston Dam area).

Reporting responsibilities for the project were divided into two parts; CDFG was responsible for reporting on the carcass survey portion of the study and the USFWS and YT for the redd enumeration part of the study. Redd survey information included in this report was summarized by the Yurok tribe and the USFWS.

Spawner surveys have been conducted intermittently on the Trinity River since 1955. Spawning surveys prior to 1964 included river sections located above river mile 111.9 (RKM 180.1), the site of present day Lewiston dam.

The redd/carcass surveys are intended to improve our understanding of the pre- and posttreatment effectiveness of flow and habitat manipulations being implemented by the TRRP. We aim to document any changes in spawner density, spawner distribution, and prespawn mortality rates that may occur in the upper mainstem Trinity River. Additionally, our surveys aid in the understanding of hatchery effects within the basin.

## METHODS

The study area included the mainstem Trinity River from its upstream limit of anadromy at Lewiston Dam downstream to the Cedar Flat Recreational Area. The study area was divided into 10 sections (Table 1, Figure 1). Sections were surveyed between September 7, 2004 and January 20, 2005. A team of DFG and YT crews attempted to survey sections $1-5$ weekly by starting at section one and working downstream through section five. USFWS crews attempted to survey sections 6 and 7 weekly and sections 8-10 biweekly. However, logistical constraints
caused some sections to be excluded on occasion (Table 2). Sections 1-3 were surveyed through Julian week 3 ( $\operatorname{Jan} 20^{\text {th }} 2005$ ), section 4 was surveyed through Julian week 51 ( $\operatorname{Dec} 23^{\text {rd }}$ ), and sections 5-10 were surveyed through Julian week 48 (Dec $2^{\text {nd }}$ ).

Table 1. River section number, section length (km) and section description used in the 2004 mainstem Trinity River carcass and redd survey.

| Section | Length(km) | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3.2 | Lewiston Dam (RKM 180.1)-Old Lewiston Bridge(RKM 176.9) |
| 2 | 7.9 | Old Lewiston Bridge(RKM 176.9)-Browns Mtn. Bridge(RKM 169.0) |
| 3 | 10.2 | Browns Mtn. Bridge(RKM 169.0)-Steel Bridge(RKM158.8) |
| 4 | 10.4 | Steel Bridge(RKM158.8)-Douglas City Camp(RKM 148.4) |
| 5 | 15.7 | Douglas City Camp(RKM 148.4)-Sky Ranch Road(RKM 132.7) |
| 6 | 7.2 | Sky Ranch Road(RKM 132.7)-Junction City Campground(RKM 125.5) |
| 7 | 8.8 | Junction City Campground(RKM 125.5)-mouth of the North Fork Trinity(RKM 116.7) |
| 8 | 9.7 | mouth of the North Fork Trinity(RKM 116.7)-Big Flat Boat Launch(RKM 107.0) |
| 9 | 14.8 | Big Flat Boat Launch(RKM 107.0)-Del Loma |
| 10 | 13.7 | Del Loma-Cedar Flat Recreation Area(RKM92.2) |



Figure1. Survey sections for 2004 Trinity River main stem spawner survey.

Surveys were conducted using $12-\mathrm{ft}$ Avon ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ and Otter ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ inflatable rafts equipped with rowing frames. Each raft was staffed by two crew members, one rower-recorder and one person responsible for recovering carcasses. Two rafts in tandem cover either side of the river as the crews proceeded down stream. Carcasses were recovered from all accessible areas in the river and along the shoreline. Fish in deeper areas were recovered using telescoping poles with attached gigs.

In the Trinity River, there is a temporal and spatial overlap in the spring and fall Chinook runs. Since there is annual variation in spring and fall run timing, a date separating the two races is determined based on two factors. First, some of the Chinook carcasses recovered during the survey contained Coded Wire Tags (CWT's), which are implanted in their snouts prior to release from Trinity River Hatchery (TRH). CWT's are race specific and are currently implanted in approximately $25 \%$ of all TRH Chinook as juveniles. Second, a portion of the carcasses recovered were marked with spaghetti tags placed on fish at CDFG fish trapping weirs located near the towns of Junction City and Willow Creek. Race was assigned to each fish tagged based on the time they were captured and tagged at the weirs. The week separating spring and fall Chinook in the carcass survey was established when the percent of fall Chinook recovered (based on CWT and run timing at the weirs) was greater than spring Chinook.

Carcasses encountered in the survey were given a condition rating in order to describe their stage or degree of decomposition. During the survey, carcasses were separated into one of three categories: condition 1 , was a carcass with one clear eye; condition 2 , was a carcass with both eyes cloudy; and condition 3, was skeletal remains.

Carcasses that were recovered during the survey were identified to species, gender, and examined for hatchery clips and program tags (spaghetti tags). Carcasses were measured to the nearest cm fork length (FL). Hatchery clips included adipose-fin clips (Ad) on Chinook and steelhead and right maxillary clips (RM) on coho salmon. Additionally, all Ad-clipped Chinook salmon are implanted with a CWT. At TRH roughly $25 \%$ of all juvenile Chinook and roughly $100 \%$ of coho and steelhead are clipped prior to release. Heads of all recovered Ad-clipped Chinook were removed and retained for later CWT tag recovery. The CWT's are extracted and decoded by DFG's Trinity River Project staff. All project (spaghetti) tags, applied at the two main stem weirs, encountered were removed and recorded.

Spawning condition of all condition-1 and condition-2 female salmon was determined by field staff via direct observation of the ovaries. Fish were classified as either spawned or un-spawned based on their egg retention. Females retaining the majority of their eggs were classified as unspawned, conversely females retaining very few eggs were determined to have spawned. Due to the difficulty in accurately determining if a male has successfully spawned, male spawning condition was not assessed. All carcasses encountered during the survey were cut in half with a machete to prevent processing the same fish twice.

## RESULTS

## Spring / Fall Chinook separation

Overlap of spring and fall Chinook occurred primarily during Julian weeks $42-44$ (Oct $15^{\text {th }}-$ Nov $4^{\text {th }}$ ). Spring Chinook carcass recoveries were predominant through Julian week 42 (Oct. 15 Oct 21), after which, fall Chinook recoveries were most numerous. For the purpose of analysis, all Chinook recoveries prior to Julian week 43 (Oct $22^{\text {nd }}$ ) were classified as spring Chinook and all subsequent carcass recoveries were classified as fall Chinook (Figure 2).

## Carcass distribution

We recovered 4,825 Chinook carcasses during an 18 week period in our 10 survey sections (Table 2). Of the 4,825 Chinook carcasses encountered, 3,809 were recovered in sections 1-2. Recovery of Chinook was greatest during Julian week 46 (Nov. 12 - Nov.18) when crews recovered 853 carcasses.


Figure 2. Weekly proportions of coded-wire tagged and Program-marked spring and fall run Chinook observed in the 2004 mainstem Trinity River spawner survey.

A total of 5,102 redds were enumerated between Julian week 36 and $50\left(\right.$ Sept $3^{\text {rd }}-$ Dec $\left.16^{\text {th }}\right)$ in the upper mainstem Trinity River redd surveys (Table 3). Total section redd counts ranged from a high of 2,878 in section 1 to a low of 53 in section 8 . Redd density (redd $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) also peaked in section 1 at 899.4 redds $/ \mathrm{km}$. Redd density dropped considerably in section 2 to 76.7 redds $/ \mathrm{km}$ and gradually reduced downstream to below 8.0 redds $/ \mathrm{km}$ in sections $8-10$. The peak week of spring Chinook spawning occurred in Julian week 40 (Oct $1^{\text {st }}-$ Oct $7^{\text {th }}$ ) when 503 redds were counted. Fall Chinook spawning peaked during Julian week 44 (Oct $29^{\text {th }}-$ Nov $\left.4^{\text {th }}\right)$ when 883 redds were observed.

Table 2. Recovery of all Chinook salmon by julian week and section in the mainstem Trinity River spawner survey during the 2004-2005 season.

a/ NS indicates that a survey was not performed that Julian week.
b/ Two surveys were conducted during this Julian week.

Table 3. Summary of weekly redd enumeration, mainstem Trinity River carcass/redd survey, 2004-05 season. a/

a/ Data provided by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

## Spring Chinook

A total of 1,187 Chinook were classified as spring-run during the survey, of which 603 were classified as condition-one (Table 4). Spring Chinook carcass observations by section ranged from 431 in section one to zero in section 9. Spring Chinook carcass density was greatest in section one with 134.7 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ and dropped considerably to 43.7 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in section two. Below section two carcass density steadily dropped by section to 2.3 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in section 7 and remained less than 1.0 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in sections 8-10.

Table 4. Number, density, incidence of Ad clips, project tags, and condition of spring Chinook salmon recovered during the 2004-2005 main stem Trinity River spawner survey.

| Section | length <br> (km) | Number observed a/ | Density (fish/km) | C-1 b/ | C-2 c/ | Ad-clips d/ |  | Project tags e/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | C-1 | Total | C-1 |
| 1 | 3.2 | 431 | 134.7 | 220 | 201 | 59 | 32 | 7 | 3 |
| 2 | 7.9 | 345 | 43.7 | 149 | 189 | 31 | 13 | 1 | 0 |
| 3 | 10.2 | 172 | 16.9 | 86 | 83 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 10.4 | 96 | 9.2 | 53 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 |
| 5 | 15.7 | 83 | 5.3 | 56 | 24 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 6 | 7.2 | 37 | 5.1 | 26 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 8.8 | 20 | 2.3 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 9.7 | 1 | 0.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 14.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 13.7 | 2 | 0.1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals: | 101.6 | 1,187 | 11.7 | 603 | 552 | 96 | 47 | 18 | 9 |

a/ For the purpose of analysis all Chinook recovered prior to Julian week 43 (Oct 22) were considered spring Chinook.
b/ Condition-1 (C-1) fish are those with at least one clear eye and considered to have died within one week.
c/ Condition-2 (C-2) fish are those with both eyes cloudy and considered to have died more than a week prior to recovery.
d/ Adipose fin clipped Chinook salmon.
e/ Spaghetti tags applied at Junction City weir.

## Fall Chinook

A total of 3,638 Chinook were classified as fall-run during the survey, of which 1,355 were classified as condition-one (Table 5). Fall Chinook carcass observations by section ranged from 2,319 in section one to 16 in section 10. Fall Chinook carcass density was greatest in section one with 724.7 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ and dropped considerably to 90.4 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in section two. Below section two carcass density dropped by section to 17.1 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in section 4 and remained less than 8.0 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in sections 5-10.

Table 5. Number, density, incidence of Ad clips, project tags, and condition of fall Chinook salmon recovered during the 2004-05 mainstem Trinity River spawner survey.

| Section | length <br> (km) | Number observed a/ | Density (fish/km) | C-1 b/ | C-2 c/ | Ad-clips d/ |  | Project tags e/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | C-1 | Total | C-1 |
| 1 | 3.2 | 2,319 | 724.7 | 842 | 1,435 | 358 | 170 | 87 | 31 |
| 2 | 7.9 | 714 | 90.4 | 233 | 446 | 66 | 29 | 19 | 5 |
| 3 | 10.2 | 188 | 18.4 | 79 | 98 | 12 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 10.4 | 178 | 17.1 | 78 | 93 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 2 |
| 5 | 15.7 | 58 | 3.7 | 31 | 24 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| 6 | 7.2 | 40 | 5.6 | 26 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 8.8 | 64 | 7.3 | 34 | 22 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 8 | 9.7 | 17 | 1.8 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 14.8 | 44 | 3.0 | 19 | 18 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 13.7 | 16 | 1.2 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals: | 101.6 | 3,638 | 35.8 | 1,355 | 2,158 | 451 | 213 | 112 | 38 |

a/ For the purpose of analysis all Chinook observed after Julian week 42 (Oct. 22) were considered fall Chinook.
b/ Condition-1 (C-1) fish are those with at least one clear eye and considered to have died within one week.
c/ Condition-2 (C-2) fish are those with both eyes cloudy and considered to have died more than a week previous to recovery.
d/ Adipose fin clipped chinook salmon.
e/ Spaghetti tags applied at Willow Creek and Junction City weirs.

## Coho Salmon

A total of 2,029 coho were observed during the survey, of which 934 were classified as condition-one (Table 6). Coho carcass observations by section ranged from 1,162 in section one to 6 in section 10. Coho carcass density was greatest in section one with 363.1 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ and dropped considerably to 70.3 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in section two. Below section two carcass density steadily dropped by section to 3.3 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in section 5 and remained less than 3.0 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in sections 610.

Table 6. Number, density, incidence of RM clips, project tags, and condition of Coho salmon recovered during the 2004-05 mainstem Trinity River spawner survey.

| Section | Length (km) | Number observed | Density (fish/km) | C-1 c/ | C-2 d/ | RM-clips a/ |  | Project tags b/ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total | C-1 | Total | C-1 |
| 1 | 3.2 | 1,162 | 363.1 | 505 | 642 | 644 | 305 | 37 | 17 |
| 2 | 7.9 | 555 | 70.3 | 245 | 294 | 240 | 117 | 11 | 8 |
| 3 | 10.2 | 147 | 14.4 | 77 | 64 | 82 | 50 | 4 | 1 |
| 4 | 10.4 | 58 | 5.6 | 34 | 24 | 38 | 28 | 5 | 3 |
| 5 | 15.7 | 52 | 3.3 | 30 | 21 | 29 | 20 | 6 | 4 |
| 6 | 7.2 | 14 | 1.9 | 10 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 0 |
| 7 | 8.8 | 19 | 2.2 | 14 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| 8 | 9.7 | 10 | 1.0 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 14.8 | 6 | 0.4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 13.7 | 6 | 0.4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals: | 101.6 | 2,029 | 20.0 | 934 | 1,054 | 1,069 | 550 | 66 | 35 |

a/ Right-maxillary (RM) clipped coho salmon.
b/ Spaghetti tags applied at Willow Creek weir.
c/ Condition-1 (C-1) fish are those with at least one clear eye and considered to have died within one week.
d/ Condition-2 (C-2) fish are those with both eyes cloudy and considered to have died more than a week prior to recovery.

## Size composition

Only condition-1 and condition-2 fish that were measured were included in the size composition analysis. Condition-3 fish were assumed to have decomposed to a point that there length measurements were no longer accurate. The size separating grilse and adults for spring and fall Chinook and coho was determined using length frequency analysis of fish trapped at WCW, JCW and TRH. For additional information regarding grilse and adult fork length separation see Task 1 of this report.

## Spring Chinook

Fork lengths of 1,153 spring Chinook averaged 74.7 cm . and ranged between $33-105 \mathrm{~cm}$. (Figure 3). Grilse accounted for $10.1 \%(117 / 1,153)$ of the measured spring Chinook. Grilse were considered fish $<57 \mathrm{~cm}$. fork length.

## Fall Chinook

Fork lengths obtained from 3,511 fall Chinook averaged 72.1 cm and ranged between 31-108 cm . (Figure 3). Grilse accounted for $10.2 \%(359 / 3,511)$ of measured fall Chinook. Grilse were considered fish $<55 \mathrm{~cm}$. fork length.

## Coho

Fork lengths of 2,270 coho salmon averaged 68.2 cm and ranged from $35-91 \mathrm{~cm}$. (Figure 3.). Grilse accounted for $3.6 \%(82 / 2,270)$ of measured coho. Grilse were considered fish $<54 \mathrm{~cm}$. fork length.


Figure 3. Length frequency histograms for Chinook and coho salmon measured during the 2004-05 mainstem Trinity River spawner survey. Grilse and adult separation was determined using fork length analysis from WCW, JCW and TRH.

> Adult sex composition and female pre-spawn mortality

## Spring Chinook

Of the adult spring Chinook recovered that were sexed, 335 were sexed as males and 706 as females, a male to female ratio of $0.47: 1$. All of the condition-1 and condition-2 spring Chinook were sexed. Sixty ( $8.5 \%$ ) of the 706 condition-1 and condition- 2 female spring Chinook carcasses evaluated were determined to be pre-spawn mortalities.

## Fall Chinook

Of the 3,161 adult fall Chinook that were sexed, 1,204 were sexed as males and 1,957 were sexed as females, a male: female ratio of $0.62: 1$. There were four condition-1 and condition-2 fall Chinook in which gender was undetermined. One hundred ( $5.1 \%$ ) of the 1,964 condition-1 and condition-2 adult female fall Chinook carcasses examined were determined to be pre-spawn mortalities.

## Coho salmon

We measured 2,196 adult coho during the survey, of which 974 were males and 1,222 were females, a male to female ratio of $0.80: 1$. There were two of the condition-1 and condition-2 adult coho encountered for which gender was undetermined. One hundred eighty seven (15.4\%) of the 1,216 condition -1 and condition- 2 adult coho carcasses examined were determined to be pre-spawn mortalities.

## Incidence of program marked salmon

## Spring Chinook

A total of 18 project tags, applied at Junction City weir, were recovered from spring Chinook, of which, 9 were recovered from condition-1 fish (Table 4). Project tags from spring Chinook were recovered in sections 1 through 5. Although the majority of project tags were recovered in section 1, the proportion of fish bearing project tags increased between section 1 and 5 . Proportionally, twice as many spring Chinook at TRH bore project tags (3.14\%) than in the carcass survey ( $1.51 \%$ ), yet ad-clipped Chinook rates for condition-1 and condition-2 fish were three times less in the carcass survey (8.3) than at TRH (23.19) (Appendices 5-6). The observed clip rates and proportions of spring Chinook bearing project tags indicates that proportionally there are roughly three times the number of wild fish contacted in the upper river carcass survey than recovered at TRH, additionally the fish recovered in the carcass survey bore project tags at a rate of $50 \%$ less than that of spring Chinook recovered at TRH.

## Fall Chinook

A total of 145 project spaghetti tags were recovered from fall Chinook, of which, 49 were recovered from condition-1 fish (Table 5). Thirty-three of the tags recovered were applied at the JCW and the remaining 112 tags originated from the WCW. The majority of project tags were recovered in section 1, but relative to the total number of fish captured by section project tags were well represented through section 7. Proportionally, twice as many fall Chinook returning to TRH bore project tags applied at WCW (7.02\%) than in the carcass survey (3.06\%), yet adclipped Chinook rates in the carcass survey for condition-1 and condition-2 fish were 2 times less than observed at TRH (Appendices 5-6). The observed clip rates and proportions of fall Chinook bearing project tags indicates that proportionally there are roughly twice the number of wild fish contacted in the upper river carcass survey than recovered at TRH, additionally the fish recovered in the carcass survey bore project tags at a rate of $50 \%$ less than that of fall Chinook recovered at TRH.

## Coho salmon

A total of sixty-six project spaghetti tags applied at WCW were recovered from coho, of which 35 were recovered from condition-1 fish (Table 6). The majority of project tags were recovered in section one, although the proportion of fish bearing project tags increased between section 1 and 7. Relative to the total captured in each sector more program tags were recovered in the carcass survey ( $2.85 \%$ ) than were captured at TRH ( $2.5 \%$ ) (Appendix 5). The observed RM clip rate in the carcass survey was $35 \%$ less than observed at TRH (Appendix 6).

Incidence of hatchery produced Chinook and coho salmon

## Spring Chinook

During the spring period 47 (7.8\%) of the condition-one and 96 (8.3 \%) of all spring Chinook bore Ad-clips. Observed ad-clip rates in sections 1 and 2 for condition-1 and condition-2 spring Chinook were $14 \%$ and $9 \%$ respectively. For all sections downstream of section 2 observed clip rates for condition-1 and condition-2 spring Chinook were below 3\% (Table 4). CWT's were recovered from 82 of the total Chinook encountered during the spring Chinook recovery period, of which two and 80 CWT's were recovered from fall and spring Chinook respectively. During the period associated with the spring run 15 ad-clipped Chinook were recovered that CWT's were not recovered from. Two yearling release groups, 065279 and 065288 comprised $41.2 \%$ of the total spring CWT recovery.

Based on expansion of all CWT codes recovered during the spring period, an estimated 340 $(28.6 \%)$ of the total 1,187 fish recovered were of TRH origin (Table 7). Based on expansions of all spring CWT groups, the estimated proportioned age structure of TRH spring Chinook recovered in the carcass survey was $8.2 \%$ age $2,37.6 \%$ age $3,52.9 \%$ age 4 , and $1.2 \%$ age 5 . Fall Chinook

During the fall period 213 ( $15.7 \%$ ) of the condition one and 451 ( $12.8 \%$ ) of all fall Chinook bore ad-clips. Observed ad-clip rates in section 1 and 2 for condition-1 and condition-2 fall Chinook were $15.7 \%$ and $9.7 \%$ respectively. For all sections downstream of section 2 observed clip rates for condition-1 and condition-2 fall Chinook were at or below $7.6 \%$ (Table 5). CWT's were recovered from 377 of the total Chinook encountered during the fall Chinook recovery period, of which five and 372 CWT's were recovered from spring and fall Chinook respectively. During the period associated with the fall run 74 ad-clipped Chinook were recovered that CWT's were not recovered from. Two yearling release groups, 065280 and 065289 comprised $72.9 \%$ of the total fall CWT recovery.

Based on expansion of all CWT codes recovered during the fall period, an estimated 1,539 $(42.3 \%)$ of the total 3,638 fish recovered were of TRH origin (Table 7). Based on expansions of all fall CWT groups, the estimated age structure of TRH fall Chinook recovered in the mainstem Trinity River carcass survey was $9.1 \%$ age $2,53.7 \%$ age $3,36.4 \%$ age 4 , and $0.8 \%$ age 5 .

## Coho

Five hundred and fifty (58.9\%) condition-1 and 1,054 (52.7\%) of all coho observed bore RM clips (Table 6). Unlike spring and fall Chinook, coho RM clip rates for condition-1 carcasses remained high throughout sections 1-10. Based on a $100 \%$ clip rate of TRH produced juvenile coho, an estimated $58.9 \%$ of adult coho recovered during the survey were of TRH origin.

Table 7. Release and recovery data for coded-wire tagged, Trinity River Hatchery-produced Chinook salmon, recovered during the mainstem Trinity River carcass survey, 2004-05 season. a/

| Release data |  |  |  |  | Recovery data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CWT | Brood |  | Release | Production multiplier $\mathrm{c} /$ | Recovery period d/ |  | Total | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \text { of } \\ \text { sub-total } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Expanded } \\ \text { total } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| code | year | Age | type b/ |  | Spring | Fall |  |  |  |
| Spring Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065252 | 1999 | 5 | Sf | 6.40 | 1 |  | 1 | 1.0 | 6.4 |
| 065260 | 2000 | 4 | Sf | 4.21 | 1 |  | 1 | 1.0 | 4.21 |
| 065261 | 2000 | 4 | Sf | 4.21 | 4 |  | 4 | 4.0 | 16.84 |
| 065262 | 2000 | 4 | Sf | 4.21 | 2 |  | 2 | 2.0 | 8.42 |
| 065263 | 2000 | 4 | Sf | 4.05 | 1 |  | 1 | 1.0 | 4.05 |
| 065264 | 2000 | 4 | Sf | 4.51 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3.0 | 13.53 |
| 065269 | 2000 | 4 | Sf | 4.05 | 7 |  | 7 | 7.0 | 28.35 |
| 065270 | 2000 | 4 | Sf | 4.51 | 6 |  | 6 | 6.0 | 27.06 |
| 065279 | 2000 | 4 | Sy | 4.05 | 20 | 1 | 21 | 21.0 | 85.05 |
| 065281 | 2001 | 3 | Sf | 4.01 | 5 |  | 5 | 5.0 | 20.05 |
| 065282 | 2001 | 3 | Sf | 4.18 | 3 |  | 3 | 3.0 | 12.54 |
| 065283 | 2001 | 3 | Sf | 4.09 | 4 |  | 4 | 4.0 | 16.36 |
| 065288 | 2001 | 3 | Sy | 4.06 | 17 | 3 | 20 | 20.0 | 81.2 |
| 065295 | 2002 | 2 | Sf | 4.1 | 4 |  | 4 | 4.0 | 16.4 |
| 065297 | 2002 | 2 | Sf | 4.1 | 3 |  | 3 | 3.0 | 12.3 |
| No CWT recovered e/ |  |  |  |  | 15 |  | 15 | 15.0 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sub-totals: | 95 | 5 | 100 |  | 352.76 |
| Fall Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065257 | 1999 | 5 | Ff | 10.96 |  | 1 | 1 | 0.2 | 10.96 |
| 065259 | 1999 | 5 | Fy | 2.89 |  | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | 5.78 |
| 065265 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.17 |  | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | 8.34 |
| 065266 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.06 |  | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | 8.12 |
| 065267 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.05 |  | 3 | 3 | 0.7 | 12.15 |
| 065268 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.12 |  | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | 8.24 |
| 065271 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.16 |  | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | 8.32 |
| 065272 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.17 |  | 1 | 1 | 0.2 | 4.17 |
| 065273 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.05 |  | 3 | 3 | 0.7 | 12.15 |
| 065274 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.04 |  | 3 | 3 | 0.7 | 12.12 |
| 065275 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.06 |  | 6 | 6 | 1.3 | 24.36 |
| 065277 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.11 |  | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | 8.22 |
| 065278 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.12 |  | 2 | 2 | 0.4 | 8.24 |
| 065280 | 2000 | 4 | Fy | 4.03 | 2 | 101 | 103 | 23.0 | 415.09 |
| 065643 | 2000 | 4 | Ff | 4.49 |  | 5 | 5 | 1.1 | 22.45 |
| 065284 | 2001 | 3 | Ff | 4.08 |  | 9 | 9 | 2.0 | 36.72 |
| 065285 | 2001 | 3 | Ff | 4.33 |  | 5 | 5 | 1.1 | 21.65 |
| 065286 | 2001 | 3 | Ff | 4.05 |  | 9 | 9 | 2.0 | 36.45 |
| 065287 | 2001 | 3 | Ff | 4.11 |  | 4 | 4 | 0.9 | 16.44 |
| 065289 | 2001 | 3 | Fy | 4.02 |  | 174 | 174 | 38.8 | 699.48 |
| 065298 | 2002 | 2 | Ff | 4.1 |  | 13 | 13 | 2.9 | 53.3 |
| 065299 | 2002 | 2 | Ff | 4.02 |  | 6 | 6 | 1.3 | 24.12 |
| 065306 | 2002 | 2 | Ff | 4.15 |  | 3 | 3 | 0.7 | 12.45 |
| 065307 | 2002 | 2 | Ff | 4.13 |  | 5 | 5 | 1.1 | 20.65 |
| 065309 | 2002 | 2 | Fy | 4.03 |  | 7 | 7 | 1.6 | 28.21 |
| No CWT recovered e/ |  |  |  |  |  | 74 | 74 | 16.5 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sub-totals: | 2 | 446 | 448 |  | 1,518.18 |
|  |  |  |  | Grand totals: | 97 | 451 | 548 |  | 1,870.94 |
|  |  |  |  | Expanded grand totals: | 340.08 | 1,538.92 |  |  |  |

a/ Survey was conducted from Lewiston Dam downstream to Cedar Flat between September 7, 2004 through January 20, 2005
b/ Release types: Sf-Spring Chinook fingerling, Sy-Spring Chinook yearling; Ff-Fall Chinook fingerling, Fy-Fall Chinook yearling.
c/ Hatchery production multiplier used to account for untagged releases of the same brood year, race, and release type.
d/ Spring Chinook recovery period was September 9 through October 21. Later recoveries were considered fall Chinook.
e/ CWT was not present or was lost during recovery.

During the 2004 season crews encountered 10,747 fewer Chinook carcasses than in 2003 (Appendix 1). This year crews encountered 1,561 more coho carcasses than during the 2003 season (Appendix 2).

Prior to 1996, CDFG conducted mark recapture carcass recovery surveys which allowed for estimation of the total numbers of spawners in each survey section. Due to additional efforts and crew constraints from 1996 to present, carcass totals are solely based on total numbers of carcasses observed. Therefore, any comparisons of data collected under the two sampling designs must proceed with caution.

## Carcass distribution

As observed in past years, Chinook and coho carcass densities were highest in the upper most sections and were negatively associated with increased distance from Lewiston Dam and TRH (Appendix 1, Appendix 2). Potential factors contributing to the observed high densities in the upper sections may include, but are not limited to; straying of TRH produced fish, proximity to Lewiston Dam, availability of suitable spawning habitat, and perpetual high levels of natural spawning year after year.

## Size composition

When compared to recent years, the proportion of Chinook and coho grilse observed at WCW, JCW, TRH and in the carcass survey varied greatly (Appendix 3). In the Salmon River, OR probability of recovering fall Chinook in carcass surveys increased with fish length (Zhou, 2002). Size dependent recovery of carcasses has not been evaluated in the upper Trinity River carcass survey. This factor along with potential sampling bias at the weirs needs to be considered when comparing proportions of grilse observed in each location. During 2004 WCW and JCW both experienced truncated operational windows due to high stream flows. Additionally, carcass surveys downstream of section 4 were not sampled after Julian week 48 (Dec $2^{\text {nd }}$ ) and carcass surveys below section 3 ceased after Julian week 51 ( $\operatorname{Dec} 23^{\text {rd }}$ ). Carcass survey duration was adequate for Chinook recovery, although surveys ended prior to the completion of coho spawning. If grilse or adult salmon migrate or die at disproportionate rates when compared to each other, the ratios of grilse to adults observed at the weirs and in the carcass survey are not comparable. Likewise age composition of wild and hatchery salmon must be considered when comparing grilse and adult ratios observed at TRH and other sampling areas.

## Adult sex composition and female pre-spawn mortality

For spring and fall Chinook and coho salmon, female adults out numbered male adults. Previous studies on the Trinity River presented in Aguilar (1996), suggest this is common for Chinook salmon. If a portion of males return as grilse every year than adult females should make up a higher percentage of adults than males.

Reported Trinity River Chinook salmon pre-spawn mortalities for years when more than 100 females were examined have ranged from 1.0 to $63 \%$ for spring Chinook and 0.7 to $43.7 \%$ for fall Chinook (Appendix 4). Pre-spawn mortality rates observed this year were $8.5 \%$ and $5.1 \%$ for spring and fall Chinook respectively. It has been noted, most recently by Zuspan (1998), that pre-spawn mortality may be density dependent and is positively related to run-size in the Trinity River. For years in which more than 100 female coho were examined pre-spawn mortality rates have ranged from 8.5 to $15.7 \%$. The coho pre-spawn mortality rate observed this season was $15.2 \%$. It is unclear how this rate is influenced by a truncated survey season, although if prespawn mortalities die sooner than successful spawners this rate would be overestimated.

## Incidence of program marked salmon

An important component of the carcass survey is recovery of program marks from Chinook and coho salmon applied at the Willow Creek and Junction City weirs. Program marked fish recovered in the carcass survey aid in our understanding of tagging operations at the two mainstem weirs. In Task 1 of this report the assumption is made that fish tagged at the weirs are representative of both hatchery and natural spawning populations within the Trinity River. If this assumption is true then observed tag rates in the carcass survey should be similar to tag rates observed at TRH.

During the 2004 season, the percentage of tags found on both spring and fall Chinook was roughly half of what was observed at TRH. With respect to coho a slightly higher percentage of carcasses bore program tags than were observed at TRH (Appendix 5). Factors that may account for differences in percentages of program marked fish recovered this year at TRH and natural areas include: 1) Weir trapping effectiveness. If a portion of the run is not trapped as efficiently as other segment of the run, and it was composed of a higher proportion of wild or hatchery fish, the recovery percentages of marked fish may vary. This may explain the difference between tag rates observed among Chinook this year. If wild Chinook disproportionably pass through the weirs untagged, while either not installed or on a scheduled opening, the observed tag rates could be explained. Although, with a limited trapping duration at WCW at the end of the trapping season and a truncated carcass survey at the end of the season, observed tag rates of coho in the carcass survey were still higher than at TRH. If the proportion of wild fish in the coho run is lower than in the Chinook runs and wild fish are trapped at a lower rate, then the observed tag rates of coho could be explained in context to Chinook. 2) Tag loss. It is reasonable to expect that as carcasses decompose the tags would be separated from the fish and produce a lower observed tag rate. Additionally, local community members and anglers occasionally walk the banks of the river looking specifically for carcasses with $\$ 10.00$ reward tags and collect the tags for payment. Tag loss is effecting the observed tag rate among carcasses found in the survey, although the magnitude is unknown.

Incidence of hatchery produced Chinook

Another important aspect of the carcass survey is to document the magnitude and distribution of hatchery fish in the survey reaches. For all three species monitored, observed TRH clip rates were highest at the hatchery, intermediate at the weirs and lowest in the carcass survey (Appendix 6). Only condition-1 and 2 Chinook and condition-1 coho were used for this years’ analysis. These proportions of clipped fish are similar to results obtained in recent years. As in recent years the majority of fish entering TRH are of hatchery origin, and fish captured at the weirs and in the carcass survey are combinations of wild and hatchery origins.

An estimate of the incidence of hatchery produced Chinook and coho found in the main stem Trinity River can be obtained by comparing the ratios of clipped salmon observed at various locations within the river. If the assumption is made that all fish that enter TRH are of hatchery origin, then by dividing observed clip rates in off site areas by observed TRH clip rates, will produce an estimate of the percentage of hatchery fish in the off-site area.

Using the above estimation method and assumption, an estimated $75.1 \%$ of spring run above the JCW was of hatchery origin, and $34.7 \%$ of spring Chinook observed in the carcass survey was of hatchery origin (Appendix 6). Based on expansion of CWT's an estimated 28.6\% ( 340 of 1,187) of the spring Chinook recovered during the carcass survey were of hatchery origin (Table 7). If the 15 ad-clipped Chinook recovered in the carcass survey that CWT's were not recovered from were included in the CWT expansion, then $33.7 \%$ of the spring run could be explained through this method. Had CWT's been recovered from these ad-clipped fish and their expansion was 4.0 then both methods of accounting for hatchery contribution in the carcass survey would yield similar results.

Using the observed clip rate method, an estimated $93.5 \%$ of fall Chinook above WCW and $53.5 \%$ of fall Chinook observed in the carcass survey were of hatchery origin (Appendix 6). Based on expansion of CWT's an estimated $42.3 \%(1,539$ of 3,638$)$ of the fall Chinook recovered during the carcass survey were of hatchery origin (Table 7). If the 74 ad-clipped Chinook recovered in the carcass survey that CWT's were not recovered from were included in the CWT expansion, then $50.4 \%$ of the fall run could be explained through this method. Had CWT's been recovered from these ad-clipped fish and their expansion was 4.0 then both methods of accounting for hatchery contribution in the carcass survey would yield similar results.

Using the observed clip rate method, an estimated $85.1 \%$ of coho above WCW and $65.3 \%$ of coho observed in the carcass survey were of hatchery origin (Appendix 6). It is unknown as to the origin of the $9.8 \%$ of adults that entered TRH. It is reasonable to expect that some if not most of these unmarked fish were wild. If a large portion of the 1,080 unmarked adult coho that entered TRH were wild then the assumption that all or the majority of fish entering TRH were of hatchery origin would be violated.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1.) Annual spawner survey activities should be continued, with current or modified objectives, in future years.
2.) In future years, the entire survey area, sections one through ten, should be surveyed on a consistent temporal basis (e.g. once each week) if possible.
3.) We should attempt to measure all identifiable fish and make all efforts to collect CWT's when possible.
4.) If recovery of coho salmon becomes a high priority, the length of the surveys will need to be extended into January.
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Appendix 1. Total spring and fall Chinook carcasses recovered by section in the upper mainstem Trinity River from Lewiston Dam to Cedar Flat, 2000-2004.

Spring Chinook

|  | Section |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | Total |
| 2000 | 695 | 368 | 101 | 52 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1,241 |
| 2001 | 383 | 331 | 137 | 113 | 8 | 12 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1,010 |
| 2002 | 951 | 641 | 311 | 214 | 169 | 245 | 124 | 20 | 46 | 8 | 2,729 |
| 2003 | 2,643 | 1,139 | 551 | 285 | 267 | 239 | 93 | 9 | 21 | 4 | 5,251 |
| 2004 | 431 | 345 | 172 | 96 | 83 | 37 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1,187 |

Fall Chinook

|  | Section |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 2000 | 3,644 | 979 | 174 | 50 | 25 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 6 | 4,909 |
| 2001 | 3,217 | 872 | 136 | 118 | 23 | 14 | 75 | 12 | 32 | 6 | 4,505 |
| 2002 | 569 | 462 | 89 | 100 | 46 | 66 | 84 | 25 | 32 | 13 | 1,486 |
| 2003 | 6,050 | 2,656 | 886 | 385 | 84 | 91 | 50 | 23 | 72 | 24 | 10,321 |
| 2004 | 2,319 | 714 | 188 | 178 | 58 | 40 | 64 | 17 | 44 | 16 | 3,638 |




Appendix 2. Total coho carcasses recovered by section in the upper mainstem Trinity River from Lewiston Dam to Cedar Flat 2000-2004.


Appendix 3. Total grilse and adult Chinook and coho salmon observed during the upper mainstem Trinity River spawner survey and at the Junctiuon City Weir, Willow Creek Weir and Trinity River Hatchery during 2004-2005.

Spring Chinook

|  | Recovery site |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | JC Weir | Trinity River Hatchery | Spawner survey d/ | Total |
| Grilse a/ | 240 | 985 | 117 | 1,342 |
| Adults | 278 | 5,251 | 1,036 | 6,565 |
| \% Grilse | 46.3 | 15.8 | 10.1 | 17.0 |

Fall Chinook

|  | Recovery site |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grilse b/ | WC Weir | JC Weir | Trinity River Hatchery | Spawner Survey d/ | Total |
| Adults | 1,759 | 138 | 1,059 | 359 | 1,934 |
| \% Grilse | 17.7 | 36.3 | 12,384 | 3,152 | 17,537 |

## Coho

|  | Recovery site |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grilse c/ | 151 | 5 | Trinity River Heir | JC Weir | 1,077 |
| Adults | 858 | 44 | 9,906 | 82 | 1,315 |
| \% Grilse | 15.0 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 2,187 | 12,995 |

a/ Spring Chinook grilse were $<57 \mathrm{~cm}$, FL; larger fish were adults.
b/ Fall Chinook grilse were $<55 \mathrm{~cm}$, FL; larger fish were adults.
c/ Coho grilse were $<54 \mathrm{~cm}$, FL; larger fish were adults.
d/ Only condition- 1 and condition-2 carcasses were used in this analysis.

Appendix 4. Female Chinook and coho salmon pre-spawning mortality rates observed in the upper mainstem Trinity River spawner surveys from selected years from 1955 through 2004.

| Study year | Literature source | Spring Chinook |  |  | Fall Chinook |  |  | Total Chinook |  |  | Coho |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Spawned | Unspawned | \% Unspawned | Spawned | Unspawned | \% Unspawned | Spawned | Unspawned | \% Unspawned | Spawned | Unspawned | \% Unspawned |
| 1955 a/ | Gibbs (1956) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,076 | 32 | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| 1956 a/ | Weber (1965) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,438 | 219 | 6.0 |  |  |  |
| 1963 a/ | LaFaunce (1965) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,953 | 328 | 6.2 |  |  |  |
| 1968 a/ | Rogers (1970) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,494 | 124 | 7.7 |  |  |  |
| 1969 a | Smith (1975) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,889 | 23 | 1.2 |  |  |  |
| 1970 a/ | Rogers (1973) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 632 | 34 | 5.1 |  |  |  |
| 1972 a | Miller (1972) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 791 | 110 | 12.2 |  |  |  |
| 1987 b/ | Stempel (1988) |  |  | 49.9 |  |  | 18.8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1988 | Zuspan (1991) | 11 | 27 | 71.1 | 479 | 372 | 43.7 | 490 | 399 | 44.9 |  |  |  |
| 1989 | Zuspan (1992a) | 194 | 327 | 62.8 | 1,546 | 464 | 23.1 | 1,740 | 791 | 31.3 |  |  |  |
| 1990 | Zuspan (1992b) | 76 | 21 | 21.6 | 104 | 6 | 5.5 | 180 | 27 | 13.0 |  |  |  |
| 1991 | Zuspan (1994) | 22 | 0 | 0.0 | 162 | 2 | 1.2 | 184 | 2 | 1.1 |  |  |  |
| 1992 | Aguilar / Zuspan (1995) | 48 | 3 | 5.9 | 133 | 1 | 0.7 | 181 | 4 | 2.2 |  |  |  |
| 1993 | Aguilar (1995) | 115 | 5 | 4.2 | 180 | 12 | 6.3 | 295 | 17 | 5.4 |  |  |  |
| 1994 | Aguilar/Davis (1995) | 202 | 2 | 1.0 | 380 | 12 | 3.1 | 582 | 14 | 2.3 |  |  |  |
| 1995 | Zuspan (1997) | 2,711 | 517 | 16.0 | 8,502 | 3,188 | 27.3 | 11,213 | 3,705 | 24.8 |  |  |  |
| 1996 | Zuspan (1997) | 1,243 | 42 | 3.3 | 1,058 | 90 | 7.8 | 2,301 | 132 | 5.4 |  |  |  |
| 1997 | Zuspan (1998) | 1,263 | 34 | 2.6 | 491 | 28 | 5.4 | 1,754 | 62 | 3.4 |  |  |  |
| 2000 | Sinnen / Null (2002) | 559 | 17 | 3.0 | 1,940 | 146 | 7.0 | 2,499 | 163 | 6.1 | 89 | 13 | 12.7 |
| 2001 | Sinnen (2004) | 327 | 22 | 6.3 | 963 | 98 | 9.2 | 1,290 | 120 | 8.5 | 236 | 22 | 8.5 |
| 2002 | Sinnen/ Currier (2004) | 1,117 | 67 | 5.7 | 625 | 11 | 1.7 | 1,742 | 77 | 4.2 | 56 | 8 | 12.5 |
| 2003 | Sinnen/ Currier (2005) | 3,173 | 220 | 6.5 | 5,526 | 730 | 11.7 | 8,699 | 950 | 9.8 | 210 | 39 | 15.7 |
| 2004 | Current Study | 646 | 60 | 8.5 | 1,864 | 100 | 5.1 | 2,510 | 160 | 6.0 | 1,042 | 187 | 15.2 |

a/ Spring and fall Chinook salmon were not separated during these years.
b/ Overall pre-spawning mortality rates were reported but not numbers of carcasses observed.

Appendix 5. Total number of program tagged Chinook and coho salmon recovered in the mainstem Trinity River spawner survey and at Trinity River Hatchery during 2004-2005.

| $\underline{\text { Tag Site a/ }}$ | Mainstem spawner survey |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Spring Chinook |  |  | Fall Chinook |  |  | Coho |  |  |
|  | Program tags | Total observed | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Program } \\ \text { tags } \end{gathered}$ | Program tags | Total observed | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { \% Program } \\ \text { tags } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Program tags | Total observed | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% Program } \\ \text { tags } \end{gathered}$ |
| JCW | 18 | 1,194 | 1.51 | 33 | 3,631 | 0.91 | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| WCW | ----- | ----- | ----- | 112 | 3,631 | 3.08 | 66 | 2,319 | 2.85 |
| Totals: | 18 | 1194 | 1.51 | 145 | 3,631 | 3.99 | 66 | 2,319 | 2.85 |

Trinity River Hatchery

| JCW | 196 | 6,236 | 3.14 | 69 | 13,443 | 0.51 | ----- | ----- | ----- |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| WCW | ----- | ----- | ----- | 944 | 13,443 | 7.02 | 275 | 10,983 | 2.50 |
| Totals: | 196 | 6,236 | 3.14 | 1,013 | 13,443 | 7.54 | 275 | 10,983 | 2.50 |

a/ JCW=Junction City weir; WCW=Willow Creek weir.

Appendix 6. Total marked and unmarked condition 1 and 2 Chinook and condition-1 coho salmon observed in the mainstem Trinity River spawner survey (TR) and at Junction City Weir (JCW), Willow Creek Weir (WCW) and Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during 2004-2005.

| Tag Site | Spring Chinook |  |  | Fall Chinook |  |  | Coho |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ad-clips | Total | \% Ad-clips | Ad-clips | Total | \% Ad-clips | RM-clips | Total | \% RM-clips |
| JCW | 93 | 518 | 17.95 | 62 | 380 | 16.32 | 44 | 49 | 89.80 |
| WCW | ----- | ----- | ----- | 480 | 2,137 | 22.46 | 774 | 1,009 | 76.71 |
| TRH | 1,491 | 6,236 | 23.91 | 3,227 | 13,443 | 24.01 | 9,903 | 10,983 | 90.17 |
| TR | 96 | 1,157 | 8.30 | 451 | 3,513 | 12.84 | 550 | 934 | 58.89 |

Appendix 7. Estimate of hatchery contributions for spring and fall Chinook salmon observed in the 2004 mainstem Trinity River Carcass survey. Estimates based on the ratio of adipose fin-clip rates observed in the carcass survey and at Trinity River Hatchery.

|  | Spring Chinook a/ |  |  |  | Fall Chinook b/ |  |  |  | Total Chinook |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Survey section | Total Chinook | Observed <br> Ad clips | Ad clip rate | Hatchery contribution c/ | Total Chinook | Observed <br> Ad clips | Ad clip rate | Hatchery contribution d/ | Total Chinook | Observed Ad clips | Ad clip rate | Hatchery contribution e/ |
| 1 | 422 | 59 | 0.14 | 0.58 | 2,277 | 357 | 0.16 | 0.65 | 2,699 | 416 | 0.15 | 0.64 |
| 2 | 338 | 31 | 0.09 | 0.38 | 679 | 66 | 0.10 | 0.40 | 1,017 | 97 | 0.10 | 0.40 |
| 3 | 169 | 4 | 0.02 | 0.10 | 176 | 12 | 0.07 | 0.28 | 345 | 16 | 0.05 | 0.19 |
| 4 | 90 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 171 | 9 | 0.05 | 0.22 | 261 | 9 | 0.03 | 0.14 |
| 5 | 80 | 2 | 0.03 | 0.10 | 55 | , | 0.02 | 0.08 | 135 | 3 | 0.02 | 0.09 |
| 6 | 36 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 36 | 2 | 0.06 | 0.23 | 72 | 2 | 0.03 | 0.12 |
| 7 | 20 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 56 | 1 | 0.02 | 0.07 | 76 | 1 | 0.01 | 0.05 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 13 | 1 | 0.08 | 0.32 | 13 | 1 | 0.08 | 0.32 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 37 | 1 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 37 | 1 | 0.03 | 0.11 |
| 10 | 2 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 14 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Totals: | 1,157 | 96 | 0.08 | 0.35 | 3,512 | 450 | 0.13 | 0.53 | 4,669 | 546 | 0.12 | 0.49 |

a/ Condition-1 and condition-2 Chinook recovered prior to October 22.
b/ Condition-1 and condition-2 Chinook recovered after October 21.
c/ Ad-clip rate divided by 2391 (Spring Chinook Ad-clip rate at TRH).
d/ Ad-clip rate divided by .2401 (Fall Chinook Ad-clip rate at TRH).
e/ Ad-clip rate dived by 2397 (Chinook Ad-clip rate at TRH)
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#### Abstract

During August 6th through November 4th, 2004 a creel census was conducted in the lower (Mouth to Coon Creek Falls) Klamath River to determine numbers of upstream migrating Chinook salmon, coho salmon and steelhead trout harvested by sport anglers. The adult fall-run Chinook lower river quota of 2,350 (or 4,700 for the basin) was met this season on September $26^{\text {th }}, 2004$. A total of 4,439 ( 2,421 adults and 2,018 grilse) Chinook salmon and 297 ( 272 adults and 25 half-pounders) steelhead were harvested. We did not start counting fish toward the fall quota until August 13th. During the first week of the creel 31 (20 adult and 11 grisle) spring-run Chinook salmon were harvested. The total of fall-run Chinook harvested was 4,408 (2,401 adults and 2,007 grilse) fish. Seasonal summaries and comparisons of angler effort and catch, catch timing, length frequencies, species composition, hatchery fin clips and tag recoveries are presented.


## INTRODUCTION

The Klamath River system is the second largest river system in California (the Sacramento system is the largest). It drains over $40,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{km}$ in northern California and southern Oregon. The Trinity River is its largest tributary and empties into the Klamath River at Weitchpec (river mile (rm) 43). Other major tributaries of the Klamath River are the Salmon River (rm 66), Scott (rm 143) and the Shasta River (rm 177).

The upper limit of anadromous fish migration in the main Klamath River is at Iron Gate Dam (rm 98). Iron Gate Hatchery, at the base of the dam, mitigates for fish loss above the dam. The upper limit of fish migration in the Trinity River is at Lewiston Dam (rm 111). Trinity River Hatchery is located at the base of Lewiston Dam and mitigates for fish loss above the dam. Both Hatcheries are operated by California Department of Fish and Game.

The Klamath River system is one of the state's primary producers of Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) and steelhead trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss). These two species support popular sport fisheries throughout the Klamath River system with most of the concentrated effort and catch occurring in the lower 30 miles of the mainstem Klamath River.

Although sport angling has been popular throughout the Klamath River for many decades angler harvest data of anadromous salmonids within the Klamath River system prior to 1978 is limited. The earliest report found that mentions angling in the Klamath River is by Snyder (1931) where he briefly describes methods, mean length and sex of a two day creel sample at the mouth of the Klamath River in August 1921. Coots (1952) reports on angler harvest of anadromous salmonids during a year long creel census from the mouth of Salmon River to Copco Dam during 1949 and 1950. Gibbs and Kimsey (1955) provide angler effort and harvest estimates for the boat fishery in the Klamath River estuary during 1951. Bailey (1952) reported on a creel census of the riffle fishery in the lower Klamath River above the Highway 101 Bridge conducted during the fall 1951 adult steelhead and Chinook salmon immigration.

Other earlier creel census reports on the mainstem Klamath River conducted upstream of the Salmon River deal with angler catches during the summer trout season. Some adult steelhead and juvenile coho salmon are reported in the catches (Coots 1950, 1951, 1953, 1954; Wales 1948; Wales and Coots 1949). More harvest data was reported by Lanse (1970) in an area of the upper Klamath River and by Miller (1971) working in an area of the middle Klamath River. Steelhead comprised the majority of the sampled catches.

Creel census studies prior to 1978 consisted primarily of angler effort, species composition and catch per hour information. Some provided harvest and effort estimates within the sampled area. However, not until 1978 was and attempt made to estimated Chinook harvest by anglers throughout the Klamath River basin (Boydstun, 1979).

The Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 declared a fishery conservation zone in ocean waters surrounding the United States from 3 to 200 miles. As a result the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC) was established in 1976. The PFMC soon recognized the need for salmon resource management and implemented the Fishery Management Plan (FMP) in 1977 for commercial and recreational salmon fisheries off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California. The Klamath River is regarded as one of the more important producers of fall Chinook to California commercial and sport fisheries; PFMC management objectives included measures to rebuild and protect depressed Klamath River fall Chinook stocks (PFMC 1983). PFMC management practices focused on harvest restrictions for ocean troll and sport fisheries that were impacting Klamath River Chinook stocks. The State of California, with management jurisdiction of fisheries in coastal waters from shore out 3 miles and of in-river sport fisheries, implemented Chinook salmon management practices and regulations supporting PFMC objectives. Thus, Klamath River adult fall Chinook run-size data has been a critical component, since 1978, for management of fall Chinook resource and its fisheries in northern California and southern Oregon.

The numbers of fall Chinook salmon entering the Klamath Basin (run-size) is determined by accumulating the numbers harvested in-river, the numbers returning to the two hatcheries and the numbers spawning naturally. Since 1978 the angler harvest of Klamath River fall Chinook has
been monitored by CDFG to provide data for fall Chinook run-size estimates. Annual reports summarizing these activities have been written through the 2002 season (Boydstun 1979, 1980; Lee 1984a, 1984b, 1985, Lau 1992-1997; Pisano 1998; Borok 1999-2003).

This report covers the period July 1, 2004 through June 30, 2005. It provides data and a description of the CDFG fall Chinook angler harvest monitoring program in the Mainstem Klamath River from the mouth to the Highway 96 Bridge at Weitchepec (formerly to the falls at Coon Creek) excluding the Trinity River. Trinity River fall Chinook angler harvest data during the corresponding time is contained in a separate CDFG report.

The Klamath River Project (KRP) divides the Klamath River in to three Areas to determine angling effort and catch for the entire river. California Department of Fish and Game (DFG) needs this information to determine when sport anglers have reached the in-river sport harvest quota of fall-run adult Chinook salmon for the entire river (excluding the Trinity River).

The Klamath River Chinook quota works in the following manner; One half the total in-river quota is dedicated to the lower river (Area 1 and Area 2). The other half is dedicated to the upper river (Area 3) and Trinity River. We monitor or model each of the areas for the fall-run Chinook harvest and determine when the quota of each portion has been met. Once met, an adult Chinook closure goes into effect in the river. Anglers are still permitted to fish, but must release any adult Chinook salmon caught. Meanwhile, anglers in the other portions of the river are still permitted to harvest adult Chinook until their individual quotas are met. Afterwards, fishing is allowed, but the entire river is closed to the harvest of any adult Chinook. However, once Iron Gate Dam has received enough adult salmon for an egg take, a special fishery for adult Chinook was permitted from Iron Gate Dam to where Interstate 5 crosses the Klamath River. Once the river is closed to adult Chinook harvest in any area, fishing for grilse Chinook and other legal species is still permitted

The Fish and Game Commission establishes all angling regulations and quotas for the Klamath River. These regulations are enforced by the CDFG. The Commission adopts the quota recommendations made by the Pacific Fishery Management Council. Typically, the in-river sport Chinook quota was $7.5 \%$ of the overall allowable harvest, or $15 \%$ of the non- tribal fisheries harvest. In abundant seasons this portion may be adjusted. This year the in-river sport anglers received the $15 \%$ of the non-tribal harvest allocation or 4,700 fish.

Starting in 1999 an "impact quota" was implemented for the Klamath and Trinity Rivers. From this impact quota a ten percent hooking mortality factor was accounted for within the quota and this number was used as the trigger quota. This trigger closure was to account for increased hook and release mortalities when the quota was met early in the season. The impact quota was further divided among the areas in the following manner: 50\% Lower Klamath River and 50\% Upper Klamath and Trinity River. The Upper Klamath River and Trinity River further divided the quota with 17 \% going to the Upper Klamath and $16.5 \%$ to each of the two sections on the Trinity River (upper Trinity; above Cedar Flat to Trinity Hatchery and lower Trinity; confluence
with Klamath to below Cedar Flat). For the 2004 season these percentages worked out to 2,350 fish for the Lower Klamath River, 799 for the upper Klamath River and 775 for each section on the Trinity River ( 1,550 total for Trinity River).

During the 2004 season, fishing regulations allowed anglers to harvest three Chinook salmon per day (up to one adult Chinook) and one hatchery trout or one hatchery steelhead per day in the Klamath and Trinity Rivers. A total length (tip to tip) of 22 inches was used in the regulations to determine the adult/grilse cutoff. No harvest of Coho salmon was permitted. Regulations stated: one "hatchery" trout or one "hatchery" steelhead could be harvested. This eliminated cutthroat fishery in the lower river as there are no facilities raising cutthroat trout in the Klamath Trinity Basin.

## METHODS

## Description of Fishery and Creel Sample Area

The mainstem Klamath River from the mouth to Iron Gate Dam was divided into three areas for estimating angler catch and effort. Areas 1 and 2 are included in this report. Area 3 was not surveyed this season.

AREA 1: This area consisted of $4.5 \mathrm{rkm}(2.8 \mathrm{mi})$ of river from the mouth of the Klamath to the Highway 101 bridge and is referred to as the estuary. Virtually all shore angling effort took place at the mouth of the river. River mouth configuration which changed between years, determined which side (north or south) afforded better angling. A creel sample of shore anglers was conducted at the mouth location. During the 2004 season fishing at the mouth was not closed. The $15 \%$ ( 705 adult Chinook salmon) of the basin quota was met below the Hwy 101 bridge, but fish were being caught above the bridge and thus not counted against the mouth closure. This area was not the busy fishing area this season.

All boat angling effort in the estuary originated from ten resort boat docks in the estuary area. Two resort docks (Chinook RV Park and Riverside RV Park) and the public launch ramp (Old Townsite Boat Ramp) were sampled this season for angler effort and catch.

AREA 2: This area extended from the Highway 101 bridge upstream to the Highway 96 Bridge at Weitchepec (rm 40). The division was formerly the falls at Coon Creek ( $54.4 \mathrm{rkm}, 34 \mathrm{rm}$ ) near the community of Johnsons (Pecwan Creek), but to make the distinction clearer for anglers it was changed this season. Shore angling effort was generally confined to two popular riffles (Lower Klamath Glen and Blakes) located in the lower 5 km of this area and were easily accessible to the shore angler. One resort boat dock (Klamath Glen) and a public boat launch (Roy Rook), also located in the lower 5 km , were the principal boat facilities in the area. Creel sampling occurred at these locations.

Shore angling access above Blakes Riffle to Johnsons was limited to about three areas: the mouth of Blue Creek (rkm 26.3, 16.4 rm ), Ah Pah Creek (rkm 27.5, 17.2 rm ) and Bear Riffle (rkm 29.8, 18.6 rm ) were accessible by vehicle but accounted for an estimated less than one percent of angling effort in the entire sample area.

Virtually all boat angling effort that took place within Area 2 originated from the one boat dock and a public launching ramp, therefore, all boat angling effort was accounted for in the daily creel samples.

Angler access routes at Lower Klamath Glen and Blakes riffles were limited to specific routes in and out enabling a complete accounting of angler effort and catch during a sample day at these locations. Boat anglers were also confined to access at the launching ramp or resort boat dock enabling a complete sample of angler effort and catch for each sample day.

Waukel Riffle, located one-quarter mile upstream of the Highway 101 Bridge, has two principal access points each on opposite sides of the river. This sight has not been used by anglers in the last five years. It is checked sporadically, but no effort was recorded.

## Creel Census Methods

Study methods and procedures used in the Lower Klamath Creel (Area 1 and 2) during the 2004 season was essentially the same as those described for the 1983-1987 seasons (Hopelain 2001). Data is presented in Standard Julian Week (JW) format throughout this report (Appendix 1).

The weekly sampling schedule in the Lower Klamath River was sampling each site three days per Julian week and in the Upper Klamath creel each site was sampled twice per Julian week. For weeks that were sampled other than above, the data is expanded accordingly. Each angling access site is sampled throughout the day to account for total catch and effort for that particular site. Scientific aids interviewed anglers as they departed the fishing site and recorded the following information:

1) Was the angler finished fishing at this time?
2) Total hours spent fishing (to the nearest half hour).
3) The first three numbers of their Zip Code (to find their general area of residence).
4) The scientific aid processed any fish harvested (species, fork length, fin clips, tags, and unusual conditions were recorded, and a scale sample collected).
5) If the Chinook (or coho) salmon had a missing adipose fin, (possessed a CWT) the scientific aid collected the head.
6) The number and kind of fish caught and released (actually released not lost) by the angler (recorded as juveniles, grilse or adults).
7) In Area 1 only, where was the angler fishing: mouth or from boat and
upstream of bridge or down stream?

## Harvest and Effort Estimating Procedures

Data was stratified for each creel census location by Julian week (Appendix 1). Angler catch and effort estimates are then calculated for each week. The catch-effort estimate formula used was:

$$
\text { Estimate total }=\sum_{\mathrm{I}=1}^{\mathrm{n}} \text { Daily total (N/n) }
$$

where: Estimate total = estimates of catch or effort
Daily total = Daily counts of catch or effort
$\mathrm{N}=$ Number of fishing days in week
$\mathrm{n}=$ number of sample days
Area 2: Harvest estimates for the area above Highway 101 to the HWY 96 bridge at Weitchepec is calculated by multiplying the observed catch and effort by a sampling ratio. This ratio is the weekly expansion value. This value is a simple ratio of the number of days sampled during that Julian week for the site over the number of legal fishing days within the week ( 7 days week / 3 days sampled $=2.33$ ). All sites are totaled for the week to obtain the weekly harvest estimate for Area 2. This procedure applies to both boat and shore harvest. No additional expansion for the boat harvest in Area 2 is needed since total boat catch and effort were accounted for in the creel sampling.

Area 1: The procedure for the area below 101 is identical with Area 2 except for the addition of a boat expansion factor. The boat expansion factor accounts for the harvest by boat anglers we missed in sampling. Since we sample only a portion of the boat anglers, we need to account for the unsampled portion. The boat expansion formula is:
(Boats at the non-sampled docks + Boats at sampled docks)
Boats at Sampled docks
This formula expands the catch and effort from sampled sites by a percentage determined from the number of sampled and non-sampled boats. A scientific aid obtains this percentage by counting the number of boats at all the docks (both sampled and non-sampled) below Hwy 101. This count occurs during a slow time of the day, usually, between 1100 to 1500 . At this time, anglers often return to the docks. It is true that not all the boats will be at their docks at this time. However, the assumption that the percentage of boats that do not return to their docks is the same between both the unsampled and sampled docks. I also assume that the effort and catch are equal between the non-sampled boats and sampled boats.

The scientific aid obtains the boat count every day we sample in Area 1. This count does not
include any boats used in the Indian gill-net fishery and any un-rented boats. An average of these daily values is used to arrive at the average boat expansion value for the week. The closer the expansion value is to one, the greater the total coverage we have in the estuary.

## Daily Real Time Harvest Estimates and Projections

As in previous seasons, the Klamath River Project thought it necessary to compute harvest and effort estimates daily (real time) as we neared the quota to help prevent any over harvesting. In addition, we estimated one, two, and three day harvest projections to allow lead time to close the adult Chinook fishery and to assist with management.

## CREEL RESULTS

Rounding numbers to whole numbers may cause some slight addition discrepancies in these results. Spring run Chinook numbers are included in totals.

The creel census for the lower Klamath River began on August 6 and ran through November 4 (JW 32 through 44) of 2004. Chinook salmon harvested in the creel fishery ranged in size from 32 to 110 cm in fork length (FL) and averaged 59 cm FL (Figure 1A). From the fork length frequency in the creel survey sample, I found the true grilse-adult separation in length to be at 56 cm (22 inches) FL (Figure 1), the same separation used during the creel season.

The grilse component of the angler harvest ranged in size from 32 to 55 cm FL and averaged 46.4 cm FL. The adult Chinook salmon component of the harvest ranged in size from 56 to 110 cm FL and averaged 70.3 cm FL (Figure 1). This separation slightly larger than that was used by Trinity River Hatchery and the Willow Creek Weir. They made the separation at 55 cm FL (personnel communication Wade Sinnen). This separation in the sport fishery is the same as Iron Gate Hatchery (Figure 2).

Steelhead ranged in size from 32 to 76 cm FL and averaged 58.8 cm FL (Figure 3). Any fish less than 42 cm FL is considered to be a half-pounder, and any steelhead larger to be an adult. Any steelhead less than 23 cm FL is considered a resident trout and not anadromous. The half-pounder steelhead ranged in size from 32 to 41 cm FL and averaged 37 cm FL. The adult steelhead ranged in size from 42 to 76 cm FL and averaged 61.8 cm FL. This is slightly larger than the 2003 season.


Figure 1. Fork Length Frequency of Chinook Salmon Harvested in the Lower Klamath River Creel During the 2004 Season.


Figure 2. Fork Length Frequency of Chinook Salmon Sampled at Iron Gate Hatchery During the 2004 Season.


Figure 3. Length Frequency of Steelhead Caught in the Lower Klamath River Creel during the 2004 Season.

## Estimated Angler Effort and Harvest

During the 2004 season, I estimate that anglers made a total of 15,180 trips in both Areas combined. Of the 15,180 trips; 6,827 were in Area 1, and 8,352 were in Area 2 (Table 1). These trips resulted in a total of 71,397 fishing hours. As in previous seasons, boat anglers outnumbered shore anglers in both Areas (Table 1). A total of 4,439 (2,421 adults and 2,018 grilse) Chinook salmon and 297 ( 272 adults and 25 half-pounders) steelhead were harvested. We did not start counting fish toward the quota until August 13th. During the first week of the creel 31 ( 20 adult and 11 grisle) spring-run Chinook salmon were harvested. The total of fall-run Chinook harvested was 4,408 (2,401 adults and 2,007 grilse) fish. Adults composed $54.4 \%$ $(2,401 / 4,408)$ of the estimated fall-run Chinook harvest. Adult steelhead trout composed 91.6 \% (272/297; Table 1) of the steelhead harvest. In addition, 47 ( 35 adult and 12 grilse) coho salmon were harvested this season.

Table 1. Summary of Estimated Angler Effort and Harvest During the 2004 Lower Klamath River Creel Census.

| Site | Angler |  | Steelhead |  | Chinook Salmon |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Location | Trips | Hours | $1 / 2$ lbers |  | Adults | Grilse |
| Adults |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Area 1 -Mouth to Highway 101 Bridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shore | 1,754 | 5,751 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 209 |
| Boats | 5,073 | 21,056 | 4 | 37 | 573 | 679 |
| Total | 6,827 | 26,807 | 6 | 43 | 585 | 888 |
| Area 2 - Highway 101 to Coon Creek Falls |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shore | 2,007 | 6,671 | 16 | 29 | 64 | 60 |


| Boats | 6,345 | 37,920 | 2 | 200 | 1,369 | 1,473 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Total | 8,352 | 44,591 | 18 | 229 | 1,433 | 1,533 |
| Grand <br> Total | 15,180 | 71,397 | 25 | 272 | 2,018 | 2,421 |
| 2003 | 16,514 | 79,228 | 27 | 162 | 736 | 4,812 |
| 2002 | 18,376 | 85,925 | 5 | 393 | 638 | 7,275 |

## 2004 Harvest and Effort Patterns

The average length of each trip ( 4.7 hours per trip) was up just a bit from last two seasons. It is our hypothesis that the larger quotas and brought the anglers back to the Klamath Area to fish (Table 2). The Daily bag limit was the same as in the 2003 season (one adult and two grilse),

During the 2004 season, Area 2 anglers harvested more fish than Area 1 (Table 1). Anglers (boat and shore) in Area 2 accounted for $66.1 \%(2,966 / 4,439)$ of the total Chinook salmon and $83.2 \%(247 / 297)$ of the steelhead harvested. Anglers in Area 1 harvested the remainder. Area 1 anglers accounted for $44.9 \%(6,827 / 15,180)$ of angler trips and only $37.5 \%$ of the angler hours ( $26,807 / 71,397$ ). Of the total Chinook harvest, $4.9 \%$ occurred in Areal at the mouth this season (Table 1). A portion of the fish recorded for Area 1 were actually caught in Area 2 later in the season. People were launching their boats from the Old Townsite Boat Ramp in Area 1 and fishing up river. These fish were not counted against the $15 \%$ of basin quota which would close the mouth/spit fishery.

Table 2. The Number of Angler Trips, Hours, and Average Length of Trip in the Lower Klamath River Sport Fishery for the Last Thirteen Seasons, 1992-2004

| Year | Total Trips | Total Hours | Average Trip |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1992 | 11,190 | 33,080 | 3.0 |
| 1993 | 16,081 | 51,889 | 3.2 |
| 1994 | 15,100 | 54,748 | 3.6 |
| 1995 | 19,881 | 63,369 | 3.2 |
| 1996 | 27,929 | 91,019 | 3.3 |
| 1997 | 18,402 | 67,154 | 3.6 |
| 1998 | 11,852 | 52,145 | 3.0 |
| 1999 | $-134-$ | 35,109 |  |


| 2000 | 14,150 | 57,184 | 4.0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2001 | 20,116 | 88,053 | 4.3 |
| 2002 | 18,376 | 85,925 | 4.6 |
| 2003 | 16,514 | 79,228 | 4.6 |
| 2004 | 15,180 | 71,397 | 4.7 |

The harvest per hour of adult Chinook salmon slightly over the average for the last twenty five years. The harvest of grilse Chinook in the 2004 season was well over the 25 year average (Figure 4). Regulations for the harvest of grilse has remained constant for the last four years. Anglers reported more grilse present in the river this season.


Figure 4. Harvest Per Hour of Chinook Salmon from the Sport Harvest on the Lower Klamath River Creel 1980-2004.

## Catch and Release

Catch and release numbers were recorded as part of the creel interview. Anglers were specifically asked if these fish were released rather than lost. Numbers should only be used as an estimation for following trends as they can be highly subjective. I estimated anglers released 5,976 half-pounders, 1,526 adult steelhead, 415 grilse, and 578 adult Chinook salmon (Tables 3 and 4). In addition, 29 grilse and 135 adult coho salmon were released this season. The majority of coho salmon harvested and released occurred in Area 2. Anglers tend to fish later into the season in Area 2, when coho are present.

Table 3 Number of Chinook and Coho Salmon and Steelhead Caught and Released from the Lower Klamath River Creel for the Last Nine Seasons 1994-2004.

| Year | Chinook |  | Steelhead |  | Coho |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Grilse | Adults | $<42$ | Grilse |  |  |
| 1994 | 290 | 2,571 | 4,044 | 198 | 0 | 0 |
| 1995 | 175 | 14,408 | 1,049 | 259 | 0 | 33 |
| 1996 | 521 | 1,438 | 1,944 | 256 | 7 | 11 |
| 1997 | 34 | 1,015 | 1,479 | 516 | 0 | 0 |
| 1998 | 330 | 1,317 | 1,738 | 460 | 10 | 19 |
| 1999 | 1,897 | 1,164 | 1,189 | 346 | 2 | 5 |
| 2000 | 757 | 6,253 | 8,103 | 1,129 | 17 | 43 |
| 2001 | 464 | 1,720 | 11,892 | 2,997 | 12 | 242 |
| 2002 | 405 | 2,985 | 4,783 | 6,036 | 12 | 243 |
| 2003 | 303 | 3,970 | 3,791 | 1,553 | 4 | 130 |
| 2004 | 509 | 688 | 6,223 | 1,577 | 29 | 135 |

Table 4. Summary of Estimated Catch and Releases During the 2004 Lower Klamath River Creel Census.

| Site | Angler |  | Steelhead |  | Chinook Salmon |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Trips | Hours | $1 / 2$ lbers | Adults | Grilse | Adults |
| Area 1 -Mouth to Highway 101 Bridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shore | 1,754 | 5,751 | 90 | 21 | 2 | 7 |
| Boats | 5,073 | 21,056 | 156 | 29 | 92 | 103 |
| Total | 6,827 | 26,807 | 246 | 50 | 94 | 110 |
| Area 2 - Highway 101 to Coon Creek Falls |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shore | 2,007 | 6,671 | 3,713 | 666 | 36 | 23 |
| Boats | 6,345 | 37,920 | 2,263 | 860 | 379 | 555 |
| Total | 8,352 | 44,591 | 5,976 | 1526 | 415 | 578 |
| Grand Total | 15,180 | 71,397 | 6,223 | 1,577 | 509 | 688 |
| 2003 | 16,514 | 79,228 | 3,791 | 1,553 | 303 | 3,970 |
| 2002 | 18,376 | 85,925 | 4,783 | 6,036 | 405 | 2,985 |

## Run Timing

Adult fall-run Chinook salmon harvest below the Highway 96 Bridge at Weitchepec (Areas 1 and 2) peaked during Julian week 37. This was the same as the 2003 season and a week later than both the 2002 and 2001 season. For grilse Chinook the peak harvest occurred also during Julian Week 37 for both Areas (Figure 5). Grilse harvest made up 45.5\% of total Chinook harvest. This is up considerably from the $13.2 \%$ in the 2003 season

Labor Day was in Julian Week 36 this season. The peak week of adult Chinook harvested was in Julian Week 37. The peak week of adult Chinook released was in Julian Week 39 (Figure 6). The quota was met 2 days into Julian Week 39 or Sept 26, 2004. For grilse Chinook, the peak harvest occurred during Julian Week 37 and releases occurred in Julian week 38 (Figure 6).

More adult steelhead (272) were harvested than half-pounders (25). The peak of the adult steelhead harvested was Julian week 35 (Figure 7). The peak for releases for both half-pounders and adults was Julian Week 33 (Figure 8). Anglers start fishing for steelhead usually in July, and creel counts start (Julian Week 32) at the beginning of August, therefore we miss the early portion of the steelhead run.

Regulations allowed anglers to keep only hatchery origin steelhead. Large numbers of steelhead were caught and released this year. Anglers released 1,577 adult and 6,223 half-pounders this season (Table 5). Area 2 is where the majority of steelhead are harvested and released. Julian Week 33 was the peak week for half-pounders released (Figure 8). For adult steelhead released Julian Week 33 was the largest peak (Figure 8).


Figure 5. Chinook Salmon Harvest By Julian Week in Lower Klamath River for the 2004 Creel Season.

Table 5. Fish Harvested and Released by Julian Week During the 2004 Lower Klamath River Creel Census.

| JULIAN WEEK |  |  | Harvest |  |  |  | Released |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Trips | Hours | $$ |  | Chinook Grilse Adult |  | Steelhead $1 / 2 \mathrm{lb}$ Adult |  | Chinook Grilse Adult |  |
| 32 | 575 | 2,269 | 5 | 27 | 11 | 20 | 367 | 117 | 2 | 9 |
| 33 | 965 | 3,401 | 2 | 14 | 21 | 53 | 1562 | 644 | 8 | 2 |
| 34 | 1,625 | 5,528 | 0 | 24 | 45 | 103 | 765 | 255 | 19 | 5 |
| 35 | 2,457 | 9,957 | 5 | 56 | 207 | 463 | 912 | 135 | 27 | 42 |
| 36 | 3,450 | 16,353 | 0 | 39 | 484 | 458 | 741 | 114 | 150 | 40 |
| 37 | 2,583 | 13,400 | 5 | 22 | 524 | 570 | 471 | 64 | 72 | 126 |
| 38 | 1,829 | 10,415 | 2 | 45 | 440 | 479 | 708 | 97 | 106 | 133 |
| 39 | 1,001 | 6,083 | 6 | 33 | 230 | 275 | 272 | 81 | 58 | 183 |
| 40 | 396 | 2,427 | 0 | 6 | 38 | 0 | 117 | 51 | 30 | 137 |
| 41 | 188 | 947 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 0 | 156 | 5 | 12 | 9 |
| 42 | 102 | 602 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 151 | 11 | 25 | 0 |
| 43 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| 44 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 15,180 | 71,397 | 25 | 272 | 2,018 | 2,421 | 6223 | 1577 | 509 | 688 |



Figure 6. Chinook Salmon Released By Julian Week in the Lower Klamath River for the 2004 Creel Season.


Figure 7. Steelhead Harvested During the 2004 Lower Klamath River Creel Season.


Figure 8. Steelhead Released By Julian Week During the Lower Klamath River 2004 Creel Season.

Coded-Wire Tag Recovery
Klamath River Project personnel recovered 188 heads of adipose fin-clipped (Ad+CWT) Chinook salmon during Julian Weeks 32 through 40 of the 2004 season. There were seven from non-random recoveries (NRR), wherein anglers and or resort owners saved their fish heads for our personnel. These NRRs were not used to estimate the harvest of marked hatchery origin (Ad+CWT) Chinook salmon (Table 6). However, they were used to calculate run timing (Figure 9). Of these 188 tags, 117 were adult salmon while 71 were grilse salmon.

Fin-clipped fall run grilse ranged in size from 41 to 73 cm . Fin-clipped fall-run adults ranged in size from 46 to 95 cm . All fin-clipped fish observed in the angler survey were assigned an individual head tag number which allowed tracking of each head through the extraction and decoding process.

There are standard codes for tags not recovered; 100000-no tag found, 200000-tag lost, 300000 -no head recovered; 400000 -tag unreadable; and 700000 tag code unresolved. For the heads recovered this season, thirteen heads had no tags recovered (100000), three were lost during extraction (200000), and one tag was unreadable (400000), while the 171 remaining were all decoded.

Hatchery Contribution
Randomly recovered, marked Chinook composed 9.6 \% $(188 / 1,877)$ of the actual Chinook harvested. With expansions made for sampling and production, I estimate 2,227 hatchery fish were harvested (Table 7). Hatchery fish represented an estimated $50.1 \%(2,227 / 4,439)$ of the entire sport harvest in the lower Klamath River. All 188 random recovered tags were from Klamath and Trinity Basin origin Chinook.

In addition to the random recovered tags, we had 7 non-random recovered (NRR) tags. These are heads brought to us from fish with adipose clips that were recovered on days we were not sampling a particular area. These are used for run timing purposes. Of these 7 NRR tags, four were from adults and 3 from grilse verified by tag code.

Klamath River Origin Chinook Salmon
We decoded 36 random recovered tags from Klamath River origin Chinook (1 five-year-old, 12 four-year-olds, 17 three-year-olds and 6 two-year-olds). These Chinook represent twelve marked groups from Iron Gate Hatchery (Table 6). When expanded by sampling and by production Iron Gate Hatchery origin fish account for $21.7 \%(963 / 4,439)$ of the sport harvest (Table 7).

The peak for Klamath River origin Chinook harvest was Julian Week 36. Personnel recovered Klamath River coded-wire-tagged fish between Julian week 33 and Julian week 38 (Figure 9).

## Trinity River Origin Chinook Salmon

We decoded a total of 128 random recovered tags from Trinity River origin Chinook ( 0 five-year-olds, 7 four-year-olds, 68 three-year-olds and 53 two-year-olds). From the 128 tags, two were spring-run Trinity River Hatchery origin Chinook ( 0 five-year-olds, 0 four-year-olds, 1 three-year-old and 1 two-year-old, Table 6). Of the rest of these tags, 10 fall-run and 2 springrun Trinity River Hatchery mark groups were represented. Trinity River origin fish represented
$28.4 \%(1,264 / 4,439)(28.0 \%$ fall-run and $0.4 \%$ spring-run) of the sport harvest (Table 7).
Trinity River spring-run Chinook tag recovery began during Julian Week 32 and extended through Julian Week 33. Fall-run fish began to appear in tag recoveries during Julian week 34 and continued through Julian Week 40. Trinity River fall-run tags peaked during Julian week 38 (Figure 9).

During the 2004 season, sport in-river harvest by stock can be described as follows: Trinity River spring-run Chinook were predominate in the harvest up to Julian week 33. Klamath River fall-run Chinook were present and peaked at Julian week 36. The bulk of the Trinity River fallrun tags were collected during Julian week 38. No more coded-wire tagged Chinook were recovered after Julian week 40 (Figure 9).

Table 6. Coded-Wire-Tag Information from Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) and Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) for Chinook Salmon Obtained from the Lower Klamath River Creel 2004 Season.

|  | Release Data |  |  | Recovery Data |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CWT Codes | Strain | B | Site | Creel | N R R | FLRange | Date Range |
| Adult Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06-63-51 | Fall | 99 | IGH | 1 | 0 | 88 | 8/30 |
| 06-52-78 | Fall | 00 | TRH | 1 | 0 | 84 | 9/4 |
| 06-52-80 | Fall | 00 | TRH | 6 | 1 | 72-83 | 8/20-9/22 |
| 06-63-53 | Fall | 00 | IGH | 2 | 0 | 81,82 | 8/27-9/5 |
| 06-63-54 | Fall | 00 | IGH | 8 | 1 | 78-95 | 8/18-9/22 |
| 0601020306 | Fall | 00 | IGH | 1 | 0 | -- | 8/20 |
| 0601020308 | Fall | 00 | IGH | 1 | 0 | 93 | 8/20 |
| 06-52-56 | Fall | 01 | IGH | 0 | 1 | -- | 9/10 |
| 06-52-85 | Fall | 01 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 72,74 | 9/12 |
| 06-52-86 | Fall | 01 | TRH | 1 | 0 | 61 | 8/29 |
| 06-52-88 | SPR | 01 | TRH | 1 | 0 | 56 | 8/11 |
| 08-52-89 | Fall | 01 | TRH | 64 | 0 | 57-79 | 8/28-9/28 |
| 06-63-55 | Fall | 01 | IGH | 4 | 1 | 61-68 | 8/22-9/18 |
| 06-63-56 | Fall | 01 | IGH | 8 | 0 | 46-87 | 9/4-9/18 |
| 06-63-57 | Fall | 01 | IGH | 5 | 0 | 62-71 | 8/28-9/13 |
| 100000 | no tag found |  |  | 6 | 0 | 59-79 | 9/4-9/11 |
| 200000 | Tag lost |  |  | 2 | 0 | 65,88 | 8/28,8/31 |


| 400000 | Tag un-readable |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  |  | 113 | 4 |  |  |
| Grilse Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06-52-97 | SPR | 02 | TRH | 1 | 0 | 48 | 8/15 |
| 06-52-98 | Fall | 02 | TRH | 18 | 0 | 44-73 | 8/25-10/6 |
| 06-52-99 | Fall | 02 | TRH | 6 | 1 | 47-55 | 9/5-9/25 |
| 06-53-06 | Fall | 02 | TRH | 8 | 0 | 43-52 | 9/6-9/26 |
| 06-53-07 | Fall | 02 | TRH | 9 | 2 | 45-51 | 9/5-9/28 |
| 06-53-09 | Fall | 02 | TRH | 11 | 0 | 41-51 | 9/8-9/26 |
| 06-63-58 | Fall | 02 | IGH | 1 | 0 | 47 | 9/8 |
| 06-63-60 | Fall | 02 | IGH | 2 | 0 | 42,45 | 9/19,9/20 |
| 0601020405 | Fall | 02 | IGH | 2 | 0 | 48,56 | 9/4,9/18 |
| 0601020407 | Fall | 02 | IGH | 1 | 0 | 49 | 9/4 |
| 100000 | no tag found |  |  | 7 | 0 | 48-52 | 9/4-9/22 |
| 200000 | Tag lost |  |  | 1 | 0 | 47 | 9/8 |
| 400000 | Tag lost |  |  | 1 | 0 | 53 | 9/12 |
| Totals |  |  |  | 68 | 3 |  |  |
| Grand Total |  |  |  | 181 | 7 |  |  |

Table 7. Chinook Salmon Proportioned by Hatchery and Brood Year from Coded-Wire tagged Fish Harvested in the Lower Klamath River Sport Harvest for the 2004 Creel Season. Expanded for sampling and by hatchery production multiplier.

| Hatchery Run | Estimated Total By Brood Year |  |  |  | Total | \% by <br> Hatchery <br> Run | \% of total harvest $(4,439)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |  |  |  |
| TRH SPR |  |  | 9 | 10 | 19 | 0.85 | 0.42 |
| TRH Fall |  | 67 | 648 | 530 | 1,245 | 55.9 | 28.0 |
| IGH Fall | 27 | 346 | 399 | 191 | 963 | 43.2 | 21.7 |
| Total | 27 | 413 | 1,056 | 731 | 2,227 |  | 50.1 |
| \% by year | 1.2 | 18.5 | 47.4 | 32.8 |  |  |  |



Figure 9. Timing by Julian Week of Coded Wire Tags, Expanded for Sampling and by Individual Tag Code, Recovered from Chinook Salmon in the Lower Klamath River 2004 Creel Season.

## DISCUSSION

The mouth configuration (far north) this season vastly reduced harvest on the mouth/spit of the river. Anglers were not happy with the bag limit of one adult per day. Had this regulation been increased to two adult fish per day, I believe the quota would have been met sometime earlier in September. Further consideration will be given to future regulations with respect to the size of quota and mouth configuration.

Warm water temperatures and low flow conditions in Mid August had all fisheries professionals concerned about the 2004 run of salmon and steelhead. An additional 13,700 acre feet of water was released from August 22 through September 12 from Lewiston Dam to provide water for Fishery purposes. The additional water was thought to help keep fish moving through the estuary thus to avert another massive die off of adult upstream migrating fall fish. A smaller volume of water was released out of Iron Gate Dam. The additional water and a small storm event kept the flows above 3000 cfs at the Terwer Gauge and decreased the average daily water temperature 1.5 C or below 21 C .

## CONCLUSION

The 2004 season resulted in the $12^{\text {th }}$ lowest run-size for fall-run Chinook salmon in the Klamath Basin over the last 27 . This season had a higher grilse to adult ratio (10.9\%) than has been seen in the last four years. This bodes well for the next season.
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Appendix 1. List of Julian weeks and their calendar equivalents.

| Julian week | Inclusive dates |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Julian week } \\ \hline 27 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Inclusive dates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 01-Jan | - | 07-Jan |  | 02-Jul | - | 08-Jul |
| 2 | 08-Jan | - | 14-Jan | 28 | 09-Jul | - | 15-Jul |
| 3 | 15-Jan | - | 21-Jan | 29 | 16-Jul | - | 22-Jul |
| 4 | 22-Jan | - | 28-Jan | 30 | 23-Jul | - | 29-Jul |
| 5 | 29-Jan | - | 04-Feb | 31 | 30-Jul | - | 05-Aug |
| 6 | $05-\mathrm{Feb}$ | - | $11-\mathrm{Feb}$ | 32 | 06-Aug | - | 12-Aug |
| 7 | $12-\mathrm{Feb}$ | - | 18 -Feb | 33 | 13-Aug | - | 19-Aug |
| 8 | $19-\mathrm{Feb}$ | - | 25-Feb | 34 | 20-Aug | - | 26-Aug |
| $9 \mathrm{a} /$ | 26-Feb | - | 04-Mar | 35 | 27-Aug | - | 02-Sep |
| 10 | 05-Mar | - | 11-Mar | 36 | 03-Sep | - | 09-Sep |
| 11 | 12-Mar | - | 18-Mar | 37 | 10-Sep | - | 16-Sep |
| 12 | 19-Mar | - | 25-Mar | 38 | 17-Sep | - | 23-Sep |
| 13 | 26-Mar | - | 01-Apr | 39 | 24-Sep | - | 30-Sep |
| 14 | 02-Apr | - | 08-Apr | 40 | 01-Oct | - | 07-Oct |
| 15 | 09-Apr | - | $15-\mathrm{Apr}$ | 41 | 08-Oct | - | 14 -Oct |
| 16 | 16-Apr | - | 22-Apr | 42 | 15-Oct | - | 21-Oct |
| 17 | $23-\mathrm{Apr}$ | - | 29-Apr | 43 | 22 -Oct | - | $28-\mathrm{Oct}$ |
| 18 | 30-Apr | - | 06-May | 44 | 29-Oct | - | 04-Nov |
| 19 | 07-May | - | 13-May | 45 | 05-Nov | - | 11-Nov |
| 20 | 14-May | - | 20-May | 46 | 12-Nov | - | 18-Nov |
| 21 | 21-May | - | 27-May | 47 | 19-Nov | - | $25-\mathrm{Nov}$ |
| 22 | 28-May | - | 03-Jun | 48 | 26-Nov | - | 02-Dec |
| 23 | 04-Jun | - | 10-Jun | 49 | 03-Dec | - | 09-Dec |
| 24 | 11-Jun | - | 17-Jun | 50 | 10-Dec | - | 16-Dec |
| 25 | 18-Jun | - | 24-Jun | 51 | 17-Dec | - | 23-Dec |
| 26 | 25-Jun | - | 01-Jul | $52 \mathrm{~b} /$ | 24-Dec | - | 31-Dec |

a/ Eight-day week in each leap year (years divisible by 4).
b/ Eight-day week every year.


[^0]:    1/ Adipose fin-clipped and coded-wire-tagged (Ad+CWT), hatchery-produced Chinook and right-maxillary-clipped coho salmon.

[^1]:    a/ The fish ladder was open from September 3, 2004 through March 15, 2005 (Julian Week 36-11).
    b/ Entry week was the week that fish were initally sorted, although they may have actually entered the hatchery during the previous sorting week.
    c/ Release types are either fingerling ( f ) or yearling ( y ).
    d/ The hatchery was closed to fish entry this week

[^2]:    a/ Estimates are upstream of Junction City and Willow Creek weirs for spring and fall estimates respectively.
    b/ CWT=coded-wire tag code. Fish are of the same race and release type (smolt or yearling).
    c/ BY=brood year.
    d/ Expansion factor used to account for untagged releases of the same BY and release type for each CWT group.
    e/ Run-size times TRH expansion factor.
    f/ TRH=Trinity River Hatchery.

[^3]:    a/ BY=Brood year
    b/ Age classes are determined using fork length frequency analysis.
    c/ TRH=Trinity River Hatchery

