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Mike Allan was a scientific technician for the Department from 1984 through 2008. Mike was an essential team member on many field projects the Department operated in the upper Trinity River. He took pride and ownership of the projects he worked on and spent many hours, often times in difficult circumstances, making sure projects ran smoothly. The Junction City weir, pictured above, was his favorite project and he spent numerous hours at all times of the day and night guiding its operation and maintenance. Though Mike had a demeanor that may have appeared gruff to some, those that knew him would all tell you he had a heart of gold. Mike had a love of the outdoors and he, along with wife Linda, maintained two "off' the grid homes in the French and Mill Creek drainages within the Trinity Basin. Mike was an avid Dodgers fan, loved to hang out with close friends, and was particularly concerned with the health of the Trinity River and the fisheries resources he spent so many years to help monitor. Mike's mentorship to younger staff, his professional behavior, and his dedication and pride will be missed by all that knew him.

This is the twentieth 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, 2008 through September 30, 2009 (FFY 2008). 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 Tribal Fisheries (HVTF), Yurok Tribal Fisheries Program (YTFP), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The HVTF, YTFP, and USFWS were contracted separately by the USBOR for cooperative and singular work performed during FFY 2008. Please refer to those respective agency/tribal fisheries departments or USBOR for information regarding 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
Mary Claire Kier and Wade Sinnen


#### Abstract

The California Department of Fish and Game's Trinity River Project (TRP) conducted tagging and recapture operations from July 2008 through March 2009 to obtain adult spring-run (spring Chinook) and fall-run (fall Chinook) Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), coho salmon (O. kisutch), and fall steelhead (O. mykiss) run-size, angler harvest, and spawner escapement estimates in the Trinity River basin. The project is conducted by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) in cooperation with the Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries Department (HVT). Two main stem weirs were placed in the Trinity River near the towns of Junction City and Willow Creek, and trapped 2,343 Chinook salmon, 449 coho salmon, 957 fall steelhead and 101 brown trout (Salmo trutta).

Based on Project-tagged fish recovered at Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) and on the return of reward tags by anglers, an estimated 10,283 spring Chinook migrated into the Trinity River basin upstream of Junction City weir (JCW). An estimated 306 spring Chinook were caught by anglers, leaving 9,977 fish as potential spawners. An estimated 22,997 fall Chinook migrated past Willow Creek weir (WCW), of which an estimated 475 were caught by anglers, leaving 22,521 potential spawners.

The coho salmon (coho) run in the Trinity River basin upstream of WCW was estimated at 9,982 fish. Zero adult coho were estimated as harvested by anglers, leaving all 9,982 as potential spawners.


An estimated 15,015 (5,477 naturally produced and 9,538 hatchery produced) adult fall steelhead returned to the Trinity River basin upstream of WCW. Anglers harvested an estimated 424 adult fall steelhead above the WCW, leaving 14,590 fish as potential spawners.

## TASK OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the size, composition, distribution, and timing of adult Chinook salmon, 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 salmon and coho salmon, and steelhead.

## INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Fish and Game's TRP, in cooperation with the HVT conducts annual tagging and recapture operations of adult Chinook and coho salmon, and fall steelhead in the main stem Trinity River. This effort determines the composition (race and proportion of hatchery-marked ${ }^{1 /}$ or Project-tagged ${ }^{2 / 1}$ fish), distribution, and timing of Chinook salmon, coho salmon, and fall steelhead runs in the Trinity River basin. Recaptures of hatchery-marked or Project-tagged fish are used to develop runsize, angler harvest, and spawner escapement estimates for Chinook and coho salmon, and steelhead runs. Additionally, tagging of brown trout continued 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-run steelhead (steelhead). 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 (DFG) (Heubach and Hubbell (1980); Heubach (1984a, 1984b); Heubach et al. (1992a, 1992b); Lau et al. (1994, 1998, 2000); Zuspan et al. (1985, 1995); Zuspan and Sinnen (1995); Sinnen and Hanson (1996); Zuspan (1996, 1997); Sinnen et al. (2001); Sinnen and Reese (2002, 2004); Reese (2004); Reese and Sinnen (2004); Sinnen and Knechtle (2005); Knechtle and Sinnen (2006, 2007, 2009), and Sinnen and Kier (2009).

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 October 1, 1989 through the present.

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 main stem Trinity River and several of its tributaries, including the South Fork Trinity River and some of its tributaries (Moffett and Smith (1950); Gibbs (1956); LaFaunce (1965a, 1965b, 1967);

[^0]Weber (1965); Rogers (1970, 1972, 1973a, 1973b, 1982); Miller (1975); and Smith (1975). Earlier efforts did not include fish which used the main stem and tributaries of the lower Trinity River nor 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, it was decided 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 late November 2008 at temporary weir sites near the towns of Willow Creek and Junction City on the main stem Trinity River. The downstream site, WCW, was located 36.5 km upstream from the Trinity River's confluence with the Klamath River ( $40^{\circ} 58^{\prime} 29.85^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}, 123^{\circ} 38^{\prime} 8.61^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$ ). The upstream site, JCW, was located 132.7 km upstream from the Klamath River confluence ( $40^{\circ} 41^{\prime} 5.51^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{N}, 123^{\circ} 01^{\prime} 35.55^{\prime \prime} \mathrm{W}$ ) (Figure 1). In general, prior to 1995, JCW was operated from May through November. From 1995 through 2008 JCW was operated from late-June or mid-July through September, with the exception of 2005 when an attempt was made to obtain additional estimates and JCW was operated from mid-July through the end of November. WCW is typically operated from mid-August through November. Most fall Chinook spawning occurs upstream of WCW, while the majority of spring Chinook spawning occurs upstream of JCW.

The JCW was operated from July 15 through September 24, 2008, and the WCW was operated from August 20 through November 25, 2008. At both weir sites, trapping was attempted during a five day period beginning around dusk on Sunday and ending Friday afternoon. Each trapping day the weir was opened for at least five hours to allow fish to pass unimpeded through the weir site, and it was opened over the weekend as well. 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 $22^{\circ}$ Celsius.

## Weir and Trap Design

Since 1989, a Bertoni (Alaskan) weir design has been used at both sites (Figures 2-4). The weir is supported by wooden tripods set 2.5 m apart. Weir panels consisted of 3.0 $\mathrm{m} \times 1.9 \mathrm{~cm}(10 \mathrm{ft} \times 3 / 4 \mathrm{in})$ electrical conduit spaced 5.1 cm apart on center, leaving a gap of 3.2 cm between conduits. Conduit pieces are supported by three sections of aluminum channel arranged 0.92 m apart, which are connected to the supporting tripods. The tripods are anchored with cable to 1.8 m stakes driven into the stream


Figure 1. Location of trapping/tagging weirs for anadromous salmonids near Willow Creek and Junction City in the main stem Trinity River, 2008 season.
bottom. The weir panels are angled at roughly a $45^{\circ}$ angle, with the top of the weir standing 1.8 m above the river bottom.

The traps are made of 1.9 cm electrical conduit spaced 2.5 cm apart and welded into panels. The panels are wired together at the corners to produce a 2.4 m square box which is bolted to a plywood floor and covered with a plywood lid to prevent fish from jumping out. A fyke, also made of conduit panels, is installed in the trap to guide fish into the trap box and prevent their escape. The trap is placed on the upstream side of the weir, directly in front of 12 raised conduit pieces creating an opening approximately 60 cm . This opening allows fish to pass through the weir, through the fyke, then into the trap. To allow boat passage, gates approximately 5.3 m wide were inserted between two weir panels. The gate at JCW was constructed of welded conduit panels with 2.5 cm spacing between pieces of conduit and was perpendicular to the stream substrate. The gate at WCW was constructed of 4.0 cm mesh chain-link fencing supported by a livestock gate and was sloped downstream, even with the weir.


Figure 2. Photograph of Alaskan-style weir tripods, support channels and conduit (looking upstream).


Figure 3. Photo (from downstream) of Willow Creek weir. Note the open boat gate (right side of picture).


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

## Processing of Fish

At both weirs, all trapped salmonids were identified to species, measured to the nearest cm fork length (FL), and examined for hook, predator, or gill-net wounds or scars, fin clips, and tags. Each untagged, un-spawned salmonid judged in good condition is tagged with a serially numbered Floy Tag and Manufacturing, Inc. FT-4 ${ }^{3 /}$ spaghetti tag (Project-tagged). Tags were inserted using an applicator needle through the fish's back approximately two cm below the base of the dorsal fin and $1 / 4$ the length of the dorsal fin, anterior of the posterior edge of the dorsal fin. At both weirs one-third of the Chinook received $\$ 10$-reward tags, while the remaining two-thirds received non-reward tags. At WCW one-half of the steelhead received reward tags while the remaining fish received non-reward tags, while all the steelhead at JCW were tagged with non-reward tags. Coho were tagged with non-reward tags at WCW, though none were tagged (or trapped) at JCW. At JCW, brown trout were tagged with serially numbered (Floy) FD-94 anchor tags, but at WCW any brown trout were tagged with FT-4 spaghetti non-reward tags.

[^1]
## Determining the Separation between Spring and Fall Chinook Runs at the Weirs

Each year there is a temporal overlap in the spring and fall Chinook runs in the Trinity River. Run timing varies between years, and each season dates are assigned that separate the spring and fall Chinook runs. This separation is determined by comparing proportions of known and estimated spring and fall Chinook trapped at the weirs each week. The week in which the proportion of fall Chinook exceeds spring Chinook is 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 run and the following as fall run.

A recovered Project-tagged Chinook is identified as either a spring or a fall Chinook based on two separate criteria. First, some Chinook tagged at the weirs have codedwire tags (CWTs) which were placed in their snouts as juveniles at TRH. These fish are identifiable by the absence of their adipose fin, which is clipped (ad-clipped) during the CWT tagging process. If these fish are recovered at the hatchery or during spawner surveys, the CWT code (which is determined after the CWT is removed from the snout of the fish and read using a microscope) indicates whether they were spring or fall fish. Second, non-CWTed Chinook (Project-tagged at the weir then recovered at the hatchery) are 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. The 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 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 CWTs that entered TRH, the numbers of tags recovered from each returning CWT group were expanded by the CWT production multiplier (the ratio of tagged to total Chinook released by same strain, brood year [BY], release site, release group and date). For example, 118,575 fall Chinook of CWT group 06-53-50 plus 383,638 unmarked fall Chinook were released from TRH in June of 2006. The expanded estimate for each return of this group is $4.235(118,575+383,638 / 118,575)$. 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 entered the hatchery on a particular sorting day than could be accounted for by the expansion of all CWT groups, the additional fish were considered to be naturally produced. These fish were designated as either spring run or fall run in the same proportions that were determined by the expansion of the CWT groups on that day.

To estimate spring and fall Chinook run-sizes, a separation date at the hatchery was assigned between the two runs. The separation date was the week in which fall Chinook out-numbered spring Chinook based on the expansion of CWTs.

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

The size separating adult and grilse spring and fall Chinook was based on two criteria; length frequency data obtained at the two trapping sites and TRH, and length data obtained from groups of CWTed fish that entered TRH whose exact age was known. Fork length data from TRH Chinook was only used from weeks in which $\geq 90 \%$ of the Chinook could be designated as either spring run or fall run as explained by the expansion of CWTs.

Coho salmon do not receive CWTs, therefore exact ages are unknown. The separation of grilse and adult coho salmon was based entirely on length-frequency analysis.

Chinook and coho salmon length-frequency data collected at the weirs and TRH were smoothed with a moving average of five 1-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, and back from, the ocean). Steelhead $\leq 41 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL that entered TRH were not counted and were classified as sub-adults.

## Recovery of Tagged Fish

## Weir Recovery

All salmonid carcasses recovered at the weir were measured to the nearest cm FL and examined for wounds, tags, fin clips, and spawning condition. All heads from ad-clipped fish were removed for the potential recovery and decoding of the CWT. After processing, all 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 of days after tagging, were not considered tagging mortalities.

## Angler Tag Returns

All the tags placed on fish at the weirs were inscribed with the TRP Arcata field office address and the word RETURN. The information from returned Project-tags by anglers and river enthusiasts allowed for estimation of angler harvest and catch and release rates for all species marked. 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 the TRP Arcata field office through June 12, 2009 were included in assessing harvest and catch and release rates. Tags returned after that date were processed for payment but not used for analysis.

## Trinity River Hatchery Returns

The TRH fish ladder was open September 08 through October 09, 2008 and October 24, 2008 through March 11, 2009. TRH closed the fish ladder from October 10 to October 24 (parts or all of JWs 41-43) as a means of separation of the spring and fall Chinook races, based on CWT analysis of recovered Chinook. Hatchery personnel typically conducted fish spawning operations two days per week during the Chinook and coho spawn. Additional spawn days occurred during the peak of the runs in November. Steelhead spawning operations ensued one day per week from January into March.

All salmon and steelhead entering TRH were identified to species, sexed, examined for tags and clips, and measured to the nearest cm FL. Each salmon and steelhead that enters the TRH spawning house is measured to the nearest cm FL only once.

Since fish are measured only once, individual fish are marked at the time of first TRH entry. Coho and adult steelhead that come through the hatchery prior to the start of the TRH spawning of those species get upper caudal fin clips prior to live release to the river. Both coho and steelhead are known to make multiple returns to the hatchery trap within the same spawning season. We refer to these marked returns as "re-runs". The purpose of the upper caudal clip is to prevent double counting of fish that have been released live to the river but return on subsequent days.

For spawning purposes, TRH staff initially sort fish as either ripe or unripe. Ripe salmon are either spawned or excised, and ripe steelhead either spawned or returned to the river. Unripe salmon are either moved to holding tanks for further ripening (up to 14 days) or are excised, and unripe steelhead either held for further ripening or returned to the river. Prior to transferring to the holding tanks, unripe fish with ad-clips or Project tags are given a date-specific fin clip to indicate which week they entered TRH. Unripe fish without an ad-clip or a Project tag were tallied prior to being transferred to the holding pond. Held fish are then processed on a later spawning day, after the "fresh" fish are sorted and processed. Entry week fin clips were recorded from all holdover fish when processed.

TRH routinely holds over unripe fish at the beginning of the spawning of each of the races of Chinook salmon, coho salmon and steelhead. Once the TRH egg-take quota is reached they cease to hold fish over.

In the database the Project-tagged salmon and steelhead recovered at TRH were generally assigned the FL recorded for them at the weir. The heads of all ad-clipped salmon were removed and placed individually in plastic bags with serially-numbered head tags noting the date, location of recovery, species, sex, and FL. Project personnel later performed extraction and decoding of those CWTs.

## Spawner Surveys

With crews from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Forest Service, the Yurok Tribe, and Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries Program, TRP staff conducted spawner surveys in the upper Trinity River from Cedar Flat (rkm 78) upstream to Lewiston Dam (rkm 180) and from Hawkins Bar (rkm 64) to Weitchpec (rkm 0). 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

The number of effectively tagged fish was estimated by subtracting from the total tagged those fish that were classified as tagging mortalities, tagged fish recovered downstream of the tagging site, and angler caught and released fish.

## Run-size Estimates

Run-size estimates were calculated using Chapman's version ${ }^{4 /}$ of the Petersen Single Census Method (Ricker 1975):

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

$\mathrm{N}=$ estimated run-size
$M=$ the number of effectively tagged fish
$C=$ the number of fish examined at TRH
$R=$ the number of Project-marked fish recovered in the hatchery sample.
Annually, TRP staff attempt to tag and recover enough fish to obtain 95\% confidence within $\pm 10 \%$ of the run-size estimate. The confidence interval estimator is selected using criteria established by Chapman (1948). Estimates for spring Chinook and coho

[^2]were not stratified into grilse and adult salmon this season 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. Estimates for fall Chinook above the WCW were stratified this year due to the unusually large discrepancy between the number of grilse and adults seen at WCW versus seen anywhere else in the Trinity system. To estimate the number of grilse and adult coho above the WCW the proportions of grilse and adults observed at WCW and TRH were combined and were applied to the run-size estimate. To estimate the number of grilse and adult spring Chinook above the JCW the proportions of grilse and adults observed at JCW and TRH were combined and were applied to the run-size estimate.

All steelhead run-size estimates were for adults only. All TRH-produced steelhead since the 1997 brood year have received adipose-fin clips. The proportion of the run that was hatchery-produced is based upon the percentage of adipose fin-clipped steelhead observed at WCW.

Assumptions of run size estimates are: 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) All tag loss was accounted for.

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

When reward tags are returned at a higher rate than non-reward tags, only returns from reward tags are used to determine harvest rates. When non-reward tags are returned at higher rates than reward tags, harvest rates are determined by combining the returns of both reward and non-reward tags.

Harvest rates were calculated for each species (and race of Chinook) by dividing the number of angler-returned tags from harvested fish by the number of fish that were effectively tagged. Independent harvest rates were calculated for grilse and adult salmon. Catch and release rate for each species (and race of Chinook) were calculated by dividing the number of angler-returned tags from caught and released fish by the number of fish effectively tagged plus the number of fish reported as released.

The numbers of fish harvested upstream of each weir were estimated 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 January 1, regardless of the day of the week on which January 1
falls (Appendix 1). The extra day in leap years is included in the ninth week. This procedure allows inter-annual comparisons of identical weekly periods.

## RESULTS

## Trapping and Tagging

## Chinook Salmon

Spring/Fall Chinook Separation and Run Timing
Chinook were designated as either spring-run (spring) or fall-run (fall) based on recoveries of coded-wire tags or entry-timing into Trinity River Hatchery. For purpose of analysis, the spring/fall separation point is a hard date, but in reality, the timing of the two runs of Chinook frequently overlaps. In 2008 spring Chinook was the only race of Chinook trapped at JCW throughout the entire trapping period (Figure 5). At JCW spring Chinook peaked during JW 31 at 14.2 fish per night. The last two Julian weeks of trapping (JW 38 and 39) combined (with 6 nights of trapping total) yielded $13 \%$ of the catch for the season with 4.3 Chinook per night (Table 1, Figure 6).

At WCW in 2008, the first two weeks of trapping, JW 34 and JW 35, spring Chinook dominated the catch. It wasn't until JW 36 that the proportion of fall Chinook tagged at WCW exceeded spring Chinook (Figure 5), therefore, all Chinook captured prior to JW 36 were considered spring Chinook, while those captured after JW 35 were considered fall Chinook (Figure 7). Fall Chinook daily catch peaked during the second week of the fall period (JW 37) at 90.6 fish per night and decreased thereafter. A storm-event during JW 44 coincided with an increased number of fish moving through the system (32.3 Chinook per night) but also meant we had to stop trapping for nearly two weeks. When we were able to resume trapping we had little success, averaging three Chinook per night in JW 46 and only two per night in JW 47 (Table 2, Figure 7). We removed the weir from the river, for the season, on 25 November.

## Size of Trapped Fish

Spring Chinook trapped at JCW, WCW and TRH averaged 66.3, 58.1 and 71.6 cm FL , respectively, with a combined average of the three sites of 70.1 cm FL (Figure 8, Appendix 4). The nadir between grilse and adult spring Chinook indicated a maximum grilse size of 54 cm FL. Data from known age, hatchery-marked spring Chinook that entered TRH reinforced a minimum adult fork length of 55 cm . There was some overlap between sizes of age 2 and age 3 fish (Appendix 2). Applying the minimum adult size of 55 cm FL to observed populations of Chinook, an estimated $21.6 \%$ of the spring Chinook observed were grilse at JCW, and $8.7 \%$ at TRH. Spring Chinook age composition at TRH based on CWT analysis alone was $27.5 \%, 15.8 \%, 53.7 \%$, and $3.0 \%$ age 2, 3, 4 and 5 year old fish, respectively. Historically, the maximum spring Chinook grilse FL averages 52 cm , and has only been greater than 56 cm once since 1977.

Fall Chinook trapped at WCW and TRH averaged 61.3 and 71.7 cm FL, respectively, with a combined average FL of 69.1 cm . (Figure 9). The nadir between grilse and adult fall Chinook indicated a maximum grilse size of 57 cm FL. Data from known age,
hatchery marked fall Chinook entering TRH supported this separation between grilse and adults; there was little overlap between sizes of age 2 and age 3 fish (Appendix 3).



Figure 5. Percent recovery of Junction City weir and Willow Creek weir marked Chinook at Trinity River Hatchery during the 2008 season.

Table 1. Weekly summary of spring Chinook trapped in the Trinity River at Junction City weir during 2008. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Julian week | Inclusive dates |  | Nights Trapped | Number trapped |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grilse ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Adclips | Adults | Adclips ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Total | Ad-clip total | Fish/ night |
| 29 | 16-Jul | - 22-Jul |  | 2 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 26 | 1 | 13.0 |
| 30 | 23-Jul | - 29-Jul | 5 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1.2 |
| 31 | 30-Jul | - 5-Aug | 5 | 9 | 0 | 62 | 14 | 71 | 14 | 14.2 |
| 32 | 6-Aug | - 12-Aug | 5 | 5 | 0 | 15 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 4.0 |
| 33 | 13-Aug | - 19-Aug | 5 | 3 | 0 | 17 | 1 | 20 | 1 | 4.0 |
| 34 | 20-Aug | - 26-Aug | 5 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1.8 |
| 35 | 27-Aug | - 2-Sep | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0.8 |
| 36 | 3-Sep | - 9-Sep | 5 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 1 | 1.8 |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - 16-Sep | 5 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 2.8 |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - 23-Sep | 5 | 9 | 0 | 12 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 4.2 |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - 30-Sep | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 5.0 |
|  |  | Total: <br> Mean: | 47 | 44 | 0 | 160 | 22 | 204 | 22 | 4.3 |

a/ Trapping at Junction City weir took place July 15 - September 24, 2008 (Julian weeks 28-39).
b/ Spring Chinook <55 cm FL were considered grilse in 2008.
c/ Adipose fin-clipped Chinook. Number shown is a subset of weekly grilse and adults totals.


Figure 6. Mean catch of spring Chinook in the Trinity River at Junction City weir during 2008.

Table 2. Weekly summary of Chinook trapped in the Trinity River at Willow Creek weir during 2008. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Julian week | Inclusive dates | Nights trapped | Number trapped |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grilse ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Adclips | Adults | Adclips ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Total | Ad-clip total | Fish/ night |
| Spring Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34 | 20-Aug - 26-Aug | 4 | 112 | 1 | 89 | 4 | 201 | 5 | 50.3 |
| 35 | 27-Aug - 2-Sep | 5 | 130 | 1 | 66 | 2 | 196 | 3 | 39.2 |
|  | Sub total: | 9 | 242 | 2 | 155 | 6 | 397 | 8 |  |
|  | Sub mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 44.1 |

Fall Chinook

| 36 | 3-Sep - 9-Sep | 5 | 209 | 4 | 82 | 3 | 291 | 7 | 58.2 |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37 | 10-Sep - 16-Sep | 5 | 290 | 9 | 163 | 14 | 453 | 23 | 90.6 |
| 38 | 17-Sep - 23-Sep | 5 | 131 | 5 | 117 | 12 | 248 | 17 | 49.6 |
| 39 | 24-Sep - 30-Sep | 5 | 145 | 8 | 141 | 25 | 286 | 33 | 57.2 |
| 40 | 1-Oct - 7-Oct | 5 | 42 | 4 | 74 | 12 | 116 | 16 | 23.2 |
| 41 | 8-Oct - 14-Oct | 5 | 17 | 1 | 47 | 6 | 64 | 7 | 12.8 |
| 42 | 15-Oct - 21-Oct | 5 | 27 | 2 | 84 | 14 | 111 | 16 | 22.2 |
| 43 | 22-Oct - 28-Oct | 5 | 18 |  | 38 | 4 | 56 | 4 | 11.2 |
| 44 | 29-Oct - 4-Nov | 3 | 9 |  | 88 | 15 | 97 | 15 | 32.3 |
| 45 | 5-Nov - 11-Nov | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | -- | - | -- |
| 46 | 12-Nov - 18-Nov | 2 | 6 |  | 0 |  | 6 | 0 | 3.0 |
| 47 | 19-Nov - 25-Nov | 7 | 11 |  | 3 |  | 14 | 0 | 2.0 |
|  | Sub-total: | 52 | 905 | 33 | 837 | 105 | 1,742 | 138 |  |
|  | Sub-mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grand total: | 61 | 1,147 | 35 | 992 | 111 | 2,139 | 146 |  |  |
|  | Grand mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  | 35.1 |  |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek weir took place August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47). b/ Spring Chinook <55 cm FL, and fall Chinook <58 cm FL were considered grilse in 2008. c/ Adipose fin-clipped Chinook. Number shown is a subset of weekly grilse and adults totals.


Figure 7. Mean catch of spring and fall Chinook at Willow Creek weir, 2008.




Figure 8. Spring Chinook fork lengths (cm) observed at Junction City weir, Willow Creek weir, Trinity River Hatchery and all three sites combined during the 2008-09 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 used to separate grilse and adults for analysis.



Figure 9. Fall Chinook fork lengths (cm) observed at Willow Creek weir and Trinity River Hatchery and both sites combined during the 2008-09 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 used to separate grilse and adults for analysis.

Using the maximum grilse size of 57 cm , fall Chinook grilse comprised $51.9 \%$ and $15.3 \%$ of the run observed at WCW and TRH respectively. Fall Chinook age composition at TRH based on CWT analysis alone was $24.7 \%, 19.9 \%, 54.3 \%$, and $1.1 \%$ age $2,3,4$, and 5 year old fish, respectively. The maximum grilse FL averages 54 cm over the 33 year period of record.

## Effectively Tagged Fish

A total of 204 spring Chinook were trapped at JCW, of which 201 (43 grilse and 158 adults) were effectively tagged (Appendix 4). There were two tagging mortalities detected and one caught and released spring Chinook, from which anglers reported removing tags (Appendix 8). A total of 67 (33.3 \%) spring Chinook were tagged with reward tags ( 15 grilse and 52 adults); the remaining fish received non-reward tags.

Of the 397 spring Chinook trapped at WCW, 375 ( 233 grilse and 142 adults) were effectively tagged. A total of 1,742 fall Chinook were trapped at WCW, of which 1,690 were tagged (the other 52 were in poor condition and not tagged). Of those 1,690 tagged fish ( 877 grilse and 813 adults), 1,666 of them ( 861 grilse and 805 adults) were effectively tagged (the number of effectively tagged fish excludes fish that were not tagged, tagging mortalities, and fish that had their tags removed by anglers (Appendix 5). There were four adult and one grilse tagging mortalities detected and 19 (15 grilse, 4 adult) caught and released fall Chinook from which anglers reported removing tags (Appendix 9). Reward tags were placed on 563 (292 grilse and 271 adults), or $33.8 \%$, of the fall Chinook trapped at WCW, non-reward tags on the remaining fish ( 585 grilse and 542 adults).

## Incidence of Tags and Fin Clips

Three of the spring Chinook tagged at WCW were subsequently recaptured at JCW this year. Ad-clipped fish comprised 10.78\% of the spring Chinook captured (22 of 204) at JCW (Appendix 4). Fourteen of the 22 (63.6\%) ad-clipped spring Chinook tagged at JCW were subsequently recovered at TRH (Table 3).

Ad-clipped fish comprised 2.0\% (8/397) of the spring Chinook (Appendix 4) and 7.9\% $(138 / 1,742)$ of the fall Chinook trapped at WCW (Appendix 5). Three (37.5\%) of the eight ad-clipped spring Chinook and 78 (56.5\%) of the 138 ad-clipped fall Chinook tagged at WCW were recovered at TRH (Table 3). Of these 138, the vast majority (25) were three year old fall Chinook released from TRH as yearlings in October of 2006, while 12 were four year olds released as yearlings in October 2005.

Incidence of Gill-net Wounds, Hook Scars, and Predator Wounds
Seventeen (8.3\%) of the 204 spring Chinook trapped at JCW had gill net wounds. Crews also noted one old hooking scar, four wounds of unknown origin and three predator wounds on spring Chinook at JCW.

Forty one (10.3\%) spring and 157 (9.0\%) fall Chinook trapped at WCW had gill net wounds. The WCW crew also noted one spring and zero fall Chinook with old hook scars; one spring and nine fall Chinook with fresh hook wounds; 10 spring and 30 fall

Chinook with unknown wounds; and 14 spring and 82 fall Chinook with predator wounds.

Table 3. Release data and recoveries of coded-wire tagged (CWT) and maxillary-clipped salmon trapped in the Trinity River at Willow Creek weir (WCW) and Junction City weir (JCW), and subsequently recovered at Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during the 2008-09 season.

| CWT and release type ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Species | Race | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Brood } \\ & \text { year } \end{aligned}$ | Date | Number of fish | Origination Site | Number recovered from tagging site: |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | WCW | JCW |
| SPRING CHINOOK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065326-y | Chinook | spring | 2004 | 10/03-11/2005 | 104,478 | TRH | 1 | 11 |
| 065332-y | Chinook | spring | 2005 | 10/02-16/2006 | 11,959 | TRH |  | 1 |
| 065334-f | Chinook | spring | 2005 | 06/01-07/2006 | 95,152 | TRH | 1 |  |
| 065335-f | Chinook | spring | 2005 | 06/01-07/2006 | 74,036 | TRH |  | 1 |
| 065347-f shed tag ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Chinook | spring | 2006 | 06/01-08/2007 | 65,914 | TRH | 1 |  |
|  | Chinook | spring |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total spring Chinook: |  | 3 | 14 |
| FALL CHINOOK |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065322-f | Chinook | fall | 2004 | 06/01-08/2005 | 123,231 | TRH | 1 |  |
| 065323-f | Chinook | fall | 2004 | 06/01-08/2005 | 120,440 | TRH | 10 |  |
| 065325-f | Chinook | fall | 2004 | 06/01-08/2005 | 120,518 | TRH | 2 |  |
| 065329-f | Chinook | fall | 2004 | 06/01-08/2005 | 5,917 | TRH | 1 |  |
| 065327-y | Chinook | fall | 2004 | 10/03-11/2005 | 218,386 | TRH | 12 |  |
| 065336-f | Chinook | fall | 2005 | 06/07-07/2006 | 104,760 | TRH | 2 |  |
| 065338-f | Chinook | fall | 2005 | 06/07-07/2006 | 119,293 | TRH | 1 |  |
| 065339-f | Chinook | fall | 2005 | 06/07-07/2006 | 127,742 | TRH | 2 |  |
| 065340-f | Chinook | fall | 2005 | 06/07-07/2006 | 10,267 | TRH | 1 |  |
| 065341-y | Chinook | fall | 2005 | 10/02-16/2006 | 227,903 | TRH | 25 |  |
| 065350-f | Chinook | fall | 2006 | 06/01-08/2007 | 118,575 | TRH | 3 |  |
| 065351-f | Chinook | fall | 2006 | 06/01-08/2007 | 119,712 | TRH | 3 |  |
| 065353-f | Chinook | fall | 2006 | 06/01-08/2007 | 126,470 | TRH | 1 |  |
| 065361-y | Chinook | fall | 2006 | 10/01-10/2007 | 238,156 | TRH | 7 |  |
| shed tag ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Chinook | fall |  |  |  |  | 7 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total fall Chinook: |  | 78 | 0 |

Table 3 (continued). Release data and recoveries of coded-wire tagged (CWT) and maxillary-clipped salmon trapped in the Trinity River at Willow Creek weir (WCW) and Junction City weir (JCW), and subsequently recovered at Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during the 200809 season.

| COHO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $R^{c}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $R^{c}$ | coho | 2005 | $03 / 15-20 / 2007$ | 511,961 | TRH | 45 |  |
|  | coho | 2006 | $03 / 17-25 / 2008$ | 455,557 | TRH | 171 |  |

a/ f = fingerling; y = yearling
b/ Fish with shed CWTs were designated as either spring or fall Chinook based on the date they were trapped at the weirs.
c/ Since 1996, all coho produced at TRH have received a right maxillary clip (RM). Coho $<53 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were classified as brood year 2006 and coho $>52 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were classified as brood year 2005. Age cutoff based on fork length distribution.

## Coho Salmon

## Run timing

No coho salmon were trapped at JCW in 2008. Four weeks into trapping at WCW we had only caught four coho, trapping week five (JW 38) we got 13, 53 were caught the following week, 117 the week after that, and the run peaked in JW 41 with 148 coho (29.6 fish per night) trapped (Table 4, Figure 10). A total of 449 coho salmon were trapped ( 107 grilse and 342 adults) at WCW during the 2008 season.

## Size of Trapped Fish

Coho trapped at WCW and TRH average FL was 59.9 and 65.0 cm respectively (Figure 11, Appendix 6). The size separating grilse and adult was based on the combined fork length data from coho salmon trapped at WCW and those that entered TRH (Figure 11). This year all coho salmon $\leq 53 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were considered grilse. Grilse comprised 23.8\% and $12.5 \%$ of the coho salmon trapped at WCW and TRH respectively.

## Effectively Tagged Fish

A total of 449 coho were trapped at WCW, of which 430 ( 101 grilse and 329 adults) were effectively tagged (Appendix 6). Due to poor condition (wounds or other stressors) 14 coho trapped at WCW were not tagged. There is no legal recreational coho fishery, though five coho were caught and released by anglers (Appendix 10). To discourage anglers from targeting coho, all coho were tagged with non-reward tags.

## Incidence of Tags and Fin Clips

Three hundred ninety of the 449 (86.9\%) coho trapped at WCW (103 grilse and 287 adults) bore right maxillary (RM) clips (Appendix 6). Two hundred twenty three of the WCW Project-tagged coho, 216 of them RM-clipped, were recovered at TRH (Table 3).

Incidence of Gill-net Wounds, Hook Scars and Predator Wounds
Of the 449 coho trapped at WCW, 43 had gill net wounds. The crew also noted 32 with predator wounds, one with a fresh hook scar, and nine with wounds of unknown origin.

Table 4. Weekly summary of coho trapped at Willow Creek weir during 2008. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Julian week | Inclusive dates | Nights trapped | Number trapped |  |  |  |  |  | Fish / night |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Grilse ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Grilse w/ RM clips $^{\text {c }}$ | Adults | Adults w/ RM clips | Total trapped | Total RM clips |  |
| 34 | 20-Aug - 26-Aug | 4 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0.3 |
| 35 | 27-Aug - 2-Sep | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.4 |
| 36 | 3-Sep - 9-Sep | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 37 | 10-Sep - 16-Sep | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 38 | 17-Sep - 23-Sep | 5 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 2.6 |
| 39 | 24-Sep - 30-Sep | 5 | 18 | 17 | 35 | 32 | 53 | 49 | 10.6 |
| 40 | 1-Oct - 7-Oct | 5 | 34 | 34 | 83 | 75 | 117 | 109 | 23.4 |
| 41 | 8-Oct - 14-Oct | 5 | 21 | 20 | 127 | 104 | 148 | 124 | 29.6 |
| 42 | 15-Oct - 21-Oct | 5 | 19 | 18 | 47 | 39 | 66 | 57 | 13.2 |
| 43 | 22-Oct - 28-Oct | 5 | 7 | 7 | 32 | 22 | 39 | 29 | 7.8 |
| 44 | 29-Oct - 4-Nov | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 7 | 2.7 |
| 45 | 5-Nov - 11-Nov | 0 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | -- |
| 46 | 12-Nov - 18-Nov | 2 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 46 | 19-Nov - 25-Nov | 7 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 0 | 0.1 |
| Total |  | 61 | 107 | 103 | 342 | 287 | 449 | 390 |  |
| Mean: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.4 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek weir took place from August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47). b/ Coho < 53 cm FL were considered grilse.
c/ The right maxillary clipped fish are presented as a subset of the total grilse or adult coho caught.


Figure 10. Mean catch of coho trapped at Willow Creek weir during 2008.




Figure 11. Coho salmon fork lengths (cm) observed at Willow Creek Weir and Trinity River Hatchery and both sites combined during the 2008-09 season. The number of fish shown at each fork length is shown as a moving average of five, $1-\mathrm{cm}$ increments. The arrow denotes the size used to separate grilse and adults for analysis.

## Fall Steelhead

## Run Timing

At JCW, only 42 (41 adult and one half-pounder) steelhead were trapped all season, of which 30 adults, and the one half-pounder, had ad-clips. Julian weeks 31 and 32 (with 5 trap nights per week) yielded the highest numbers of fish trapped (eight), averaging 1.6 per night, though JW 29 saw five adults trapped in two nights of trapping (Table 5, Figure 12). Adipose fin-clipped steelhead were tagged at JCW in 2008, though no run estimates were attempted. The results of the tagging are purely qualitative in nature. Of the 31 tagged fish, nine were recovered at TRH.

Nine hundred fifteen fall steelhead were trapped at WCW in 2008 (Table 6, Figure 13), 46 half-pounders ( $<42 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{FL}$ ) and 869 adults. The peak of the run was during JW 40 with an average of 58.8 fish per night trapped. Julian week 44 yielded a mere 1.7 fish/night.

## Size of Fish Trapped

Steelhead caught at JCW, WCW, and TRH averaged 62.1, 62.3 and 64.8 cm FL, respectively (Figure 14). Adult steelhead (>41 cm FL) made up 97.6\% and 95.0\% of the steelhead trapped at JCW, and WCW, respectively.

## Effectively Tagged Fish

A total of 869 adult steelhead were trapped at WCW in 2008, and 855 of those were tagged (Appendix 7). Only adult fish were tagged. Six adult fish were not tagged due to poor condition. Six fish were declared tagging mortalities (anytime a fish is found on the weir within 30 days of tagging and has not spawned it is considered a tagging mortality) and anglers reported removing tags from 85 caught and released fish, leaving 775 effectively tagged adult steelhead. Eight of the adult steelhead trapped wore Project tags from previous years. Of the 855 newly tagged fish, reward-tags were attached to 426 while the remainder (429) received non-reward tags.

Incidence of Tags and Fin Clips
Ad-clips were found on 31 (73.8\%) of the steelhead at JCW, 584 (63.8\%) at WCW and 2,527 (98.8\%) at TRH (Appendix 7). Steelhead trapped at WCW had various other clips as well: 1-left maxillary; 1-left maxillary plus ad-clip; and 1-right maxillary clip. 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 JCW one gill-net wound and one predator wound were noted on steelhead in 2008. On the 915 steelhead trapped at WCW we noted the following: 18 gill-net wounds; eight fresh hooking wounds; 30 unknown wounds or scars; and 72 predator wounds.

Table 5. Weekly summary of fall-run steelhead trapped at the Junction City weir during 2008. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Julian week | Inclusive dates | Nights trapped | Number trapped |  |  |  |  |  | Fish / <br> night |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Half pounders ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Adclips | Adults | Adclips ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Total | Ad-clip total |  |
| 29 | 16-Jul - 22-Jul | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2.5 |
| 30 | 23-Jul - 29-Jul | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0.8 |
| 31 | 30-Jul - 5-Aug | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1.6 |
| 32 | 6-Aug - 12-Aug | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 6 | 1.6 |
| 33 | 13-Aug - 19-Aug | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0.6 |
| 34 | 20-Aug - 26-Aug | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.4 |
| 35 | 27-Aug - 2-Sep | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.5 |
| 36 | 3-Sep - 9-Sep | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0.6 |
| 37 | 10-Sep - 16-Sep | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0.4 |
| 38 | 17-Sep - 23-Sep | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1.0 |
| 39 | 24-Sep - 30-Sep | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 |
|  | Total: <br> Mean: | 47 | 1 | 1 | 41 | 30 | 42 | 31 | 0.9 |

a/ Trapping at Junction City weir took place July 16-September 24, 2008 (Julian weeks 29-39). b/ Steelhead $<42 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were considered half-pounders.
c/ Adipose fin-clipped steelhead. Number shown is a subset of weekly half-pounder and adult totals.


Figure 12. Mean catch of fall-run steelhead at Junction City weir during 2008.

Table 6. Weekly summary of fall-run steelhead trapped at the Willow Creek weir during 2008. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Julian <br> week | Inclusive dates | Nights trapped | Number trapped |  |  |  |  |  | Fish/ night |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Half pounders ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Adclips ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Adults | Ad- <br> clips | Total | Ad-clip total |  |
| 34 | 20-Aug - 26-Aug | 4 | 5 | 2 | 114 | 56 | 119 | 58 | 29.8 |
| 35 | 27-Aug - 2-Sep | 5 | 3 | 2 | 61 | 28 | 64 | 30 | 12.8 |
| 36 | 3-Sep - 9-Sep | 5 | 1 | 1 | 39 | 23 | 40 | 24 | 8.0 |
| 37 | 10-Sep-16-Sep | 5 | 2 | 1 | 35 | 22 | 37 | 23 | 7.4 |
| 38 | 17-Sep - 23-Sep | 5 | 4 | 3 | 39 | 30 | 43 | 33 | 8.6 |
| 39 | 24-Sep - 30-Sep | 5 | 4 | 4 | 106 | 77 | 110 | 81 | 22.0 |
| 40 | 1-Oct - 7-Oct | 5 | 21 | 14 | 273 | 192 | 294 | 206 | 58.8 |
| 41 | 8-Oct - 14-Oct | 5 | 2 | 2 | 136 | 90 | 138 | 92 | 27.6 |
| 42 | 15-Oct - 21-Oct | 5 | 1 | 1 | 34 | 23 | 35 | 24 | 7.0 |
| 43 | 22-Oct - 28-Oct | 5 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 2.4 |
| 44 | 29-Oct - 4-Nov | 3 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 1.7 |
| 45 | 5-Nov - 11-Nov | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -- |
| 46 | 12-Nov-18-Nov | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2.5 |
| 47 | 19-Nov - 25-Nov | 7 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 13 | 1 | 1.9 |
|  | Total: Mean: | 61 | 46 | 32 | 869 | 552 | 915 | 584 | 15.0 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek weir took place August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47).
b/ Steelhead $<42 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were considered half-pounders.
c/ Adipose fin-clipped steelhead. Number shown is a subset of weekly half-pounder and adult totals.


Figure 13. Mean catch of fall-run steelhead at Willow Creek weir during 2008.





Figure 14. Steelhead fork lengths (cm) observed at Junction City weir, Willow Creek weir, Trinity River Hatchery and all three sites combined during the 2008-09 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 used to separate $1 / 2$ pounders (sub-adults) and adults for analysis.

## Brown Trout

Capture Timing
During the 2008 trapping season, 101 brown trout were captured during 47 nights of trapping at JCW (Table 7, Figure 15). The highest catch occurred in the fourth week of trapping (JW 32) with a mean fish/night rate of 5.2. No brown trout were trapped at WCW during 2008.

Size of Trapped Fish
Brown trout captured this season ranged in size from 32 to 62 cm FL (Table 8, Figure 16). Four brown trout tagged in previous years were recaptured at JCW in 2008, one tagged in 2005 (tagged at 46 cm FL, recaptured at 53 cm FL ) and three browns tagged in 2007 (which averaged an increase of 3.3 cm growth from the previous year).

## Effectively Tagged Fish

Of the 101 brown trout tagged at JCW in 2008, two were reported as caught/released by anglers, leaving 99 effective tags. No Project-tagged brown trout were reported as harvested. All of the brown trout at JCW were tagged with non-reward tags.

Table 7. Weekly summary of brown trout trapped in the Trinity River at Junction City weir during 2008. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Julian week | Inclusive dates |  |  | Nights trapped | Number trapped |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Total | Fish/night |
| 29 | 16-Jul | - | 22-Jul |  | 2 | 10 | 5.0 |
| 30 | 23-Jul | - | 29-Jul | 5 | 5 | 1.0 |
| 31 | 30-Jul | - | 5-Aug | 5 | 22 | 4.4 |
| 32 | 6-Aug | - | 12-Aug | 5 | 26 | 5.2 |
| 33 | 13-Aug | - | 19-Aug | 5 | 13 | 2.6 |
| 34 | 20-Aug | - | 26-Aug | 5 | 12 | 2.4 |
| 35 | 27-Aug | - | 2-Sep | 4 | 4 | 1.0 |
| 36 | 3-Sep | - | 9-Sep | 5 | 3 | 0.6 |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - | 16-Sep | 5 | 1 | 0.2 |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - | 23-Sep | 5 | 3 | 0.6 |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - | 30-Sep | 1 | 2 | 2.0 |
|  |  |  | Total: | 47 | 101 |  |
|  |  |  | Mean: |  |  | 2.1 |

a/ Trapping at Junction City weir took place July 16 - September 24, 2008 (Julian weeks 28-39).


Figure 15. Mean catch of brown trout (fish/night) at Junction City weir, by Julian week, during 2008.

Table 8. Summary of brown trout trapped by Julian week at Junction City weir during 2008. ${ }^{\text {. }}$

| Fork length (cm) | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |
| 38 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1 |
| 39 |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 3 |
| 40 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 4 |
| 41 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 4 |
| 42 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 |  | 6 |
| 43 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 | 0 |  | 7 |
| 44 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |  | 0 | 1 | 10 |
| 45 |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| 46 |  | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 5 |
| 47 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 6 |
| 48 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| 49 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 4 |
| 50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| 51 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  | 5 |
| 52 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 7 |
| 53 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 54 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 55 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 56 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 57 | 0 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 58 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 59 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 60 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 61 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 62 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| Totals: | 10 | 5 | 22 | 26 | 13 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 101 |
| Mean FL: | 54.1 | 47.6 | 48.9 | 47.8 | 45.3 | 43.9 | 50.5 | 46.7 | 43.0 | 43.3 | 44.5 | 47.7 |

a/ Trapping at Junction City weir took place July 15 - September 24, 2008 (Julian weeks 29-39).


Figure 16. Fork length distribution of brown trout trapped at Junction City weir during 2008.

## Recovery of Tagged Fish

## Total Recoveries

Fish tagged at JCW and WCW were recovered from four different sources: Angler tag returns; upper Trinity River spawner surveys, Trinity River Hatchery, 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 8-11.

Of the 204 tagged spring Chinook at JCW 45.1\% were recovered, whereas 25.9\% of the 1,742 tagged WCW fall Chinook were recovered. Of the 435 coho tagged at WCW, $55.4 \%$ were recovered, as were $27.3 \%$ of the 863 adult fall steelhead recovered throughout the Trinity basin. The highest percentage of all recoveries for all species occurred at TRH.

## Tag Returns by Anglers

The number of fish available each year to sport fishers is determined by DFG and published in the annual fishing regulations. In 2008 the fall Chinook sport quota for the Klamath River basin season was 20,500, split between the lower (below the Highway 96 Bridge in Weitchpec) and upper basins. Anglers were allowed to retain one ad-clipped steelhead, although the take of coho was prohibited.

Sport (and tribal) fishers remove Project tags from harvested and caught and released fish and return the tags to the DFG address imprinted on the tags. Tags are also returned by river enthusiasts and agency personnel who happen upon them (either attached to dead fish or laying on the river bar unattached) during the course of their river activities.

## Spring Chinook

Four tags from adult spring Chinook tagged at JCW (three from harvested fish, one from a caught and released fish) were returned. Additionally, tags from two JCW grilse (one harvested, one found unattached) were returned (Appendix 8). Harvest rate of JCWtagged grilse Chinook was estimated at $2.3 \%$, while the harvest rate of JCW tagged adults was $1.9 \%$ (with one reward and two non-reward tags returned). The catch and release rate for adults was estimated at $0.6 \%$ by averaging tag returns from reward (zero) and non-reward (one tag) marked fish. There were no tags returned from caught/released grilse.

## Fall Chinook

Anglers returned 12 reward tags (seven grilse/five adult) and nine non-reward tags (four grilse/five adult) from harvested fall Chinook tagged at WCW. Based on those tag returns, the estimated harvest rate of Project-tagged fall Chinook upstream of WCW was $1.3 \%$ for grilse and $1.2 \%$ for adults. Anglers reported the catch and release of 15 grilse (seven reward and eight non-reward tagged) and four adult fall Chinook (two with reward tags, two with non-reward tags) from WCW (Appendix 9). Using those numbers, the catch and release rates for fall Chinook upstream of the WCW were estimated at $1.7 \%$ of the tagged grilse and $0.5 \%$ of the tagged adults.

## Coho Salmon

To discourage the harvest of threatened coho salmon, all coho salmon tagged at WCW and JCW received non-reward tags. No tags were returned from any harvested grilse or adult coho salmon tagged at WCW, though we did receive five tags from grilse coho that were caught and released (Appendix 10). Catch and release rates for coho salmon above the WCW were estimated at $1.5 \%$ for grilse and $0 \%$ for adults based on that return.

## Fall Steelhead

Anglers returned 102 tags from steelhead tagged at WCW. Of those 102 tags, 73 were from ad-clipped fish. Anglers returned 82 tags from steelhead reported as caught/released, 53 of those ad-clipped fish (Appendix 11). Based on tag return, an estimated $9.6 \%$ of the tagged steelhead migrating upstream of WCW were caught and released.

## Brown Trout

All brown trout tagged at JCW received non-reward tags during 2008. Anglers returned two tags from caught and released brown trout tagged during the season, and one tag was recovered in the upper mainstem spawner surveys.

## Spawner Surveys

Main stem Trinity spawner surveys were conducted from September 16, 2008 to December 19, 2008 from TRH to Cedar Flat. During the spawner surveys 11 spring Chinook tagged at JCW (Appendix 8), 16 spring Chinook tagged at WCW and 74 fall Chinook tagged at WCW (Appendix 9) were recovered. Thirteen coho salmon tagged at WCW were also recovered (Appendix 10). There were no steelhead recovered in the spawner survey in 2008 (Appendix 11). For additional information on the 2008 spawner survey refer to Task 4 of this report.

## Trinity River Hatchery

## Operation Dates

The fish ladder and trapping facility at TRH were operated from September 09, 2008 (JW 36) through March 11, 2009 (JW 10). The ladder and trap were closed October 10, and not reopened until October 23 (most of JW 41, all of JW 42 and some of JW 43) to separate the spring and fall runs of Chinook. The ladder was also occasionally closed at the discretion of the hatchery manager for fish health concerns or labor constraints.

## Spring Chinook

Based on CWT recoveries, spring Chinook began entering TRH during JW 36 and continued through JW 44 (Figure 17, Table 9). Recovery of spring Chinook peaked during JW 39 when 238 fish entered the facility and decreased thereafter with only one fish in JW 44. Based upon CWT expansion, an estimated 3,745 spring Chinook entered TRH (Figure 17).

Of the 204 spring Chinook tagged at JCW, 73 (35.8\%) were recovered at TRH. The mean FL for effectively tagged JCW spring Chinook was 66.3 cm , whereas the spring Chinook recovered at TRH averaged 71.6 cm FL (Figure 8, Appendix 4). Sixteen of the 397 (4.0\%) spring Chinook tagged at WCW were recovered at TRH. The mean FL for effectively tagged WCW spring Chinook was 58.1 cm .

A total of 3,766 spring Chinook were recovered at TRH, from which 741 CWTs were recovered (Table 9). Spring Chinook age composition at TRH based on CWT analysis was $8.4 \%, 22.6 \%, 68.7 \%$, and $0.3 \%$ age $2,3,4$ and 5 year old fish, respectively (See Task 2 of this report).

## Fall Chinook

Based on the recovery of CWTs, the first fall Chinook entered TRH during JW 40 of 2008 (Figure 17, Table 11). The fall run peaked during JW 45 when an estimated 1,677 Chinook entered the facility, decreasing thereafter until the last Chinook entered during JW 2 of 2009. Using CWT expansions, an estimated 5,271 fall Chinook entered TRH.

There were not any fall Chinook tagged at JCW in 2008 (they were all spring run). Of the 1,742 tagged fall Chinook from WCW, 323 (18.5\%) were recovered at TRH. The mean FL for effectively tagged WCW fall Chinook was 61.3 cm while the mean FL for fall Chinook trapped at TRH was 71.7 cm (Figure 9). A total of 1,163 ad-clipped fall Chinook were recovered at TRH, from which 1,064 CWTs were recovered (Table 11). Fall Chinook age composition at TRH based on CWT analysis was $14.0 \%, 32.0 \%$, $54.0 \%$, and $0 \%$ age 2, 3, 4, and 5 year old fish, respectively.


Figure 17. Estimated numbers of spring and fall Chinook that entered Trinity River Hatchery during the 2008-2009 season, based on expansion of coded-wire tagged fish (showing the fish ladder closure/spawning break during all or parts of JWs 41-43).

Table 9. Recoveries at Trinity River Hatchery of coded-wire tagged, spring Chinook during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

a/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
b/ Entry week was the week that fish were initally sorted; 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 with shed or lost tags recovered after October 14, 2008 (JW 41) were considered fall run.

Table 10. Total number and numbers of Willow Creek weir (WCW) and Junction City weir (JCW) tagged Chinook and coho that entered Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Julian week of entry ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Inclusive dates |  | Chinook |  |  |  |  | Coho |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Total entering | Spring run tagging site |  | Fall run tagging site |  | Total entering | Tagging site |  |
|  |  |  | TRH | WCW | JCW | WCW | JCW | TRH | WCW | JCW |
| 36 | 3-Sep | - 9-Sep | 164 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | 10-Sep | - 16-Sep | 337 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 | 17-Sep | - 23-Sep | 722 | 2 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 39 | 24-Sep | - 30-Sep | 1,376 | 3 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 40 | 1-Oct | - 7-Oct | 1,060 | 4 | 13 | 2 |  | 5 |  |  |
| 41 | 8-Oct | - 14-Oct | 107 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 5 | 1 |  |
| 42 | 15-Oct | - 21-Oct | 0 | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |  |
| 43 | 22-Oct | - 28-Oct | 466 | 3 |  | 80 |  | 403 | 14 |  |
| 44 | 29-Oct | - 4-Nov | 852 | 2 |  | 83 |  | 207 | 13 |  |
| 45 | 5-Nov | - 11-Nov | 1,677 | 0 |  | 104 |  | 348 | 22 |  |
| 46 | 12-Nov | - 18-Nov | 1,638 | 0 |  | 41 |  | 2,375 | 123 |  |
| 47 | 19-Nov | - 25-Nov | 371 | 1 |  | 10 |  | 706 | 23 |  |
| 48 | 26-Nov | - 2-Dec | 202 |  |  | 5 |  | 604 | 17 |  |
| 49 | 3-Dec | - 9-Dec | 34 |  |  |  |  | 298 | 3 |  |
| 50 | 10-Dec | - 16-Dec | 7 |  |  |  |  | 139 | 5 |  |
| 51 | 17-Dec | - 23-Dec | 4 |  |  |  |  | 61 | 1 |  |
| 52 | 24-Dec | - 31-Dec | 0 |  |  |  |  | 33 | 1 |  |
| 1 | 1-Jan | - 7-Jan | 1 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| 2 | 8-Jan | - 14-Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | 15-Jan | - 21-Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | 22-Jan | - 28-Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 29-Jan | - 4-Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | 5-Feb | - 11-Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7 | 12-Feb | - 18-Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 19-Feb | - 25-Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | 26-Feb | - 4-Mar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 | 5-Mar | - 11-Mar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Totals: | 9,018 | 16 | 73 | 327 | 0 | 5,187 | 223 | 0 |

a/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
b/ Entry week was the week that fish were initally sorted; they may have actually entered the hatchery during the previous sorting week.

Table 11. Recoveries of Trinity River Hatchery-origin fall Chinook by coded-wire tag (CWT) group during the 2008-09 season.

a/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
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 CWTs were recovered from these ad-clipped fish. Chinook with shed or lost tags recovered after October 21, 2008 (JW 42) were considered fall Chinook.

## Coho Salmon

The first coho entered TRH during JW 40 OF 2008. The coho run peaked during JW 46 and the last three coho entered TRH during JW 1 of 2009 (Table 12). A total of 5,182 coho ( 4,539 adults and 648 grilse) were recovered at TRH the season. Two hundred twenty three WCW tagged coho salmon (43 grilse and 180 adults) were recovered at TRH (51.9 \% of those effectively tagged). The mean FL of effectively tagged coho salmon at WCW was 60.1 cm and the mean FL of all coho salmon recovered at TRH was 65.0 cm (Appendix 6).

Of the 5,182 coho recovered at TRH, 4,819 (92.9\%) were observed to have right maxillary (RM) clips, indicating they were of TRH origin, while 368 ( $7.1 \%$ ) had no clips. These unclipped fish are believed to be either naturally produced coho salmon which entered the hatchery or TRH-produced fish which received no or poor clips prior to release from the hatchery (Table 12).

Based on length frequency analysis, TRH-produced, RM-clipped coho salmon were apportioned into two brood years. Coho salmon $\leq 52 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were considered grilse (age 2) from the 2006 brood year and accounted for $13.3 \%(642 / 4,819)$ of the total, while the remaining 4,177 were considered adults (age 3) from the 2005 brood year. The 368 non RM clipped coho salmon which entered the hatchery were also considered grilse or adults based on their length (Appendix 6).

## Fall Steelhead

Steelhead were recovered almost every week that the fish ladder and trap at TRH was open, though they did not arrive in sizeable numbers until November (Table 13). A total of 2,557 adult steelhead ( $>41 \mathrm{~cm}, \mathrm{FL}$ ) entered TRH during the season. Of the 775 adult fall steelhead effectively tagged at WCW, 128 were recovered at TRH (Table 13, Appendix 7). The mean FL of effectively tagged steelhead at WCW was 63.6 cm and the mean FL of all adult steelhead recovered at TRH was 64.7 cm

Ad-clipped adults composed $98.8 \%(2,527 / 2,557)$ of the steelhead that entered TRH this season (Appendix 7). Beginning with the 1997 brood year, all steelhead released from TRH have been ad-clipped prior to their release.

Table 12. Total number of coho, by brood year and clip, that returned to Trinity River Hatchery by Julian week during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| Julian Week of Entry ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Inclusive Dates |  | Brood Year and Clip ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 2005 |  | 2006 |  |  |
|  |  |  | No Clip | RM | No Clip | RM |  |
| 40 | 1-Oct | 7-Oct |  | 3 |  | 2 |  |
| 41 | 8-Oct | - 14-Oct |  | 1 |  | 4 | 5 |
| 42 | 15-Oct | - 21-Oct |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| 43 | 22-Oct | - 28-Oct | 6 | 149 | 3 | 245 | 403 |
| 44 | 29-Oct | - 4-Nov | 12 | 24 | 1 | 170 | 207 |
| 45 | 5-Nov | - 11-Nov | 41 | 185 | 1 | 121 | 348 |
| 46 | 12-Nov | - 18-Nov | 75 | 2228 | , | 71 | 2,375 |
| 47 | 19-Nov | - 25-Nov | 56 | 638 |  | 12 | 706 |
| 48 | 26-Nov | - 2-Dec | 81 | 514 |  | 9 | 604 |
| 49 | 3-Dec | - 9-Dec | 51 | 243 |  | 4 | 298 |
| 50 | 10-Dec | - 16-Dec | 26 | 109 |  | 4 | 139 |
| 51 | 17-Dec | - 23-Dec | 5 | 56 |  |  | 61 |
| 52 | 24-Dec | - 31-Dec | 8 | 25 |  |  | 33 |
| 1 | 1-Jan | - 7-Jan | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |
|  |  | Totals: | 362 | 4,177 | 6 | 642 | 5,182 |

a/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
b/ Coho < 53 cm FL were considered of the 2006 brood year, and coho > 52 cm FL were considered of the 2005 brood year. Right maxillary clips are designated by RM.
c/ Entry week was the week the fish were initially sorted, although they may have actually entered the hatchery during a previous week.

Table 13. Total number of adult steelhead ${ }^{a}$ ( $>41 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{FL}$ ) entering Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) and number recovered that were tagged at Willow Creek weir (WCW) during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {b }}$

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Julian Week } \\ \text { of Entry }{ }^{\text {c }}\end{array}$ | Inclusive Dates |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |\(\left.\left.\quad \begin{array}{c}Number <br>

Entering TRH\end{array}\right) ~ $$
\begin{array}{c}\text { Recoveries from } \\
\text { WCW }\end{array}
$$\right]\)
a/ Steelhead $<42 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL are considered sub-adults and were not counted at TRH.
b/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
c/ Entry week was the week the fish were initially sorted, although they may have actually entered the hatchery during a previous sorting week.

Run-size, Angler Harvest, and Spawner Escapement Estimates

## Spring Chinook Salmon

An estimated 10,238 (8,065 adults and 2,218 grilse) spring Chinook migrated into the Trinity River basin upstream of JCW. Based on the Poisson Approximation, the 95\% confidence interval for the spring Chinook run-size estimate was 8,255-13,054 (Table 14). Spawning escapement above JCW was estimated at 9,977 adult fish, including 3,766 spring Chinook that entered TRH (Table 15). This year's run-size estimate is $57.4 \%$ of the 30 year average spring Chinook run-size of 17,902. Estimated spring Chinook run-size has ranged from 2,381 fish in 1991 to 62,692 fish in 1988 (Appendix 12). Anglers were estimated to have caught and kept 158 adults and 148 grilse from the spring run (Table 15).

## Fall Chinook Salmon

An estimated 22,997 (15,141 adults and 7,856 grilse) fall Chinook migrated into the Trinity River basin upstream of WCW. Based on the Normal (Stratified) Approximation, the $95 \%$ confidence interval for the fall Chinook run-size estimate upstream of WCW was 13,323-17,075 adults and 6,388-9,489 grilse (Table 14). Trinity River fall Chinook spawner escapement, upstream of WCW, was estimated at 15,141 adult fish, including 4,451 adult fall Chinook that entered TRH (Table 15). Harvest rates generated from tags applied at WCW were used to estimate 194 grilse and 281 adult fall Chinook harvested by anglers. 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 13). This year's fall Chinook estimated run-size of 22,997 fish is $54.2 \%$ of the 42,416 fish mean run-size for all the years since 1977.

Table 14. Run-size estimates and $95 \%$ confidence limits for Trinity River basin spring and fall Chinook and coho salmon, and adult fall steelhead during the 2008-2009 season.

| Species/race | Area of Trinity River basin for run-size estimate | Stratum ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Number effectively tagged | Trinity River Hatchery recoveries |  | Run-size estimate ${ }^{d}$ | Confidence limits$1-p=0.95$ | Confidence limit estimator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Number examined for tags ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Number of tags in sample |  |  |  |
| Spring | Upstream of | Grilse | 43 | 329 | 3 | 2,218 |  |  |
| Chinook | Junction City weir | Adults | 158 | 3,437 | 70 | 8,065 |  | Poisson |
|  |  | Total | 201 | 3,766 | 73 | 10,283 | 8,255-13,054 | Approximation |
| Fall | Upstream of | Grilse | 861 | 801 | 87 | 7,856 | 6,388-9,489 | Normal, Stratified |
| Chinook | Willow Creek weir | Adults | 805 | 4,451 | 236 | 15,141 | 13,323-17,075 | Approximation |
|  |  | Total | 1,666 | 5,252 | 323 | 22,997 |  |  |
| Coho | Upstream of | Grilse | 101 | 648 | 47 | 2,379 |  |  |
|  | Willow Creek weir | Adults | 329 | 4,539 | 176 | 7,603 |  | Poisson |
|  |  | Total | 430 | 5,187 | 223 | 9,982 | 8,775-11,408 | Approximation |
| Fall run steelhead | Upstream of Willow Creek weir | Adults | 775 | 2,495 | 128 | 15,015 | 12,598-17,646 | Normal Approx |

a/ Stratum: Grilse = two year old salmon; Adults = three years or older; Steelhead adults = 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 Chinook were estimated from expansion of coded wire tag recoveries at Trinity River Hatchery; coho and steelhead numbers were actual recoveries.
d/ Run-size estimates for coho were based on the proportion of grilse to adults observed at Willow Creek weir and Trinity River Hatchery combined; for spring Chinook on Junction City weir and TRH numbers combined. Run-size estimates for grilse and adult fall Chinook were based on stratified Peterson estimator (due to proportion of grilse to adults observed at the Willow Creek weir, but not observed likewise anywhere else in the basin, except in the lower Klamath River creel census).

Table 15. Estimates of Trinity River basin spring and fall Chinook and coho salmon, and adult fall-run steelhead run-size, angler harvest, and spawner escapement during the 2008-2009 season.

| Species/ race | Area of Trinity River basin for run-size estimate | Stratum ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Run-size estimate | Angler Harvest |  | Spawner Escapement |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Harvest rate ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Number of fish ${ }^{\circ}$ | Natural area spawners ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Trinity River Hatchery | Total |
| Spring Chinook | Upstream of | Grilse | 2,218 | 0.067 | 148 | 1,741 | 329 | 2,070 |
|  | Junction City weir | Adults | 8,065 | 0.020 | 158 | 4,470 | 3,437 | 7,907 |
|  |  | Total | 10,283 |  | 306 | 6,211 | 3,766 | 9,977 |
| Fall Chinook | Upstream of | Grilse | 7,856 | 2.470 | 194 | 6,861 | 801 | 7,662 |
|  | Willow Creek weir | Adults | 15,141 | 1.859 | 281 | 10,408 | 4,451 | 14,859 |
|  |  | Total | 22,997 |  | 475 | 17,269 | 5,252 | 22,521 |
| Coho | Upstream of | Grilse | 2,379 | 0.000 | 0 | 1,730 | 649 | 2,379 |
|  | Willow Creek weir | Adults | 7,603 | 0.000 | 0 | 3,064 | 4,539 | 7,603 |
|  |  | Total | 9,982 |  | 0 | 4,794 | 5,188 | 9,982 |
| Fall-run adult steelhead | Upstream of | Natural | 5,477 | 0.007 | 38 | 5,415 | 24 | 5,439 |
|  | Willow Creek weir | Hatchery | 9,538 | 0.004 | 386 | 6,680 | 2,471 | 9,151 |
|  |  | Total | 15,015 |  | 424 | 12,095 | 2,495 | 14,590 |

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 for fall and spring Chinook and steelhead. There was no coho harvest.
c/ Calculated as the run-size times the harvest rate.
d/ Calculated as run-size minus angler harvest minus hatchery escapement. Natural area spawners includes both wild and hatchery fish that spawn in areas outside Trinity River Hatchery.

## Coho Salmon

An estimated 9,982 (7,603 adults and 2,379 grilse) coho migrated into the Trinity River basin upstream of the WCW in 2008. Based on the Poisson Approximation, the 95\% confidence interval for the coho run-size estimate upstream of WCW was 8,775 11,408 fish (Table 14). Of those estimated 9,982 fish, 4,539 adults are estimated to have entered TRH (Table 15). Estimated coho salmon run-size, upstream of WCW, has ranged from 852 fish in 1994 to 59,079 fish in 1987 (Appendix 14). This year's run-size estimate was $56.5 \%$ of the 17,657 fish 32 -year average. No tags were returned from harvested coho, therefore harvest rates generated from tags applied at WCW were estimated to be zero for both grilse and adults (Table 15).

## Adult Fall Steelhead

An estimated 15,015 adult fall steelhead migrated upstream of WCW this season. The $95 \%$ confidence interval for the estimate, based on the Normal Approximation, was 12,598-17,646 adult steelhead (Table 14). The run was estimated to be composed of 5,477 natural and 9,538 TRH origin fish. Of those 15,015 fish an estimated 38 wild and 386 TRH produced steelhead were harvested by anglers above WCW (Table 15). The estimated 14,590 fish spawner escapement was comprised of 12,095 natural spawners ( 5,415 natural origin and 6,680 TRH origin fish) in addition to the 2,495 steelhead that entered TRH. In the 25 years for which we have data since 1980, run-size estimates have ranged from 2,972 in 1998 to 53,885 in 2007 (Appendix 15). The mean estimated run-size for fall adult steelhead in the Trinity River above WCW across the period of record is 14,810 fish. This year's run was $101.4 \%$ of the average.

## DISCUSSION

It was a tough sampling year in 2008. The regulated river flows were not diminished sufficiently to get the JCW into the river until 15 July, and because of numerous longburning lightening-ignited forest fires the air was quite smoky, and the sky increasingly darker throughout the summer. Due to the combination of high flows and fire evacuations JCW only operated 47 days, compared to 70 trapping days in 2007. Down river the fires had less effect...the fires burned all summer and fall, and the smoke and haze hung in the air, but WCW did not suffer any fire evacuations. A storm in late October demanded the cessation of trapping for nearly two weeks but when the high flows receded we were able to sample again for an additional nine nights. With another storm looming on the horizon and reduced catch of all target species, we pulled the weir November 25, 2008.

The estimated spring Chinook salmon, fall Chinook salmon, and coho salmon runs were all in the $50-60 \%$ of average range, while the steelhead run was slightly above average in 2008. Most of the salmon and steelhead runs had passed the WCW by the third week of October so the Halloween storm is not thought to have kept us from sampling any major component of any of the species/races. The very strong grilse component
detected at the weirs of both the spring and fall Chinook runs will hopefully translate to a strong three-year old Chinook cohort in 2009.

The number of grilse seemed out of proportion to adults at the Willow Creek weir, compared to other recovery areas in the basin. Why that same grilse to adult proportion was not seen at TRH could not be easily explained. Because we trapped salmonids from 32 cm to 102 cm FL (and, anecdotally, large numbers of Klamath suckers smaller than 32 cm in length) we assume we were not selecting for grilse. It seems likely those large number of grilse must have ended up elsewhere in the system, but we have no monitoring on the South Fork of the Trinity (nor any of the other major tributaries in the upper basin) so that will have to remain a supposition.

Too few grilse spring Chinook or grilse coho salmon were tagged to generate independent estimates for adults and grilse, therefore we used numbers of adults and grilse combined to generate the total tagged, total recaptured and total recovered fish when calculating spawning escapement and run-size estimates for each species or race. We trapped sufficient fall Chinook salmon (grilse and adult) to run stratified population estimates for that race/species. The run-size estimate for coho salmon was separated into grilse and adults by the ratio of grilse and adults observed at the WCW and TRH combined. For spring Chinook, the total run-size estimate was stratified based on the ratio of adults and grilse observed at JCW only. The steelhead estimates above WCW are for adults only.

The WCW was installed prior to the arrival of the coho salmon run, which was concentrated in Julian weeks 38 through 43 . We only caught one coho in the two final weeks of sampling. Slightly more than half of all WCW-tagged coho were eventually recovered at TRH, and only six of the 223 were not RM-clipped (hatchery-origin) fish. There were no WCW-tagged coho trapped at TRH after JW 1, nor were there any other coho recovered at TRH after that, indicating all of the coho run passed WCW while it was installed.

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, and in carcass surveys, although we are sure that not all tagging mortalities are found. 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 WCW tagged fish survive to arrive at TRH, then the approximate positive proportional bias would be almost $30 \%$. We have attempted to address this concern through our tagging protocol at the weirs. Fish are not tagged if deemed in poor condition, if they have already spawned, and trapping is suspended if water temperatures exceed $21^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. We identified 25 total tagging mortalities resulting from our project at both the WCW and JCW combined. At
less than $1 \%$ of the 3,850 total fish that went through those two weirs we consider that mortality rate to be pretty good, but we would like to bring it down even further.

At the current JCW location the trap is unable to be installed prior to mid June or July, (depending upon the water year classification and resulting flow regime) when Lewiston Dam releases allow the Trinity River main stem flows to recede below 800cfs in Junction City. Historically, JCW was installed in the beginning of May and peak numbers of spring Chinook ran in late May and early June; at the time, however, spring flow releases from Lewiston Dam were much lower than under the current flow schedule.

## 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 really should be identified if possible. The current site does not allow for trapping at flows that exceed approximately 800 cfs, which means a mid-June or July put-in, after much of the spring Chinook have migrated. Ideally, trapping should commence in mid May. If an alternate site that would meet the available flow regime is not available then perhaps modification to a resistance board weir (or other potentially more effective or flexible weir design) should be researched. The advantages to maintaining the monitoring sites at both Willow Creek and Junction City are many (access, land owner cooperation etc); the flow limitations at each site make them less than perfect. Perhaps with a modified weir type the sampling season could be extended, or the loss of trapping days during moderate storm events decreased
3. Funding for re-instated monitoring of the South Fork Trinity River should be sought/identified/acquired. The information gleaned about such an important tributary would be quite useful, especially in a year such as this when the ratio of fish age classes at the different trapping locales did not mesh.
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Appendix 1. List of Julian weeks and their calendar date equivilents

| Julian <br> Week <br> Number | Inclusive Dates |  |  | Julian <br> Week Number | Inclusive Dates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Jan-01 | - | Jan-07 | 27 | Jul-02 | - | Jul-08 |
| 2 | Jan-08 | - | Jan-14 | 28 | Jul-09 | - | Jul-15 |
| 3 | Jan-15 | - | Jan-21 | 29 | Jul-16 |  | Jul-22 |
| 4 | Jan-22 | - | Jan-28 | 30 | Jul-23 | - | Jul-29 |
| 5 | Jan-29 | - | Feb-04 | 31 | Jul-30 |  | Aug-05 |
| 6 | Feb-05 | - | Feb-11 | 32 | Aug-06 |  | Aug-12 |
| 7 | Feb-12 | - | Feb-18 | 33 | Aug-13 |  | Aug-19 |
| 8 | Feb-19 | - | Feb-25 | 34 | Aug-20 |  | Aug-26 |
| 9 | Feb-26 | - | Mar-04 * | 35 | Aug-27 |  | Sep-02 |
| 10 | Mar-05 | - | Mar-11 | 36 | Sep-03 | - | Sep-09 |
| 11 | Mar-12 | - | Mar-18 | 37 | Sep-10 | - | Sep-16 |
| 12 | Mar-19 | - | Mar-25 | 38 | Sep-17 | - | Sep-23 |
| 13 | Mar-26 | - | Apr-01 | 39 | Sep-24 | - | Sep-30 |
| 14 | Apr-02 | - | Apr-08 | 40 | Oct-01 | - | Oct-07 |
| 15 | Apr-09 | - | Apr-15 | 41 | Oct-08 | - | Oct-14 |
| 16 | Apr-16 | - | Apr-22 | 42 | Oct-15 | - | Oct-21 |
| 17 | Apr-23 | - | Apr-29 | 43 | Oct-22 | - | Oct-28 |
| 18 | Apr-30 | - | May-06 | 44 | Oct-29 | - | Nov-04 |
| 19 | May-07 | - | May-13 | 45 | Nov-05 | - | Nov-11 |
| 20 | May-14 | - | May-20 | 46 | Nov-12 | - | Nov-18 |
| 21 | May-21 | - | May-27 | 47 | Nov-19 | - | Nov-25 |
| 22 | May-28 | - | Jun-03 | 48 | Nov-26 | - | Dec-02 |
| 23 | Jun-04 | - | Jun-10 | 49 | Dec-03 | - | Dec-09 |
| 24 | Jun-11 | - | Jun-17 | 50 | Dec-10 | - | Dec-16 |
| 25 | Jun-18 | - | Jun-24 | 51 | Dec-17 | - | Dec-23 |
| 26 | Jun-25 | - | Jul-01 | 52 | Dec-24 | - | Dec-31 ** |

[^3]Appendix 2. Fork length distribution of coded-wire tagged, Trinity River Hatchery-produced, spring Chinook recovered at TRH during the 2008-09 season.


| FL (cm) | Brood Years (by coded-wire tag number and type) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2004 |  |  |  |  |  | 2005 |  |  |  |  |  | 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 065322-f 065323-f | 065324-f | 065325-f | 065328-f 065329-f 065327-y |  |  | 065336-f | 065337-f | 065338-f | 065339-f | 065340-f 065341-y |  | 065350-f 065351-f 065352-f 065353-f 065361-y |  |  |  |  |  |
| 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 39 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 41 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |  | 0 | 9 | 12 |
| 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 |
| 46 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 5 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 16 |
| 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 12 |
| 48 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 19 |
| 49 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 13 |
| 50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 |
| 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 13 |
| 53 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 9 |
| 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |  | 7 |
| 55 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 |  | 4 |
| 56 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 3 |
| 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 0 |  | 2 |
| 58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  | 3 |
| 59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 3 |
| 60 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 11 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 61 | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 62 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 13 |  |  |  |  |  | 18 |
| 63 | 0 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 11 |  |  |  |  |  | 23 |
| 64 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 |  |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| 65 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 31 |  |  |  |  |  | 38 |
| 66 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 32 |  |  |  |  |  | 38 |
| 67 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 26 |  |  |  |  |  | 39 |
| 68 | 0 | 1 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 25 |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| 69 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  | 32 |
| 70 | 10 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 0 | 0 | 3 |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |  | 29 |
| 71 | $0 \quad 1$ | 2 | 1 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  | 16 |
| 72 | 11 | 0 | 1 |  |  | 8 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| 73 | 00 | 0 | 2 |  |  | 10 |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  | 20 |
| 74 | 50 | 4 | 2 |  |  | 12 |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
| 75 | 03 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 17 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 27 |
| 76 | $3 \quad 4$ | 3 | 1 |  |  | 24 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 38 |
| 77 | 40 | 1 | 7 |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 30 |
| 78 | 23 | 2 | 5 | 1 |  | 27 |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 43 |
| 79 | 45 | 3 | 5 | 0 |  | 23 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 41 |
| 80 | 36 | 7 | 1 | 0 |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 43 |
| 81 | 25 | 4 | 3 | 0 |  | 19 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 33 |
| 82 | $4 \quad 4$ | 4 | 4 | 1 |  | 23 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 41 |
| 83 | 45 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 23 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| 84 | $0 \quad 4$ | 3 | 2 | 0 |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  | 26 |
| 85 | 20 | 4 | 1 | 0 |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 29 |
| 86 | $3 \quad 3$ | 1 | 3 | 0 |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 34 |
| 87 | 31 | 1 | 2 | 0 |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 22 |
| 88 | 13 | 0 | 3 | 0 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| 89 | 20 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |
| 90 | $0 \quad 1$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 |
| 91 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 10 |
| 92 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 93 | 00 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 94 | 10 |  | 0 | 1 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7 |
| 95 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| 96 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 |
| 97 | 1 |  | 0 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 |
| 98 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| 99 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |
| Totals: | 4653 | 47 | 52 | 3 | 1 | 373 | 8 | 26 | 14 | 18 | 4 | 270 | 34 | 29 | 19 | 23 | 44 | 1064 |
| Mean | $80.9 \quad 80.8$ | 79.6 | 79.5 | 84.7 | 83.0 | 81.1 | 63.6 | 66.0 | 66.5 | 67.5 | 66.3 | 67.1 | 50.5 | 48.4 | 50.8 | 49.2 | 46.8 | 71.9 |

Appendix 4. Fork length (FL) distribution of spring Chinook trapped and tagged at Willow Creek (WCW) and Junction City (JCW) weirs during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| FL (cm) | WCW |  |  | JCW |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Trapped | Ad-clips ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Effective Tags ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | Total Trapped | Ad-clips ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Effective Tags ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| 35 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 36 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 37 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 38 | 4 |  | 4 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 39 | 2 |  | 2 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 40 | 7 |  | 6 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 41 | 10 |  | 10 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 42 | 13 |  | 13 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 43 | 12 |  | 12 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 44 | 17 |  | 14 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 45 | 25 |  | 25 | 1 |  | 0 |
| 46 | 11 |  | 11 | 5 |  | 5 |
| 47 | 24 |  | 23 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 48 | 17 | 1 | 16 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 49 | 19 | 0 | 17 | 6 |  | 6 |
| 50 | 21 | 0 | 20 | 8 |  | 8 |
| 51 | 18 | 0 | 18 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 52 | 16 | 0 | 16 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 53 | 11 | 1 | 11 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 54 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 4 |  | 4 |
| 55 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 56 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 57 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 58 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| 59 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 60 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 61 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 62 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 63 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 64 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 65 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| 66 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 67 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 7 |
| 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| 69 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 70 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 7 |
| 71 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 1 | 13 |
| 72 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| 73 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| 74 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| 75 | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 76 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 8 |
| 77 | 9 | 1 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 78 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 0 | 7 |
| 79 | 9 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| 80 | 8 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 5 |
| 81 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
| 82 | 12 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 83 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| 84 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 85 | 4 |  | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 86 | 4 |  | 3 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 87 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 88 | 4 |  | 4 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 89 | 1 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 90 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 91 | 6 |  | 6 |  |  |  |
| 92 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 93 | 0 |  | 0 |  |  |  |
| 94 | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| Totals: | 397 | 8 | 375 | 204 | 22 | 201 |
| Mean FL: | 58.2 | 66.9 | 57.8 | 66.3 | 69.9 | 66.3 |
| Total grilse: ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 242 | 2 | 233 | 44 | 0 | 43 |
| Total adults: | 155 | 6 | 142 | 160 | 22 | 158 |

a/ Trapping at JCW took place July 15 - September 24, 2008 (Julian weeks 28 -39). All Chinook trapped at JCW were considered spring Chinook. Trapping at WCW took place August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47). Chinook trapped prior to Julian week 36 at WCW were considered spring Chinook.
b/ Ad-clip = Adipose fin clipped fish.
c/ Number of effectively tagged fish excludes fish not tagged, tagging mortalities, and fish that had their tags removed (caught/released).

Appendix 5. Fork length (FL) distribution of fall Chinook trapped and tagged at Willow Creek weir (WCW) during the $2008-09$ season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| FL (cm) | WCW |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Trapped | Ad-clips ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Effective Tags ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| 35 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 36 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 37 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 38 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 39 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
| 40 | 13 | 0 | 12 |
| 41 | 17 | 0 | 15 |
| 42 | 33 | 1 | 31 |
| 43 | 40 | 2 | 36 |
| 44 | 68 | 4 | 64 |
| 45 | 80 | 4 | 75 |
| 46 | 73 | 4 | 69 |
| 47 | 95 | 2 | 92 |
| 48 | 84 | 4 | 81 |
| 49 | 77 | 1 | 73 |
| 50 | 82 | 1 | 76 |
| 51 | 47 | 2 | 46 |
| 52 | 60 | 3 | 60 |
| 53 | 39 | 1 | 37 |
| 54 | 34 | 2 | 32 |
| 55 | 26 | 1 | 26 |
| 56 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| 57 | 17 | 0 | 16 |
| 58 | 12 | 0 | 11 |
| 59 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| 60 | 23 | 3 | 23 |
| 61 | 18 | 3 | 17 |
| 62 | 27 | 4 | 27 |
| 63 | 28 | 2 | 27 |
| 64 | 30 | 6 | 29 |
| 65 | 28 | 9 | 28 |
| 66 | 22 | 4 | 21 |
| 67 | 29 | 5 | 29 |
| 68 | 10 | 3 | 10 |
| 69 | 17 | 4 | 17 |
| 70 | 20 | 4 | 18 |
| 71 | 19 | 3 | 19 |
| 72 | 13 | 0 | 13 |
| 73 | 20 | 2 | 18 |
| 74 | 27 | 4 | 26 |
| 75 | 16 | 4 | 14 |
| 76 | 34 | 7 | 34 |
| 77 | 21 | 1 | 20 |
| 78 | 37 | 4 | 36 |
| 79 | 48 | 8 | 45 |
| 80 | 39 | 6 | 38 |
| 81 | 38 | 5 | 37 |
| 82 | 26 | 3 | 26 |
| 83 | 30 | 3 | 29 |
| 84 | 33 | 0 | 28 |
| 85 | 29 | 2 | 27 |
| 86 | 19 | 0 | 19 |
| 87 | 22 | 1 | 22 |
| 88 | 13 | 1 | 13 |
| 89 | 19 | 0 | 19 |
| 90 | 15 | 1 | 14 |
| 91 | 6 | 1 | 6 |
| 92 | 11 | 0 | 10 |
| 93 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 94 | 4 | 0 | 3 |
| 95 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| 96 | 4 |  | 3 |
| 97 | 6 |  | 6 |
| 98 | 1 |  | 0 |
| 99 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 100 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 101 | 0 |  | 0 |
| 102 | 1 |  | 1 |
| Totals: | 1,742 | 138 | 1,666 |
| Mean FL: | 61.3 | 66.9 | 61.3 |
| Total grilse: ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 905 | 33 | 861 |
| Total adults: | 837 | 105 | 805 |

a/ Trapping at WCW took place August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks $34-47$ ). Only those Chinook trapped after Julian week 35 at WCW were considered fall Chinook. There were no fall Chinook trapped at Junction City weir this season
b/ Ad-clip = Adipose fin clipped fish.

Appendix 6. Fork length (FL) distribution of coho salmon trapped at Willow Creek weir (WCW), and recovered at Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| FL (cm) | WCW |  |  | TRH |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Trapped | RM-clips ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Effective Tags ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | WCW tags recovered at TRH | Total Trapped | RM-clips ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 30 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 31 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 32 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 33 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 34 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 35 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 |
| 36 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 7 | 7 |
| 37 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 13 | 13 |
| 38 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 18 | 18 |
| 39 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 43 | 43 |
| 40 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 6 | 51 | 51 |
| 41 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 51 | 51 |
| 42 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 86 | 85 |
| 43 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 63 | 62 |
| 44 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 70 | 67 |
| 45 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 60 | 60 |
| 46 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 54 | 54 |
| 47 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 36 | 35 |
| 48 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 30 | 30 |
| 49 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 22 | 22 |
| 50 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| 51 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 12 |
| 52 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 13 | 13 |
| 53 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 11 |
| 54 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 10 |
| 55 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 16 |
| 56 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 24 | 24 |
| 57 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 26 | 26 |
| 58 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 28 | 27 |
| 59 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 53 | 52 |
| 60 | 20 | 19 | 17 | 11 | 72 | 70 |
| 61 | 17 | 16 | 17 | 8 | 82 | 78 |
| 62 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 5 | 98 | 95 |
| 63 | 21 | 18 | 20 | 12 | 157 | 155 |
| 64 | 23 | 19 | 21 | 11 | 219 | 209 |
| 65 | 31 | 25 | 30 | 16 | 264 | 249 |
| 66 | 35 | 29 | 35 | 20 | 336 | 319 |
| 67 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 17 | 409 | 383 |
| 68 | 24 | 19 | 23 | 15 | 465 | 431 |
| 69 | 19 | 15 | 18 | 8 | 530 | 493 |
| 70 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 14 | 522 | 467 |
| 71 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 320 | 288 |
| 72 | 7 | 5 | 7 | 2 | 288 | 251 |
| 73 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 211 | 186 |
| 74 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 140 | 120 |
| 75 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 93 | 81 |
| 76 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 84 | 65 |
| 77 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 52 | 47 |
| 78 |  |  |  |  | 16 | 14 |
| 79 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| 80 |  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 |
| 81 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 0 |
| 82 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 83 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 84 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 85 |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |
| 86 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Totals: | 449 | 390 | 430 | 223 | 5,187 | 4,819 |
| Mean FL: | 59.9 | 59.0 | 60.1 | 60.3 | 65.0 | 64.7 |
| Total grilse: ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | 107 | 103 | 101 | 43 | 648 | 642 |
| Total adults: | 342 | 287 | 329 | 180 | 4,539 | 4,177 |

a/ Trapping at WCW took place August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47). The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43). There were no coho trapped at Junction City weir in 2008.
b/ RM-clip = Right maxillary-clipped fish.
c/ Number of effectively tagged fish excludes fish not tagged, tagging mortalities, and fish that had their tags removed (caught/released). d/ Coho salmon less than 53 cm FL were considered grilse.

Appendix 7. Fork length (FL) distribution of steelhead trapped at the Willow Creek weir and Trinity River Hatchery during the 2008-09

| FL (cm) | Willow Creek weir |  |  | Trinity River Hatchery |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total Trapped | Ad-clips ${ }^{\text {bc }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Effective } \\ \text { Tags }^{\text {d }} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | WCW tags recovered at TRH | Total Trapped | Ad-clips ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| 31 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |
| 32 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |
| 33 | 6 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 1 |
| 34 | 6 | 6 |  |  | 5 | 4 |
| 35 | 7 | 6 |  |  | 2 | 1 |
| 36 | 5 | 3 |  |  | 4 | 3 |
| 37 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 12 | 12 |
| 38 | 4 | 3 |  |  | 7 | 7 |
| 39 | 3 | 3 |  |  | 7 | 7 |
| 40 | 3 | 2 |  |  | 7 | 6 |
| 41 | 6 | 4 |  |  | 12 | 12 |
| 42 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 11 | 11 |
| 43 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 13 | 13 |
| 44 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  | 6 | 6 |
| 45 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 4 | 4 |
| 46 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 |
| 47 | 2 | 0 | 2 |  | 6 | 6 |
| 48 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 2 | 2 |
| 49 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 4 | 4 |
| 50 | 1 | 0 | 1 |  | 5 | 5 |
| 51 | 3 | 0 | 3 |  | 2 | 2 |
| 52 | 5 | 1 | 4 |  | 5 | 5 |
| 53 | 6 | 1 | 6 |  | 11 | 11 |
| 54 | 10 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 20 | 20 |
| 55 | 17 | 5 | 15 | 1 | 28 | 27 |
| 56 | 15 | 11 | 13 | 3 | 35 | 34 |
| 57 | 25 | 14 | 20 | 2 | 56 | 54 |
| 58 | 34 | 21 | 31 | 5 | 90 | 89 |
| 59 | 61 | 34 | 57 | 8 | 100 | 100 |
| 60 | 81 | 51 | 69 | 16 | 159 | 156 |
| 61 | 59 | 38 | 54 | 13 | 149 | 149 |
| 62 | 68 | 46 | 60 | 7 | 164 | 162 |
| 63 | 55 | 35 | 47 | 12 | 169 | 167 |
| 64 | 57 | 36 | 53 | 7 | 157 | 155 |
| 65 | 51 | 27 | 49 | 8 | 139 | 138 |
| 66 | 56 | 39 | 49 | 4 | 128 | 126 |
| 67 | 58 | 33 | 53 | 14 | 127 | 127 |
| 68 | 44 | 34 | 40 | 7 | 137 | 136 |
| 69 | 33 | 19 | 32 | 4 | 126 | 123 |
| 70 | 28 | 24 | 24 | 1 | 102 | 101 |
| 71 | 22 | 16 | 19 | 3 | 72 | 72 |
| 72 | 12 | 9 | 11 | 3 | 75 | 75 |
| 73 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 2 | 72 | 72 |
| 74 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 1 | 79 | 78 |
| 75 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 53 | 52 |
| 76 | 12 | 11 | 8 | 3 | 45 | 45 |
| 77 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 34 | 34 |
| 78 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 25 | 25 |
| 79 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 21 | 21 |
| 80 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 22 | 22 |
| 81 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 16 | 16 |
| 82 |  |  |  |  | 9 | 9 |
| 83 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| 84 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| 85 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 86 |  |  |  |  | 4 | 4 |
| 87 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| 88 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |
| Totals: | 915 | 584 | 775 | 128 | 2,557 | 2,527 |
| Mean FL: | 62.3 | 62.9 | 63.6 | 64.1 | 64.7 | 64.8 |
| Total 1/2 pounders: ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | 46 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 56 |
| Total adults: | 869 | 552 | 775 | 128 | 2,495 | 2,471 |

${ }^{a}$ Trapping at WCW took place August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47). The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 3610; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
Ad-clips= Adipose fin-clipped fish.
Other clips included: 1-left maxillary, 1-left maxillary + ad-clip, and 1-right maxillary clip.
Number of effectively tagged fish excludes those 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 adult steelhead ( $>41 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) were tagged at WCW.
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Appendix 8. Fork length (FL) distribution of spring Chinook tagged at Junction City weir and subsequently recovered during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| FL (cm) | Total Tagged | Recoveries |  |  |  |  |  | Total <br> Recoveries | \% <br> Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tag Morts ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Carcass ${ }^{\text {c }}$ <br> Recoveries | TRH ${ }^{\text {d }}$ <br> Recoveries | Angler Released ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Angler Harvest ${ }^{f}$ | Angler Found Tags ${ }^{9}$ |  |  |
| 38 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 39 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | -- |
| 40 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 41 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 100.0 |
| 42 | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | -- |
| 43 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 44 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 45 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 46 | 5 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 47 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 48 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 49 | 6 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 33.3 |
| 50 | 8 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 51 | 3 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 33.3 |
| 52 | 1 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 53 | 3 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 54 | 4 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 55 | 4 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 50.0 |
| 56 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 57 | 2 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 58 | 6 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 33.3 |
| 59 | 5 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |  | 4 | 80.0 |
| 60 | 4 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 50.0 |
| 61 | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 62 | 5 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 40.0 |
| 63 | 2 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 64 | 5 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |  | 4 | 80.0 |
| 65 | 5 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 40.0 |
| 66 | 1 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 67 | 7 |  | 0 | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | 71.4 |
| 68 | 8 |  | 1 | 4 |  | 1 |  | 6 | 75.0 |
| 69 | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 70 | 7 |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  | 5 | 71.4 |
| 71 | 13 |  | 1 | 5 |  |  |  | 6 | 46.2 |
| 72 | 8 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 |  | 5 | 62.5 |
| 73 | 7 |  | 1 | 4 |  |  |  | 5 | 71.4 |
| 74 | 3 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 75 | 5 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 20.0 |
| 76 | 8 |  | 2 | 5 |  |  |  | 7 | 87.5 |
| 77 | 6 |  | 0 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 50.0 |
| 78 | 7 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 57.1 |
| 79 | 8 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | 62.5 |
| 80 | 6 |  |  | 3 | 1 |  |  | 4 | 66.7 |
| 81 | 6 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  | 4 | 66.7 |
| 82 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 83 | 2 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 84 | 4 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 85 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 86 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 87 | 2 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 88 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | -- |
| 89 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Grilse: ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | 44 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 13.6 |
| Adults: | 160 | 1 | 11 | 70 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 86 | 53.8 |
| Total: | 204 | 2 | 11 | 73 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 92 | 45.1 |

a/ Trapping at Junction City took place July 15 - September 24, 2008 (Julian weeks 28-39). All Chinook trapped at JCW in 2008 were considered spring b/ Tagged fish found dead and unspawned within 30 days of tagging.
c/ Fish recovered in upper Trinity River spawner surveys.
d/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
e/ Fish reported as caught and released by anglers.
f/ Fish reported as harvested by anglers.
$\mathrm{g} /$ Tags found on dead fish or found unattached.
h/ Spring Chinook <55 cm FL were considered grilse.

Appendix 9. Fork length (FL) distribution of fall Chinook tagged at Willow Creek weir and subsequently recovered during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| FL (cm) | Total Tagged | Recoveries |  |  |  |  |  | Total Recoveries | \% Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tag Morts ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Carcass Recoveries | TRH Recoveries ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Angler } \\ \text { Released }^{\text {e }} \end{gathered}$ | Angler Harvest ${ }^{f}$ | Angler Found Tags ${ }^{\text {g }}$ |  |  |
| 35 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 36 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | -- |
| 37 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | -- |
| 38 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 39 | 5 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 40 | 13 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 41 | 17 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 11.8 |
| 42 | 33 |  | 2 | 4 | 2 |  | 0 | 8 | 24.2 |
| 43 | 40 |  | 1 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 4 | 10.0 |
| 44 | 68 |  | 0 | 9 | 1 |  | 0 | 10 | 14.7 |
| 45 | 80 |  | 6 | 13 | 2 |  | 0 | 21 | 26.3 |
| 46 | 73 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 15 | 20.5 |
| 47 | 95 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 11.6 |
| 48 | 84 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9.5 |
| 49 | 77 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 11.7 |
| 50 | 82 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 18.3 |
| 51 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 10.6 |
| 52 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6.7 |
| 53 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.1 |
| 54 | 34 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 14.7 |
| 55 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 15.4 |
| 56 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9.1 |
| 57 | 17 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 29.4 |
| 58 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16.7 |
| 59 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 23.1 |
| 60 | 23 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 34.8 |
| 61 | 18 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 44.4 |
| 62 | 27 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 48.1 |
| 63 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 32.1 |
| 64 | 30 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 19 | 63.3 |
| 65 | 28 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 67.9 |
| 66 | 22 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 54.5 |
| 67 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 14 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 55.2 |
| 68 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 60.0 |
| 69 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 52.9 |
| 70 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 55.0 |
| 71 | 19 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 57.9 |
| 72 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 38.5 |
| 73 | 20 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 7 | 35.0 |
| 74 | 27 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 29.6 |
| 75 | 16 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 56.3 |
| 76 | 34 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 32.4 |
| 77 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 38.1 |
| 78 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 27.0 |
| 79 | 48 | 1 | 3 | 18 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 50.0 |
| 80 | 39 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 48.7 |
| 81 | 38 | 0 | 5 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 11 | 28.9 |
| 82 | 26 | 0 | 1 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 7 | 26.9 |
| 83 | 30 | 0 | 3 | 6 |  | 1 | 0 | 10 | 33.3 |
| 84 | 33 | 1 | 4 | 6 |  | 0 | 0 | 11 | 33.3 |
| 85 | 29 | 0 | 1 | 4 |  | 0 | 1 | 6 | 20.7 |
| 86 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 3 | 15.8 |
| 87 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | 0 |  | 2 | 9.1 |
| 88 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 0 |  | 1 | 7.7 |
| 89 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 6 |  | 1 |  | 8 | 42.1 |
| 90 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 4 |  | 0 |  | 5 | 33.3 |
| 91 | 6 | 0 |  | 3 |  | 0 |  | 3 | 50.0 |
| 92 | 11 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 0 |  | 3 | 27.3 |
| 93 | 4 |  |  | 0 |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 94 | 4 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 | 50.0 |
| 95 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 96 | 4 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 25.0 |
| 97 | 6 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 98 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| 99 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 0 | -- |
| 100 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | -- |
| 101 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | -- |
| 102 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Grilse: ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | 905 | 1 | 18 | 87 | 15 | 4 | 5 | 130 | 14.4 |
| Adults: | 837 | 4 | 56 | 236 | 4 | 17 | 5 | 322 | 38.5 |
| Total: | 1,742 | 5 | 74 | 323 | 19 | 21 | 10 | 452 | 25.9 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47). Chinook trapped after Julian week 35 were considered fall run.
b/ Tagged fish found dead and unspawned within 30 days of tagging
c/ Fish recovered in upper Trinity River spawner surveys.
d/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
/ Fish reported as caught and released by anglers.
f/ Fish reported as harvested by anglers.
$\mathrm{g} /$ Tags found on dead fish or found unattached.
$\mathrm{h} /$ Fall Chinook $<58 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were considered grilse.

Appendix 10. Fork length (FL) distribution of coho tagged at Willow Creek weir and subsequently recovered during the 2008-09

| FL (cm) | Total Tagged | Recoveries |  |  |  |  |  | Total Recoveries | \% <br> Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Tag Morts ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Carcass <br> Recoveries ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | TRH <br> Recoveries ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Angler Released ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Angler Harvest ${ }^{f}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Angler } \\ \text { Found Tags }{ }^{\text {g }} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 35 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 36 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 37 | 6 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 33.3 |
| 38 | 9 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | 55.6 |
| 39 | 11 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 6 | 54.5 |
| 40 | 12 |  |  | 6 |  |  |  | 6 | 50.0 |
| 41 | 5 |  |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 60.0 |
| 42 | 12 |  |  | 7 |  |  |  | 7 | 58.3 |
| 43 | 8 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 25.0 |
| 44 | 8 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | 62.5 |
| 45 | 8 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 4 | 50.0 |
| 46 | 7 |  | 0 | 4 |  |  |  | 4 | 57.1 |
| 47 | 4 |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 25.0 |
| 48 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 49 | 2 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 100.0 |
| 50 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 51 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 52 | 4 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 50.0 |
| 53 | 3 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 66.7 |
| 54 | 2 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 100.0 |
| 55 | 1 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 56 | 9 |  | 0 | 5 |  |  |  | 5 | 55.6 |
| 57 | 5 |  | 0 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 | 60.0 |
| 58 | 8 |  | 0 | 7 |  |  |  | 7 | 87.5 |
| 59 | 5 |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 40.0 |
| 60 | 20 |  | 0 | 11 | 3 |  |  | 14 | 70.0 |
| 61 | 17 |  | 1 | 8 | 0 |  |  | 9 | 52.9 |
| 62 | 13 |  | 1 | 5 | 0 |  |  | 6 | 46.2 |
| 63 | 20 |  | 1 | 12 | 0 |  |  | 13 | 65.0 |
| 64 | 21 |  | 0 | 11 | 0 |  |  | 11 | 52.4 |
| 65 | 30 |  | 0 | 16 | 0 |  |  | 16 | 53.3 |
| 66 | 35 |  | 0 | 20 | 0 |  |  | 20 | 57.1 |
| 67 | 31 |  | 2 | 17 | 0 |  |  | 19 | 61.3 |
| 68 | 24 |  | 0 | 15 | 1 |  |  | 16 | 66.7 |
| 69 | 18 |  | 0 | 8 | 0 |  |  | 8 | 44.4 |
| 70 | 31 |  | 3 | 14 | 0 |  |  | 17 | 54.8 |
| 71 | 15 |  | 1 | 8 | 0 |  |  | 9 | 60.0 |
| 72 | 7 |  | 1 | 2 | 0 |  |  | 3 | 42.9 |
| 73 | 8 |  | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 6 | 75.0 |
| 74 | 5 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 20.0 |
| 75 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 50.0 |
| 76 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 77 | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 100.0 |
| Grise: ${ }^{\text {n }}$ | 101 | 0 | 2 | 47 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 48.5 |
| Adults: | 334 | 0 | 11 | 176 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 192 | 57.5 |
| Total: | 435 | 0 | 13 | 223 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 241 | 55.4 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place from August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47).
b/ Tagged fish found dead and unspawned within 30 days of tagging.
c/ Fish recovered in upper Trinity River spawner surveys.
d/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
e/ Fish reported as caught and released by anglers.
$\mathrm{f} /$ Fish reported as harvested by anglers (Regulations stipulate no harvest of coho).
$\mathrm{g} /$ Tags found on dead fish or found unattached.
$\mathrm{h} /$ Coho $<53 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL were considered grilse.

Appendix 11. Fork length (FL) distribution of adult fall-run steelhead tagged at Willow Creek weir and subsequently recovered during the 2008-09 season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

| FL (cm) | Total Tagged | Recoveries |  |  |  |  |  | Total Recoveries | \% <br> Recoveries |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Tag } \\ \text { Morts }^{\text {b }} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Carcass } \\ \text { Recoveries }{ }^{\text {c }} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | TRH Recoveries ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | Angler Released ${ }^{\text {e }}$ | Angler Harvest ${ }^{f}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Angler } \\ \text { Found Tags }{ }^{9} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| 43 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 44 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | -- |
| 45 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 46 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 47 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 48 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 49 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 50 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 51 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 52 | 5 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 20.0 |
| 53 | 6 |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 54 | 10 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 20.0 |
| 55 | 17 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 | 17.6 |
| 56 | 15 |  |  | 3 | 2 |  |  | 5 | 33.3 |
| 57 | 24 | 1 |  | 2 | 3 | 2 |  | 8 | 33.3 |
| 58 | 34 | 0 |  | 5 | 3 | 1 |  | 9 | 26.5 |
| 59 | 61 | 1 |  | 8 | 4 | 1 |  | 14 | 23.0 |
| 60 | 80 | 1 |  | 16 | 10 | 2 |  | 29 | 36.3 |
| 61 | 59 | 1 |  | 13 | 4 | 1 |  | 19 | 32.2 |
| 62 | 68 | 0 |  | 7 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 17 | 25.0 |
| 63 | 55 | 1 |  | 12 | 7 | 0 | 1 | 21 | 38.2 |
| 64 | 57 | 0 |  | 7 | 4 | 1 |  | 12 | 21.1 |
| 65 | 51 | 0 |  | 8 | 2 | 1 |  | 11 | 21.6 |
| 66 | 55 | 0 |  | 4 | 6 | 3 |  | 13 | 23.6 |
| 67 | 57 | 0 |  | 14 | 4 | 0 |  | 18 | 31.6 |
| 68 | 44 | 0 |  | 7 | 4 | 2 |  | 13 | 29.5 |
| 69 | 33 | 0 |  | 4 | 1 | 0 |  | 5 | 15.2 |
| 70 | 28 | 0 |  | 1 | 4 | 0 |  | 5 | 17.9 |
| 71 | 22 | 0 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |  | 6 | 27.3 |
| 72 | 11 | 0 |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |  | 3 | 27.3 |
| 73 | 17 | 0 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 5 | 29.4 |
| 74 | 12 | 0 |  | 1 | 3 | 0 |  | 4 | 33.3 |
| 75 | 3 | 0 |  | 0 | 1 | 0 |  | 1 | 33.3 |
| 76 | 12 | 1 |  | 3 | 3 | 0 |  | 7 | 58.3 |
| 77 | 6 |  |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | 1 | 16.7 |
| 78 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 0 |  |  | 2 | 100.0 |
| 79 | 3 |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| 80 | 3 |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 66.7 |
| 81 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0.0 |
| Totals: | 863 | 6 | 0 | 128 | 82 | 18 | 2 | 236 | 27.3 |

a/ Trapping at Willow Creek took place August 20 - November 25, 2008 (Julian weeks 34-47).
b/ Tagged fish found dead and unspawned within 30 days of tagging.
c/ Fish recovered in upper Trinity River spawner surveys. There were no Project-tagged fish recovered in the 2008 carcass surveys.
d/ The fish ladder was open September 08, 2008 - March 11, 2009 (Julian weeks 36-10; closed parts or all of JWs 41-43).
e/ Fish reported as caught and released by anglers.
f/ Fish reported as harvested by anglers.
$\mathrm{g} /$ Tags found on dead fish or found unattached.

Appendix 12. Spring Chinook run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Junction City weir from 1977 through 2008.

| Year | Run-size estimate |  |  |  |  | Spawner escapements |  |  |  |  |  | Angler harvest |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grilse |  | Adults |  | Total | Natural Area Spawers ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Trinity River Hatchery |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Grilse | Adults |  | Total | Grilse | Adults | Total | Grilse | Adults | Total |  |
|  | Number | Percent |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Number | Percent |
| 1977 | no estimates |  |  |  |  | no estimates |  |  | 385 | 1,124 | 1,509 | no estima |  |  |  |
| 1978 | 190 | 1.0 | 18,816 | 99.0 | 19,006 | 29 | 14,384 | 14,413 | 153 | 3,680 | 3,833 | 8 | 752 | b/ | 760 |
| 1979 | 113 | 1.4 | 7,964 | 98.6 | 8,077 | 0 | 5,008 | 5,008 | 113 | 1,658 | 1,771 | 0 | 1,298 |  | 1,298 |
| 1980 | 1,949 | 45.9 | 2,301 | 54.1 | 4,250 | 1,312 | 1,614 | 2,926 | 353 | 547 | 900 | 284 | 140 |  | 424 |
| 1981 | 347 | 4.2 | 7,913 | 95.8 | 8,260 | 242 | 3,362 | 3,604 | 95 | 2,405 | 2,500 | 10 | 2,146 |  | 2,156 |
| 1982 | 656 | 10.3 | 5,731 | 89.7 | 6,387 | 387 | 3,868 | 4,255 | 150 | 1,226 | 1,376 | 119 | 637 |  | 756 |
| 1983 | no estimates |  |  |  |  | no estimates |  |  | 385 | 930 | 1,315 | no estimates |  |  |  |
| 1984 | 255 | 9.4 | 2,465 | 90.6 | 2,720 | 140 | 1,354 | 1,494 | 76 | 736 | 812 | 39 | 375 |  | 414 |
| 1985 | 1,434 | 14.8 | 8,278 | 85.2 | 9,712 | 799 | 4,897 | 5,696 | 508 | 2,645 | 3,153 | 127 | 736 | c/ | 863 |
| 1986 | 7,018 | 23.1 | 23,403 | 76.9 | 30,421 | 4,335 | 13,371 | 17,706 | 1,461 | 7,083 | 8,544 | 1,222 | 2,949 |  | 4,171 |
| 1987 | 4,858 | 9.5 | 46,016 | 90.5 | 50,874 | 2,577 | 29,083 | 31,660 | 1,387 | 8,466 | 9,853 | 894 | 8,467 |  | 9,361 |
| 1988 | 720 | 1.1 | 61,972 | 98.9 | 62,692 | 241 | 39,329 | 39,570 | 377 | 13,905 | 14,282 | 102 | 8,738 |  | 8,840 |
| 1989 | 502 | 1.9 | 25,804 | 98.1 | 26,306 | 435 | 18,241 | 18,676 | 17 | 4,983 | 5,000 | 50 | 2,580 |  | 2,630 |
| 1990 | 265 | 4.1 | 6,123 | 95.9 | 6,388 | 126 | 2,880 | 3,006 | 104 | 2,433 | 2,537 | 35 | 810 |  | 845 |
| 1991 | 190 | 8.0 | 2,191 | 92.0 | 2,381 | 92 | 1,268 | 1,360 | 71 | 614 | 685 | 27 | 309 |  | 336 |
| 1992 | 1,671 | 41.5 | 2,359 | 58.5 | 4,030 | 944 | 942 | 1,886 | 533 | 1,313 | 1,846 | 194 | 104 | c/ | 298 |
| 1993 | 68 | 1.3 | 5,164 | 98.7 | 5,232 | 37 | 2,111 | 2,148 | 31 | 2,630 | 2,661 | 0 | 423 | c/ | 423 |
| 1994 | 1,793 | 26.4 | 4,995 | 73.6 | 6,788 | 550 | 2,897 | 3,447 | 944 | 1,943 | 2,887 | 299 | 155 | c/ | 454 |
| 1995 | 1,793 26.4 no estimates |  |  |  |  | no estimates |  |  | 385 | 8,722 | 9,107 | no estimates |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 489 | 2.1 | 22,927 | 97.9 | 23,416 | 370 | 16,283 | 16,653 | 119 | 5,131 | 5,250 | 0 | 1,513 | c/ | 1,513 |
| 1997 | 768 | 3.8 | 19,271 | 96.2 | 20,039 | 543 | 13,049 | 13,592 | 225 | 4,892 | 5,117 | 0 | 1,330 | c/ | 1,330 |
| 1998 | 802 | 5.0 | 15,365 | 95.0 | 16,167 | 567 | 9,057 | 9,624 | 184 | 4,679 | 4,863 | 51 | 1,629 | c/ | 1,680 |
| 1999 | 1,028 | 9.1 | 10,265 | 90.9 | 11,293 | 440 | 5,968 | 6,408 | 547 | 3,671 | 4,218 | 41 | 626 | c/ | 667 |
| 2000 | 2,159 | 8.3 | 23,923 | 91.7 | 26,082 | 1,264 | 10,846 | 12,110 | 571 | 11,594 | 12,165 | 324 | 1,483 | c/ | 1,807 |
| 2001 | 2,065 | 10.5 | 17,556 | 89.5 | 19,621 | 1,178 | 10,284 | 11,462 | 629 | 6,366 | 6,995 | 258 | 906 |  | 1,164 |
| 2002 | 2,575 | 6.7 | 35,910 | 93.3 | 38,485 | 1,883 | 23,674 | 25,557 | 617 | 10,440 | 11,057 | 75 | 1,796 |  | 1,871 |
| 2003 | 1,039 | 2.2 | 46,756 | 97.8 | 47,795 | 909 | 30,211 | 31,120 | 130 | 14,512 | 14,642 | 0 | 2,033 |  | 2,033 |
| 2004 | 2,929 | 18.1 | 13,218 | 81.9 | 16,147 | 1,708 | 7,314 | 9,022 | 985 | 5,251 | 6,236 | 236 | 653 |  | 889 |
| 2005 | 55 | 0.4 | 13,929 | 99.6 | 13,984 | 30 | 6,003 | 6,033 | 25 | 6,966 | 6,991 | 0 | 961 |  | 961 |
| 2006 | 1,963 | 26.2 | 5,520 | 73.8 | 7,483 | 1,127 | 2,955 | 4,082 | 819 | 2,565 | 3,384 | 17 | 0 |  | 17 |
| 2007 | 135 | 0.9 | 14,700 | 99.1 | 14,835 | 80 | 8,154 | 8,234 | 55 | 5,981 | 6,036 | 0 | 565 |  | 565 |
| 2008 | 2,218 | 21.6 | 8,065 | 78.4 | 10,283 | 1,741 | 4,470 | 6,211 | 329 | 3,437 | 3,766 | 148 | 158 |  | 306 |

a/ Natural area spawners includes both wild and hatchery fish that spawn in areas outside Trinity River Hatchery.
b/ The 1978 sport harvest of spring Chinook was limited by a salmon fishing closure beginning August 25, 1978.
c/ The sport harvest of adult spring Chinook was subject to seasonal and size limit restrictions.

Appendix 12 (continued). Spring Chinook run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Junction City weir from 1977 through 2008.


Appendix 13. Fall Chinook run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek weir from 1977 through 2008.

| Year | Run-size estimate |  |  |  |  | Spawner escapements |  |  |  |  |  | Angler harvest |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grilse |  | Adults |  | Total | Natural Area Spawners ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Trinity River Hatchery |  |  | Grilse | Adults |  |
|  |  |  | Grilse | Adults |  | Total | 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 |  |
| 1978 | 6,037 | 14.0 | 37,086 | 86.0 | 43,123 | 4,712 | 31,052 | 35,764 | 1,325 | 6,034 | 7,359 | Fishing closure |  | b/ |
| 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 |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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 |  |
| 1983 | 1,240 | 4.7 | 25,138 | 95.3 | 26,378 | 853 | 17,284 | 18,137 | 271 | 5,494 | 5,765 | 116 | 2,360 |  |
| 1984 | 4,575 | 34.8 | 8,556 | 65.2 | 13,131 | 3,416 | 5,654 | 9,070 | 766 | 2,166 | 2,932 | 393 | 736 |  |
| 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 | c/ |
| 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 |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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 |  |
| 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 |  |
| 1990 | 634 | 6.3 | 9,358 | 93.7 | 9,992 | 241 | 7,682 | 7,923 | 371 | 1,348 | 1,719 | 22 | 328 |  |
| 1991 | 681 | 7.4 | 8,526 | 92.6 | 9,207 | 382 | 4,867 | 5,249 | 205 | 2,482 | 2,687 | 94 | 1,177 |  |
| 1992 | 2,932 | 20.7 | 11,232 | 79.3 | 14,164 | 2,563 | 7,139 | 9,702 | 211 | 3,779 | 3,990 | 158 | 314 | c/ |
| 1993 | 3,381 | 32.2 | 7,104 | 67.8 | 10,485 | 2,473 | 5,898 | 8,371 | 736 | 815 | 1,551 | 172 | 391 | c/ |
| 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 | c/ |
| 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 | c/ |
| 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 | c/ |
| 1997 | 3,767 | 17.6 | 17,580 | 82.4 | 21,347 | 2,845 | 11,507 | 14,352 | 820 | 5,387 | 6,207 | 102 | 686 | c/ |
| 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 | c/ |
| 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 | d/ |
| 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/ |
| 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/ |
| 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/ |
| 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/ |
| 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/ |
| 2005 | 899 | 3.2 | 27,332 | 96.8 | 28,231 | 751 | 12,717 | 13,468 | 48 | 13,758 | 13,806 | 100 | 856 | d/ |
| 2006 | 12,290 | 35.2 | 22,622 | 64.8 | 34,912 | 8,228 | 14,566 | 22,794 | 3,938 | 8,056 | 11,994 | 124 | 0 | d/ |
| 2007 | 886 | 1.5 | 57,987 | 98.5 | 58,873 | 765 | 38,967 | 39,732 | 33 | 18,081 | 18,114 | 89 | 939 | d/ |
| 2008 | 7,856 | 34.2 | 15,141 | 65.8 | 22,997 | 6,861 | 10,408 | 17,269 | 801 | 4,451 | 5,252 | 194 | 281 | d/ |

a/ Natural area spawners includes both wild and hatchery fish that spawn in areas outside Trinity River Hatchery
b/ The 1978 sport harvest of fall Chinook was restricted by a salmon fishing closure beginning August 25, 1978.
c/ The sport harvest of adult fall Chinook was subject to seasonal and size limit restrictions.
d/ The 1999-2008 sport harvest of Klamath Basin fall Chinook was managed with a quota system. The quota for adult fall Chinook was 957 in 1999; 693 in 2000; 9,834 in $2001 ; 6,926$ in $2002 ; 10,800$ in 2003; 4,700 in 200 2005, zero in 2006, 10,600 in 2007, and 20,500 in 2008.

Appendix 13 (continued). Fall Chinook run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek weir from 1977 through 2008.


Appendix 14. Coho salmon run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek weir from 1977 through 2008.

| Year | Run-size estimate |  |  |  |  | Spawner escapements |  |  |  |  |  | Angler harvest |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grilse |  | Adults |  | Total | Natural Area Spawners ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | Trinity River Hatchery |  |  | Grilse | Adults | 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 | Fishing | sure ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 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 | $582{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 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 | $248{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 1997 | 5,951 | 75.0 | 1,984 | 25.0 | 7,935 | 5,038 | 1,097 | 6,135 | 871 | 887 | 1,758 | 42 | 0 | $42{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 1998 | 2,471 | 19.8 | 10,009 | 80.2 | 12,480 | 1,494 | 5,995 | 7,489 | 977 | 4,014 | 4,991 | 0 | 0 | $0{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 1999 | 623 | 11.3 | 4,912 | 88.7 | 5,535 | 234 | 1,696 | 1,930 | 389 | 3,118 | 3,507 | 0 | 98 | $98{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 2000 | 5,486 | 35.3 | 10,046 | 64.7 | 15,532 | 4,560 | 6,585 | 11,145 | 926 | 3,461 | 4,387 | 0 | 0 | $0{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 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 | $0{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 2002 | 1,709 | 10.7 | 14,307 | 89.3 | 16,016 | 1,006 | 7,812 | 8,818 | 703 | 6,495 | 7,198 | 0 | 0 | $0{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 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 | $0{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 2004 | 5,819 | 15.0 | 33,063 | 85.0 | 38,882 | 4,742 | 23,117 | 27,859 | 1,077 | 9,906 | 10,983 | 0 | 40 | $40^{\text {d }}$ |
| 2005 | 3,093 | 9.8 | 28,326 | 90.2 | 31,419 | 1,341 | 11,702 | 13,043 | 1,731 | 16,624 | 18,355 | 21 | 0 | $21^{\text {d }}$ |
| 2006 | 1,369 | 6.8 | 18,709 | 93.2 | 20,078 | 708 | 8,870 | 9,578 | 661 | 9,839 | 10,500 | 0 | 0 | $0{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 2007 | 545 | 9.5 | 5,205 | 90.5 | 5,750 | 270 | 2,552 | 2,822 | 275 | 2,653 | 2,928 | 0 | 0 | $0{ }^{\text {d }}$ |
| 2008 | 2,379 | 23.8 | 7,603 | 76.2 | 9,982 | 1,730 | 3,064 | 4,794 | 649 | 4,539 | 5,188 | 0 | 0 | $0{ }^{\text {d }}$ |

a/ Natural area spawners includes both wild and hatchery fish that spawn in areas outside Trinity River Hatchery.
c/ The 1985 sport harvest of adult coho was limited by a closure for the taking of salmon greater than or equal to 56 cm total length beginning September 22,1985
d/ The 1996-2008 sport fishery was closed to the take of coho salmon.

Appendix 14 (continued). Coho salmon run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek weir from 1977 through 2008.


Appendix 15. Fall-run adult steelhead (>41cm FL) run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek weir from 1977 through 2008

a/ Natural area spawners includes both wild and hatchery fish that spawn in areas outside Trinity River Hatchery.
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 15 (continued). Fall-run adult steelhead ( $>41 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL) run-size, spawner escapement, and angler harvest estimates for the Trinity River upstream of Willow Creek weir from 1977 through 2008.


Appendix 16. Daily mean flow (CFS) and stream temperature at Junction City weir, 2008.


Appendix 17. Daily mean flow (CFS) and stream temperature at Willow Creek weir, 2008.


# ANNUAL REPORT <br> TRINITY RIVER BASIN SALMON AND STEELHEAD MONITORING PROJECT 2008-09 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 September 8, 2008 and March 11, 2009. Of the 9,018 Chinook salmon that entered TRH, we recovered 1,945 adipose fin-clipped (AD) Chinook salmon, $21.6 \%$ of the total. Of these, coded-wire tags (CWT) were recovered from 741 spring Chinook and 1,064 fall Chinook salmon.

We estimated that 1,102 marked (AD+CWT) spring Chinook returned to the Trinity River upstream of the Junction City weir (JCW) and 2,045 marked fall Chinook returned to the Trinity River upstream of the Willow Creek weir (WCW) during the 2008-09 season.

Estimated in-river run-size, angler harvest, and spawner escapements of marked TRH spring and fall Chinook salmon for the 2003 through 2006 brood years (BY's) are presented. Complete returns are only available for both runs of fish from the 2003 BY. These fish have reached age five and are considered to have completed their life cycle. Chinook in-river return rates (expressed as a percentage of release numbers) for the completed 2003 BY ranged from $0.085 \%$ to $0.156 \%$ for spring Chinook fingerling CWT groups and $0.026 \%$ to $0.085 \%$ for fall Chinook fingerlings. Returns of spring Chinook released as yearlings was estimated at $0.323 \%$, while fall Chinook yearlings returned at a rate of $0.418 \%$.

Total spring Chinook run-size, upstream of Junction City Weir, was estimated to be composed of 4,577 (44.5\%) Trinity River Hatchery produced fish and 5,706 naturally produced fish. Similar estimates for fall Chinook, upstream of Willow Creek Weir, were 8,585 (37.3\%) hatchery produced fish and 14,412 naturally produced fish.


## TASK OBJECTIVES

To determine relative return rates and the contribution to spawning escapement and inriver sport 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 September 18, 2008 through March 11, 2009, 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 codedwire 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, 2005, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2010.

## 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. CWTs that were lost or un-readable were apportioned to all groups recovered on a weekly basis. Heads from AD-clipped salmon which did not contain a CWT were considered to have shed their tags and were accounted for in the quality control process prior to their release from TRH as juveniles.

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) Grilse and adult total run-size, 2) angler harvest rate of grilse and adults, 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 number of grilse and adult salmon above a specific weir site with a CWT, we used the equation:

$$
\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT}}=\frac{\mathrm{NW}_{\text {ADclip }}}{\mathrm{NW}} \times \frac{\mathrm{NH}_{\text {ADCWT }}}{N \mathrm{H}_{\text {ADclip }}} \times \mathrm{N}_{\text {run-size estimate }}
$$

where, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT}}$ = estimated number of Chinook salmon above the weir with a CWT; $\mathrm{NW}_{\text {ADclip }}=$ number of salmon observed at the weir with an AD clip; NW = total number of salmon observed at the respective weir; $\mathrm{NH}_{\text {ADCwt }}=$ 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. Independent estimates were generated for grilse (2-year-old) and adult (ages 3-5) salmon.

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:

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

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

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

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

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:

$$
S F_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}=N_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }} X \quad N_{\text {harvest rate estimate }}
$$

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:

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

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:
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { naurara escapement }}=\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { escapement }}-\mathrm{NH}_{\mathrm{CWT} \text { group }}$
where, $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{cwt}}$ naural escapement $=$ 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 run-size 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/CWTed fish released). In doing this, we assume that marked fish are representative of their unmarked counterparts.

## RESULTS

## Coded-Wire Tag Recovery

We recovered 9,018 Chinook salmon at TRH this season, of which 1,945 (21.6\%) bore AD-clips. We recovered CWTs from 741 known spring Chinook and 1,064 known fall Chinook (Table 1). The remaining 140 AD-clipped fish had either shed their CWT (114) or the CWT was lost or unreadable (26). Chinook without CWTs were classified as either spring- or fall-run based on their date of entry into TRH.

| Release data |  |  |  |  |  |  | Recovery data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CWT a/ code | $\begin{gathered} \text { Egg } \\ \text { source } \end{gathered}$ | Brood year | Date | $\begin{array}{cc}\text { Number } & \text { Size } \\ \text { (No./lb) }\end{array}$ |  | Site | Males |  | Females |  | Total |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | No. | FL b/ | No. | FL b/ |  |
| Spring-run chinook salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065310 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 94,182 | 54.0 |  | TRH | 0 | ----- | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065311 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 78,663 | 54.0 | TRH | 1 | 100.0 | 0 | ----- | 1 |
| 065312 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 92,711 | 60.0 | TRH | 1 | 88.0 | 0 | ----- |  |
| 065317 | TRH | 2003 | 10/20/04 | 104,974 | 11.4 | TRH | 0 |  | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065319 | TRH | 2004 | 06/1-8/05 | 91,301 | 38.0 | TRH | 7 | 78.9 | 25 | 72.4 | 32 |
| 065320 | TRH | 2004 | 06/1-8/05 | 90,290 | 38.0 | TRH | 12 | 84.9 | 21 | 74.0 | 33 |
| 065321 | TRH | 2004 | 06/1-8/05 | 72,239 | 48.0 | TRH | 11 | 84.0 | 33 | 75.5 | 44 |
| 065326 | TRH | 2004 | 10/3-11/05 | 104,478 | 9.9 | TRH | 175 | 80.7 | 227 | 73.9 | 402 |
| 065330 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,265 | 13.3 | TRH | 2 | 62.0 | , | 64.0 | 3 |
| 065331 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,247 | 13.3 | TRH | 1 | 59.0 | 0 | ----- | 1 |
| 065332 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,959 | 13.3 | TRH | 1 | 57.0 |  | 69.0 | 2 |
| 065333 | TRH | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 93,920 | 56.0 | TRH | 23 | 68.0 | 19 | 63.7 | 42 |
| 065334 | TRH | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 95,152 | 56.0 | TRH | 22 | 70.2 | 18 | 65.1 | 40 |
| 065335 | TRH | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 74,036 | 54.5 | TRH | 36 | 68.9 | 20 | 65.6 | 56 |
| 065342 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,382 | 13.3 | TRH | 4 | 74.3 | 5 | 61.0 | 9 |
| 065343 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,510 | 13.3 | TRH | 2 | 65.0 | 3 | 64.0 | 5 |
| 065344 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,766 | 13.3 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 1 | 61.0 | 1 |
| 065345 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,169 | 13.3 | TRH | 1 | 70.0 | 1 | 62.0 | 2 |
| 065346 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 27,309 | 13.3 | TRH | 8 | 66.5 | 5 | 67.0 | 13 |
| 065347 | TRH | 2006 | 06/1-08/07 | 65,914 | 64.2 | TRH | 8 | 48.5 | 1 | 62.0 | 9 |
| 065348 | TRH | 2006 | 06/1-08/07 | 86,088 | 76.2 | TRH | 9 | 49.0 | 0 | ----- | 9 |
| 065349 | TRH | 2006 | 06/1-08/07 | 74,456 | 76.2 | TRH | 5 | 49.6 | 1 | 53.0 | 6 |
| 065360 | TRH | 2006 | 10/1-10/07 | 74,456 | 11.7 | TRH | 30 | 43.6 | 0 | ----- | 30 |
| Lost CWT c/ e/ No CWT d/e/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 76.2 | 6 | 70.8 | 11 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 | 70.0 | 14 | 69.9 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  | Spring-run | ook salmon | tals: | 380 |  | 402 |  | 782 |
| Fall-run chinook salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065293 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 11,342 | 130.0 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065294 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 5,230 | 130.0 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065313 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 125,073 | 99.0 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065314 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 132,044 | 99.0 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065315 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 131,548 | 105.0 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065316 | TRH | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 128,982 | 105.0 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065318 | TRH | 2003 | 10/20/04 | 225,798 | 16.0 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 0 | ----- | 0 |
| 065322 | TRH | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 123,231 | 66.0 | TRH | 10 | 84.9 | 36 | 79.8 | 46 |
| 065323 | TRH | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 120,440 | 73.0 | TRH | 13 | 84.1 | 40 | 79.7 | 53 |
| 065324 | TRH | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 122,180 | 82.0 | TRH | 9 | 82.4 | 38 | 79.0 | 47 |
| 065325 | TRH | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 120,518 | 78.0 | TRH | 14 | 84 | 38 | 77.9 | 52 |
| 065328 | TRH | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 8,110 | 110.0 | TRH | 2 | 88 | 1 | 78.0 | 3 |
| 065329 | TRH | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 5,917 | 110.0 | TRH | 0 | ----- | 1 | 83.0 | 1 |
| 065327 | TRH | 2004 | 10/20/05 | 218,386 | 14.3 | TRH | 140 | 85.4 | 233 | 78.5 | 373 |
| 065336 | TRH | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 104,760 | 101.1 | TRH | 4 | 62.3 | 4 | 65 | 8 |
| 065337 | TRH | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 126,404 | 101.1 | TRH | 11 | 67.4 | 15 | 64.9 | 26 |
| 065338 | TRH | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 119,293 | 108.8 | TRH | 8 | 67.5 | 6 | 65.2 | 14 |
| 065339 | TRH | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 127,742 | 108.8 | TRH | 12 | 68.4 | 6 | 65.7 | 18 |
| 065340 | TRH | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 10,267 | 157.0 | TRH | 3 | 65.7 | 1 | 68 | 4 |
| 065341 | TRH | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 227,903 | 19.8 | TRH | 152 | 68.1 | 118 | 65.8 | 270 |
| 065350 | TRH | 2006 | 06/1-8/07 | 118,575 | 110.0 | TRH | 34 | 50.5 | 0 | ----- | 34 |
| 065351 | TRH | 2006 | 06/1-8/07 | 119,712 | 110.0 | TRH | 29 | 48.5 | 0 | ----- | 29 |
| 065352 | TRH | 2006 | 06/1-8/07 | 122,076 | 134.3 | TRH | 19 | 50.8 | 0 | ----- | 19 |
| 065353 | TRH | 2006 | 06/1-8/07 | 126,470 | 134.3 | TRH | 23 | 49.2 | 0 | ----- | 23 |
| 065361 | TRH | 2006 | 10/1-10/07 | 238,156 | 19.5 | TRH | 44 | 46.8 | 0 | ---- | 44 |
| Lost CWT c/e/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 59.0 | 9 | 70.2 | 15 |
| No CWT d/e/ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 40 | 70.3 | 44 | 73.8 | 84 |
|  |  |  |  | Fall-run chinook salmon totals: |  |  | 573 |  | 590 |  | 1,163 |

a/ CWT = Coded-wire tag.
b/ $\mathrm{FL}=$ Mean fork length in cm.
c/ CWT lost or un-readable 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.

Spring Chinook CWTs were represented by 21 release groups from the 2003 through 2006 BY's. Fall Chinook CWTs were composed of 18 groups representing the 2004 through 2006 BY's (Table 1). We did not recover any known age five fish from fall Chinook this year at TRH.

## Run-Size, Angler Harvest, and Escapement of Coded-Wire Tagged Salmon

## Spring 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 1,102 (92 grilse and 1,010 adults) CWTed spring Chinook salmon returned to the Trinity River above JCW during the 2008 season.

In 2008 none of the grilse spring Chinook at JCW were observed to have an AD-clip, thus we used a surrogate AD-clip rate of .0455 for estimates above the weir. We felt this rate reasonably approximated the number of grilse which entered TRH and accounted for angler harvest and natural area spawners of hatchery origin.

An estimated 120 adult and 6 grilse CWTed fish were harvested by anglers during the season. Escapement of CWTed spring Chinook was divided between 741 fish recovered at TRH and 335 estimated to have spawned in natural areas (Table 2). The year's run of known aged CWTd spring Chinook was composed of the following: 92 (8.3\%) age 2; 256 (23.2\%) age 3; 751 (68.2\%) age 4; and 2 (0.2\%) age 5 fish (Table 2).

## 2003 Brood Year

Four spring Chinook CWT groups from the 2003 BY completed their life cycle this season, having reached the age of five. Cumulative age two through five in-river return rates, expressed as a percentage of the number of returns divided by the number released, ranged from $0.085 \%$ to $0.156 \%$ for fingerling release groups. The one yearling release group, 065317, experienced a return rate of $0.323 \%$ (Table 3). Thus, yearlings returned at a rate approximately twice If that of their fingerling released cohorts. All release types experienced their highest returns as age four fish.

## 2004 Brood Year

Spring Chinook from the 2004 brood year will complete their life cycle next year. To date, fish from this brood have returned through age four. Both fingerling and yearling release groups have experienced fair returns (ranging from $0.68 \%$ to $1.17 \%$ ), which is approximately 4 to 7 times better than the completed 2003 BY returns (Table 3). Both the fingerling and yearling groups had their highest returns as age three fish.

Table 2. Run-size, angler harvest, and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatchery produced, coded-wire tagged, spring- and fall-run Chinook salmon returning to the Trinity River during the 2008-09 season.

|  | Run Size estimate |  | Harvest rates |  | TRH <br> Ads <br> With | \% weir Ad clips |  | Ad+CWT <br> Run-size estimates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Run-size estimates | Grilse | Adults | Grilse | Adults | CWTs | Grilse | Adults | Grilse | Adults | Total |
| Sp. Chinook (JCW) | 2,218 | 8,065 | 6.7\% | 2.0\% | 0.911 | 4.55\% | 13.75\% | 92 | 1,010 | 1,102 |
| Fall Chinook (WCW) | 7,856 | 15,141 | 2.5\% | 1.9\% | 0.931 | 3.76\% | 12.55\% | 275 | 1,770 | 2,045 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CWT } \\ & \text { code } \end{aligned}$ | BY | Age | TRH <br> Total No. | \% of <br> Total | Run-size | Angler harvest | Spawning escapement |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRH | Natural | Total |
| Spring-run chinook salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adults |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065311 | 03 | 5 | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 065312 | 03 | 5 | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 065319 | 04 | 4 | 32 | 4.7\% | 47 | 1 | 32 | 14 | 46 |
| 065320 | 04 | 4 | 33 | 4.8\% | 49 | 1 | 33 | 15 | 48 |
| 065321 | 04 | 4 | 44 | 6.4\% | 65 | 1 | 44 | 19 | 63 |
| 065326 | 04 | 4 | 402 | 58.5\% | 591 | 12 | 402 | 178 | 580 |
| 065330 | 05 | 3 | 3 | 0.4\% | 4 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 065331 | 05 | 3 | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 065332 | 05 | 3 | 2 | 0.3\% | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 065333 | 05 | 3 | 42 | 6.1\% | 62 | 1 | 42 | 19 | 61 |
| 065334 | 05 | 3 | 40 | 5.8\% | 59 | 1 | 40 | 18 | 58 |
| 065335 | 05 | 3 | 56 | 8.2\% | 82 | 2 | 56 | 25 | 81 |
| 065342 | 05 | 3 | 9 | 1.3\% | 13 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| 065343 | 05 | 3 | 5 | 0.7\% | 7 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| 065344 | 05 | 3 | 1 | 0.1\% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 065345 | 05 | 3 | 2 | 0.3\% | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 065346 | 05 | 3 | 13 | 1.9\% | 19 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 19 |
|  |  | Totals: | 687 | 1 | 1,010 | 20 | 687 | 303 | 990 |
| Grilse |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065347 | 06 | 2 | 9 | 16.7\% | 15 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| 065348 | 06 | 2 | 9 | 16.7\% | 15 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| 065349 | 06 | 2 | 6 | 11.1\% | 10 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| 065360 | 06 | 2 | 30 | 55.6\% | 51 | 3 | 30 | 18 | 48 |
|  |  | Totals: | 54 | 1 | 92 | 6 | 54 | 32 | 86 |

Fall-run chinook salmon

## Adults

| 065322 | 04 | 4 | 46 | 5.0\% | 89 | 2 | 46 | 41 | 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 065323 | 04 | 4 | 53 | 5.8\% | 103 | 2 | 53 | 48 | 101 |
| 065324 | 04 | 4 | 47 | 5.1\% | 91 | 2 | 47 | 42 | 89 |
| 065325 | 04 | 4 | 52 | 5.7\% | 101 | 2 | 52 | 47 | 99 |
| 065327 | 04 | 4 | 373 | 40.8\% | 721 | 13 | 373 | 335 | 708 |
| 065328 | 04 | 4 | 3 | 0.3\% | 6 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 065329 | 04 | 4 | 1 | 0.1\% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 065336 | 05 | 3 | 8 | 0.9\% | 15 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 15 |
| 065337 | 05 | 3 | 26 | 2.8\% | 50 | 1 | 26 | 23 | 49 |
| 065338 | 05 | 3 | 14 | 1.5\% | 27 | 1 | 14 | 13 | 27 |
| 065339 | 05 | 3 | 18 | 2.0\% | 35 | 1 | 18 | 16 | 34 |
| 065340 | 05 | 3 | 4 | 0.4\% | 8 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 065341 | 05 | 3 | 270 | 29.5\% | 522 | 10 | 270 | 243 | 513 |
|  |  | Totals: | 915 | 1 | 1,770 | 33 | 915 | 822 | 1,737 |
| Grilse |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065350 | 06 | 2 | 34 | 22.8\% | 63 | 2 | 34 | 27 | 61 |
| 065351 | 06 | 2 | 29 | 19.5\% | 53 | 1 | 29 | 23 | 52 |
| 065352 | 06 | 2 | 19 | 12.8\% | 35 | 1 | 19 | 15 | 34 |
| 065353 | 06 | 2 | 23 | 15.4\% | 42 | 1 | 23 | 18 | 41 |
| 065361 | 06 | 2 | 44 | 29.5\% | 81 | 2 | 44 | 35 | 79 |
|  |  | Totals: | 149 | 1 | 275 | 7 | 149 | 119 | 268 |

Table 3. Run-size, percent return, in-river sport catch and spawner escapement estimates for Trinity River Hatchery-produced coded-wieretagged spring Chinook salmon returning to the Trinity River upstream of Junction City Weir during the period 2005 through 2008.

| Release data |  |  |  |  | Estimated returns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CWT a/ code | Brood year | Date b/ | Number | Site | Age | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Run- } \\ & \text { size } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { release } \end{gathered}$ | River harvest | Spawning escapement |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRH c/ | Natural | Total |
| 065310 | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 94,182 | TRH | 2 | 4 | 0.004 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 23 | 0.024 | 0 | 18 | 5 | 23 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 81 | 0.086 | 3 | 35 | 43 | 78 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  | Totals: d/ <br> Total adults: e/ |  |  | 108 | 0.115 | 3 | 55 | 50 | 105 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 104 | 0.110 | 3 | 53 | 48 | 101 |
| 065311 | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 78,663 | TRH | 2 | 9 | 0.011 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 49 | 0.062 | 0 | 39 | 10 | 49 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 64 | 0.081 | 2 | 27 | 34 | 61 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1 | 0.001 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  | otals: d/ |  | 123 | 0.156 | 2 | 72 | 48 | 120 |
|  |  |  | Total | dults: e/ |  | 114 | 0.145 | 2 | 67 | 44 | 111 |
| 065312 | 2003 | 06/4-10/04 | 92,711 | TRH | 2 | 2 | 0.002 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 14 | 0.015 | 0 | 11 | 3 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 62 | 0.067 | 2 | 26 | 33 | 59 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 1 | 0.001 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  | Totals: d/ <br> Total adults: e/ |  |  | 79 | 0.085 | 2 | 39 | 37 | 76 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 77 | 0.083 | 2 | 38 | 36 | 74 |
| 065317 | 2003 | 10/20/04 | 104,974 | TRH | 2 | 2 | 0.002 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 54 | 0.051 | 0 | 43 | 11 | 54 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 283 | 0.270 | 11 | 121 | 152 | 273 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 5 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 339 | 0.323 | $11$ | 165 | $164$ | 329 |
|  |  |  | Total | dults: e/ |  | 337 | 0.321 | 11 |  |  | 327 |
| 065319 | 2004 | 06/1-8/05 | 91,301 | TRH | 2 | 49 | 0.054 | 0 | 33 | 16 | 49 |
|  |  |  |  |  | $3$ | $526$ | $0.576$ | $20$ | $224$ | $281$ | 505 |
|  |  |  |  |  | $4$ | 47 | 0.051 | 1 | 32 | 14 | 46 |
| 065320 | 2004 | 06/1-8/05 | 90,290 | TRH | 2 | 91 | 0.101 | 1 | 61 | 29 | 90 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 628 | 0.696 | 24 | 268 | 336 | 604 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 49 | 0.054 | 1 | 33 | 15 | 48 |
| 065321 | 2004 | 06/1-8/05 | 72,239 | TRH |  |  |  |  |  | 28 | 87 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 545 | 0.754 | 21 | 232 | 292 | 524 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 65 | 0.090 | 1 | 44 | 19 | 63 |
| 065326 | 2004 | 10/3-11/05 | 104,478 | TRH | 2 | 16 | 0.015 | 0 | 11 | 5 | 16 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 611 | 0.585 | 23 | 260 | 327 | 587 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 591 | 0.566 | 12 | 402 | 178 | 580 |
| 065330 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,265 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 4 | 0.036 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| 065331 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,247 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 0.009 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

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 2003. 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-produced coded-wiere-tagged spring Chinook salmon returning to the Trinity River upstream of Junction City Weir during the period 2005 through 2008.

| 065332 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,959 | TRH | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ | $0$ | $0.000$ | 0 0 | 0 | $0$ | 0 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 065333 | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 93,920 | TRH | 2 | 6 | 0.006 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 5 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 62 | 0.066 | 1 | 42 | 19 | 61 |
| 065334 | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 95,152 | TRH | 2 | 7 | 0.007 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 59 | 0.062 | 1 | 40 | 18 | 58 |
| 065335 | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 74,036 | TRH | 2 | 5 | 0.007 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 82 | 0.111 | 2 | 56 | 25 | 81 |
| 065342 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,382 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 13 | 0.114 | 0 | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| 065343 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,510 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 7 | 0.061 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 7 |
| 065344 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,766 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 1 | 0.008 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 065345 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 11,169 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 0.027 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 065346 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 27,309 | TRH | 2 | 1 | 0.004 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 19 | 0.070 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 19 |
| 065347 | 2006 | 06/1-08/07 | 65,914 | TRH | 2 | 15 | 0.023 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| 065348 | 2006 | 06/1-08/07 | 86,088 | TRH | 2 | 15 | 0.017 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 14 |
| 065349 | 2006 | 06/1-08/07 | 74,456 | TRH | 2 | 10 | 0.013 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| 065360 | 2006 | 10/1-10/07 | 104,019 | TRH | 2 | 51 | 0.049 | 3 | 30 | 18 | 48 |

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 2003. 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.

## 2005 Brood Year

Spring Chinook from the 2005 brood year have returned as age two and three thus far. Returns to date indicate that this brood is doing poorly. Only 273 fish have returned as two and three-year-olds for all groups combined (Table 3). However, some cohorts in the past have contributed most returns as age four fish. This brood will return as four and five-year-old fish in the next two seasons.

## 2006 Brood Year

Four 2006 BY release groups ( 3 fingerling and 1 yearling) returned as two-year-olds this season. Thus far, the fingerling CWT group, 065360, has experienced the highest return rate (Table 3). Spring Chinook from this BY are expected to return as three through five-year-olds during the next three years.

## Fall 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 2,045 CWTed fall Chinook salmon returned to the Trinity River above WCW during the 2008-09 season. We estimated that anglers harvested 7 grilse and 33 adult CWTed fall Chinook. Escapement of CWTed fall Chinook was divided between 1,064 fish recovered at TRH and 941 estimated to have spawned in natural areas this season (Table 2).

The fall Chinook CWT run was composed of 275 (13.4\%) age 2 fish, 658 (32.2\%) age 3 fish, 1,112 (54.4\%) age 4 fish, and no age five fish (Table 2).

## 2003 Brood Year

The BY 2003 releases were composed of six fingerling and one yearling release groups and have completed their life cycle this season, having reached the age of five. Return rates for fingerling releases ranged between $0.026 \%$ and $0.085 \%$. The lone yearling group, 065318 , returned at a rate of $.418 \%$, which is approximately 10 times that of the mean fingerling group return rates (Table 4). All Chinook from the 2003 BY experienced their highest returns as three-year-old fish (Table 4).

## 2004 Brood Year

The 2004 BY is represented by seven CWT groups, of which six are fingerling groups and one a yearling group. In contrast to the poor returns of the 2003 BY releases, fall Chinook from the 2004 BY are returning at a much higher rate. Through age four returns, all fingerling groups have returned at rates exceeding 0.4\% (table 4). The lone yearling group, 065327 , is approaching a $1.8 \%$ return, approximately four times

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 2005 through 2008.

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 2003. 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 2005 through 2008.

| Release data |  |  |  |  | Estimated returns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CWT a/ } \\ \text { code } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Brood year | Date b/ | Number | Site | Age | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Run- } \\ & \text { size } \end{aligned}$ | \% ofrelease | River harvest | Spawning escapement |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRH c/ | Natural | Total |
| 065322 | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 123,231 | TRH | 2 | 348 | 0.282 | 4 | 225 | 119 | 344 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 684 | 0.555 | 11 | 463 | 210 | 673 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 89 | 0.072 | 2 | 46 | 41 | 87 |
| 065323 | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 120,440 | TRH | 2 | 294 | 0.244 | 3 | 190 | 101 | 291 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 632 | 0.525 | 10 | 427 | 194 | 621 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 103 | 0.086 | 2 | 53 | 48 | 101 |
| 065324 | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 122,180 |  | 2 | 204 | 0.167 | 2 | 132 | 70 | 202 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 566 | 0.463 | 9 | 383 | 174 | 557 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 91 | 0.074 | 2 | 47 | 42 | 89 |
| 065325 | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 120,518 | TRH | 2 | 305 | 0.253 | 3 | 197 | 105 | 302 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 705 | 0.585 | 11 | 477 | 216 | 693 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 101 | 0.084 | 2 | 52 | 47 | 99 |
| 065327 | 2004 | 10/20/05 | 218,386 | TRH | 2 | 155 | 0.071 | 2 | 100 | 53 | 153 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 3,022 | 1.384 | 49 | 2,045 | 928 | 2973 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 721 | 0.330 | 13 | 373 | 335 | 708 |
| 065328 | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 8,110 | TRH | 2 | 8 | 0.099 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 21 | 0.259 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 21 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 6 | 0.074 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| 065329 | 2004 | 06/4-10/05 | 5,917 | TRH | 2 | 8 | 0.135 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 21 | 0.355 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 21 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 4 | 2 | 0.034 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 065336 | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 104,760 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 15 | 0.014 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 15 |
| 065337 | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 126,404 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 50 | 0.040 | 1 | 26 | 23 | 49 |
| 065338 | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 119,293 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 27 | 0.023 | 1 | 14 | 13 | 27 |
| 065339 | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 127,742 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 35 | 0.027 | 1 | 18 | 16 | 34 |
| 065340 | 2005 | 06/1-7/06 | 10,267 | TRH | 2 | 0 | 0.000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 8 | 0.078 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| 065341 | 2005 | 10/2-16/06 | 227,903 | TRH | 2 | 16 | 0.007 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 14 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 522 | 0.229 | 10 | 270 | 243 | 513 |
| 065350 | 2006 | 06/1-8/07 | 118,575 | TRH | 2 | 63 | 0.053 | 2 | 34 | 27 | 61 |
| 065351 | 2006 | 06/1-8/07 | 119,712 | TRH | 2 | 53 | 0.044 | 1 | 29 | 23 | 52 |
| 065352 | 2006 | 06/1-8/07 | 122,076 | TRH | 2 | 35 | 0.029 | 1 | 19 | 15 | 34 |
| 065353 | 2006 | 06/1-8/07 | 126,470 | TRH | 2 | 42 | 0.033 | 1 | 23 | 18 | 41 |
| 065361 | 2006 | 10/1-10/07 | 238,156 | TRH | 2 | 81 | 0.034 | 2 | 44 | 35 | 79 |

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 2001. 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.
that of the yearling group from the 2003 brood (Table 4).of less than $0.1 \%$, while the yearling group, 065318 has returned at a rate of approximately $0.42 \%$ (Table 4). Age three returns have been the most numerous for all release types to date. Fish released from this BY are expected to return as five-year-olds during the 2009 season.

## 2005 Brood Year

Six release groups ( 5 fingerling and 1 yearling) have returned to date as two- and three-year-old fish (Table 4). The yearling group, 065327, has experienced the best returns to date, surpassing $0.23 \%$ through age 3. Fish from both release groups should return as four and five-year-olds in 2009 and 2010, respectively. No age two returns were estimated for any of the fingerling release groups and only 16 were estimated for the yearling group (Table 4).

## 2006 Brood Year

Five CWT groups (4 fingerling and 1 yearling) from the 2006 BY returned as two-yearolds during the 2008 season (Table 4). Age two return rates have been average so far, surpassing 2003 and 2005 returns for age two, but considerably less than 2004 returns through age two. Adult returns from these groups will occur over 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 2008-09 run of spring Chinook was composed of 4,577 ( 372 grilse and 4,205 adult) fish of TRH origin. This represents $16.8 \%(372 / 2,218)$ of the grilse, $52.1 \%$ $(4,205 / 8,065)$ of the adult run, and $44.5 \%(4,577 / 10,283)$ of the total run estimated upstream of JCW.

The fall run, upstream of WCW, was estimated to be composed of 8,585 (1,133 grilse and 7,452 adults) TRH-produced Chinook, which represents $37.3 \%(8,585 / 22,997)$ of the total estimated run. Hatchery produced fall Chinook were estimated to contribute $14.4 \%(1,133 / 7,856)$ of the two-year-olds (grilse) and $49.2 \%(7,452 / 15,141)$ of the adult run this season.

## 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 CWTd fish estimated to have spawned naturally are the remaining estimated number of fish after hatchery CWTs and estimated angler harvest are

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 2008-09 season. a/


| Fall-run chinook salmon |  |  |  | Adults |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 065293 | 03 | 5 | 4.07 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065294 | 03 | 5 | 4.07 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065313 | 03 | 5 | 4.08 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065314 | 03 | 5 | 4.01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065315 | 03 | 5 | 4.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065316 | 03 | 5 | 4.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065318 | 03 | 5 | 4.01 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 065322 | 04 | 4 | 4.10 | 89 | 365 | 2 | 8 | 46 | 189 | 41 | 168 | 87 | 357 |
| 065323 | 04 | 4 | 4.06 | 103 | 418 | 2 | 8 | 53 | 215 | 48 | 195 | 101 | 410 |
| 065324 | 04 | 4 | 4.05 | 91 | 369 | 2 | 8 | 47 | 190 | 42 | 170 | 89 | 360 |
| 065325 | 04 | 4 | 4.14 | 101 | 418 | 2 | 8 | 52 | 215 | 47 | 195 | 99 | 410 |
| 065327 | 04 | 4 | 4.31 | 721 | 3,108 | 13 | 56 | 373 | 1,608 | 335 | 1,444 | 708 | 3,051 |
| 065328 | 04 | 4 | 4.20 | 6 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 13 | 6 | 25 |
| 065329 | 04 | 4 | 4.20 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8.4 |
| 065336 | 05 | 3 | 4.71 | 15 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 38 | 7 | 33 | 15 | 71 |
| 065337 | 05 | 3 | 4.04 | 50 | 202 | 1 | 4 | 26 | 105 | 23 | 93 | 49 | 198 |
| 065338 | 05 | 3 | 4.25 | 27 | 115 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 60 | 12 | 51 | 26 | 111 |
| 065339 | 05 | 3 | 4.03 | 35 | 141 | 1 | 4 | 18 | 73 | 16 | 64 | 34 | 137 |
| 065340 | 05 | 3 | 4.44 | 8 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 4 | 18 | 8 | 36 |
| 065341 | 05 | 3 | 4.17 | 522 | 2,177 | 10 | 42 | 270 | 1,126 | 242 | 1,009 | 512 | 2,135 |
|  |  |  | Total adults: | 1,770 | 7,452 | 34 | 143 | 915 | 3,852 | 821 | 3,457 | 1,736 | 7,309 |
|  |  |  |  | Grilse |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 065350 | 06 | 2 | 4.24 | 63 | 267 | 2 | 8 | 34 | 144 | 27 | 114 | 61 | 259 |
| 065351 | 06 | 2 | 4.21 | 53 | 223 | 1 | 4 | 29 | 122 | 23 | 97 | 52 | 219 |
| 065352 | 06 | 2 | 4.18 | 35 | 146 | 1 | 4 | 19 | 79 | 15 | 63 | 34 | 142 |
| 065353 | 06 | 2 | 4.00 | 42 | 168 | 1 | 4 | 23 | 92 | 18 | 72 | 41 | 164 |
| 065361 | 06 | 2 | 4.05 | 81 | 328 | 2 | 8 | 44 | 178 | 35 | 142 | 79 | 320 |
|  |  |  | Total grilse: | 274 | 1,133 | 7 | 29 | 149 | 616 | 118 | 488 | 267 | 1,104 |

[^4]subtracted from the overall CWT estimate. Return rates are also affected by ocean and in-river harvest below the weir sites, which is not included in our estimates. Thus, harvest rates in these sectors can greatly affect river returns upstream of respective weir sites in any given year.

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 spring Chinook return rates of fingerling releases for the 2003 BY were approximately $25 \%$ of the 18 year average ( $0.12 \%$ vs. $0.54 \%$ ) and the fifth lowest observed in our data set (Appendix 1). Spring Chinook yearling releases for the same 2003 BY returned at rate one third of the long term average ( $0.32 \%$ vs. $1.11 \%$ ), but more than double the rate estimated for fingerling release types (Appendix 1).

Fall Chinook 2003 BY releases experienced similar patterns of return as their spring Chinook counterparts. Fall Chinook yearling releases returned at a rate almost ten times ( $0.42 \%$ vs. $0.05 \%$ ) their fingerling released siblings (Appendix 2). Return rates for both fingerling and yearling releases were substantially less than the long term averages (Appendix 2).

The contribution of hatchery-produced Chinook to total run-size was an estimated $44.5 \%$ of the spring Chinook run upstream of Junction City weir (Appendix 3), the fourth lowest since 1991. The contribution of hatchery-produced fall Chinook to total run-size, upstream of Willow Creek weir, was estimated at $37.3 \%$ (Appendix 4), the third lowest observed rate since 1991. The reason for the low rate of hatchery fish in both the spring- and fall-runs of Chinook this year is unknown, but obviously either hatchery fish performed poorly or wild fish survived reasonably well, compared to their hatchery counterparts.

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 grilse and adult run-sizes are based on AD clip rates observed at either JCW or WCW times the total estimated grilse and adult 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.

## 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 2009-10.
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 1986-2003. a/

| Brood year |  | Fingerling releases |  |  | Yearling releases |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number released | Number of returns | Percent return | Number released | Number of returns | Percent 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 | a/ | 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\% |
| 2000 |  | 261,193 | 4,422 | 1.693\% | 99,304 | 2,029 | 2.043\% |
| 2001 |  | 253,248 | 412 | 0.163\% | 104,627 | 1,480 | 1.415\% |
| 2002 |  | 244,754 | 2,217 | 0.906\% | 106,139 | 514 | 0.484\% |
| 2003 |  | 265,556 | 310 | 0.117\% | 104,974 | 339 | 0.323\% |
| Means: |  | 204,160 | 1,104 | 0.54\% | 111,011 | 1,314 | 1.11\% |


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 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 1986-2003. a/

|  | Fingerling releases |  |  | Yearling releases |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brood year | 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\% |
| 2000 | 522,316 | 3,909 | 0.748\% | 216,593 | 5,245 | 2.422\% |
| 2001 | 499,919 | 476 | 0.095\% | 230,055 | 5,894 | 2.562\% |
| 2002 | 508,963 | 3,563 | 0.700\% | 236,319 | 3,561 | 1.507\% |
| 2003 | 534,219 | 289 | 0.054\% | 225,798 | 944 | 0.418\% |
| Means: | 285,947 | 954 | 0.32\% | 175,619 | 3,191 | 1.61\% |


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

Appendix 3. Estimated contributions of Trinity River Hatchery-produced, spring-run chinook salmon, to total estimated run-size above Junction City weir, 1991-2008 seasons.

| Year | Run-size | TRH <br> component | Natural <br> component | $\%$ TRH <br> composition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | 2,381 | 1,016 | 1,365 | $42.7 \%$ |
| 1992 | 4,030 | 1,794 | 2,236 | $44.5 \%$ |
| 1993 | 5,232 | 3,206 | 2,026 | $61.3 \%$ |
| 1994 | 6,788 | 2,659 | 4,129 | $39.2 \%$ |
| 1995 | No estimate | No estimate | No estimate |  |
| 1996 | 23,416 | 12,524 | 10,892 | $53.5 \%$ |
| 1997 | 20,039 | 8,303 | 11,736 | $41.4 \%$ |
| 1998 | 16,167 | 8,774 | 7,393 | $54.3 \%$ |
| 1999 | 11,293 | 7,616 | 3,677 | $67.4 \%$ |
| 2000 | 26,083 | 19,730 | 6,353 | $75.6 \%$ |
| 2001 | 19,622 | 12,051 | 7,571 | $61.4 \%$ |
| 2002 | 38,485 | 24,599 | 13,886 | $63.9 \%$ |
| 2003 | 47,795 | 33,546 | 14,249 | $70.2 \%$ |
| 2004 | 16,147 | 11,324 | 4,823 | $70.1 \%$ |
| 2005 | 13,984 | 10,966 | 3,018 | $78.4 \%$ |
| 2006 | 7,483 | 3,649 | 3,834 | $48.8 \%$ |
| 2007 | 14,835 | 12,099 | 2,736 | $81.6 \%$ |
| 2008 | 10,283 | 4,577 | 5,706 | $44.5 \%$ |
| Means: | 16,710 | 10,496 | 6,214 | $58.8 \%$ |



Appendix 4. Estimated contributions of Trinity River Hatchery-produced, fall-run chinook salmon, to total estimated run-size above Willow Creek weir, 1991-2008 seasons.

| Year | Run-size | TRH <br> component | Natural <br> component | $\%$ TRH <br> composition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1991 | 9,207 | 5,597 | 3,610 | $60.8 \%$ |
| 1992 | 14,164 | 4,651 | 9,513 | $32.8 \%$ |
| 1993 | 10,485 | 1,499 | 8,986 | $14.3 \%$ |
| 1994 | 21,924 | 11,880 | 10,044 | $54.2 \%$ |
| 1995 | 105,725 | 53,263 | 52,462 | $50.4 \%$ |
| 1996 | 55,646 | 20,824 | 34,822 | $37.4 \%$ |
| 1997 | 21,347 | 9,977 | 11,370 | $46.7 \%$ |
| 1998 | 43,189 | 23,536 | 19,653 | $54.5 \%$ |
| 1999 | 18,516 | 13,081 | 5,435 | $70.6 \%$ |
| 2000 | 55,473 | 38,881 | 16,592 | $70.1 \%$ |
| 2001 | 57,109 | 33,984 | 23,125 | $59.5 \%$ |
| 2002 | 18,156 | 6,884 | 11,272 | $37.9 \%$ |
| 2003 | 64,362 | 52,944 | 11,418 | $82.3 \%$ |
| 2004 | 29,534 | 25,956 | 3,578 | $87.9 \%$ |
| 2005 | 28,231 | 19,674 | 8,557 | $69.7 \%$ |
| 2006 | 34,912 | 21,768 | 13,144 | $62.4 \%$ |
| 2007 | 58,873 | 24,633 | 34,240 | $41.8 \%$ |
| 2008 | 22,997 | 8,585 | 14,412 | $37.3 \%$ |
| Means: | 37,214 | 20,979 | 16,235 | $53.9 \%$ |
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#### Abstract

Project personnel effectively marked 457,478 yearling coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) from the 2007 brood year (BY) with a right maxillary (RM) clip prior to their release from Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) in March of 2009. These fish are expected to return as two and three-year-old fish during the 2009-10 and 2010-11 seasons respectively.

An estimated 9,983 coho salmon returned to the Trinity River, upstream of the Willow Creek Weir (WCW), during the 2008-09 season. We estimated the TRH-produced component (86.9\%) of this run to be 8,671 fish. Spawning escapement of TRHproduced coho was divided between 4,820 fish which entered TRH and 3,851 fish estimated to have spawned outside of the hatchery facility.

TRH-produced coho from the 2005 brood year (age 3) are considered to have completed their life cycle this year. An estimated 6,884 grlise and adult coho from the 2005 brood year returned to the Trinity River basin, upstream of Willow Creek weir, the past two seasons. This represents $1.34 \%$ of the 511,961 marked coho yearlings released from TRH in March of 2006 (BY 2005). Estimated TRH-produced coho returns from the 2006 brood year are complete for age two returns only. An estimated 2,290 coho have returned thus far, representing $0.50 \%$ 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 Federal 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 2008-09 coho run above WCW. Data compilation and analysis is reliant upon previously reported data in Sinnen and Null, 2002; Sinnen and Moore, 2000; Sinnen, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2006, 2008; and Sinnen and Hileman, 2009, 2010a and 2010b.

## Marking at Trinity River Hatchery

Marking of coho is performed by CDFG personnel in a marking shed which is placed parallel to the raceways at TRH. The shed is 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 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 in each raceway by adding marked totals with the estimated unmarked totals minus mortalities. The number of unmarked fish is determined using quality control data collected just prior to the release date.

## 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 NRM = the estimated number of coho salmon above Willow Creek weir with a right maxillary clip;
NWRM = the number of coho salmon observed at Willow Creek weir that were rightmaxillary clipped;
NW = the total number of coho salmon observed at Willow Creek weir; NCohorun = 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, $\mathrm{NN}=$ the estimated number of naturally produced coho above Willow Creek weir.

The size separating grilse and adult coho is determined by performing 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 run-size 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, Hcoho = 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 NNaturalescapement = the estimated number of coho salmon above Willow Creek weir estimated to have spawned in natural areas; and

NTRHescapement = 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 457,478 2007 BY coho, representing the $99.9 \%$ of the entire production at TRH. We began marking coho in late December, 2008 and finished in early March, 2009.

We performed a quality control check to determine our clipping effectiveness for coho in each raceway on March 10-12, 2009. 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 $99.9 \%$ for the 10,065 fish examined. We also recorded 2,141 post-clip mortalities. Based on these data we estimate that 457,478 coho were effectively clipped and released (Table 1). These fish ranged in size from 81 to 334 mm , fork length (FL), with a range of mean lengths of 156 to 163 mm , FL. We estimate that 462 unmarked coho were released for a total release number of 457,940 fish. All BY 2007 coho were volitionally released from TRH March 16-23, 2009.

Table 1. Production, marking totals, and quality control data for 2007 brood year coho salmon reared at Trinity River Hatchery and released March 16 through March 23, 2009.

|  | Hatchery raceway |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Marking totals | G3-4 | H1-2 | H3-4 | $\mathbf{I 1 - 2}$ | $\mathbf{I 3 - 4}$ | J1-2 | J3-4 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number clipped | 64,756 | 64,496 | 64,478 | 66,386 | 66,729 | 68,675 | 64,099 | $\mathbf{4 5 9 , 6 1 9}$ |  |
| Post-clip mortalities | 302 | 300 | 300 | 309 | 311 | 320 | 299 | $\mathbf{2 , 1 4 1}$ |  |
| Total marked | 64,454 | 64,196 | 64,178 | 66,077 | 66,418 | 68,355 | 63,800 | $\mathbf{4 5 7 , 4 7 8}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality control parameters |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number examined | 1,365 | 1,324 | 1,312 | 1,365 | 1,368 | 1,830 | 1,501 | $\mathbf{1 0 , 0 6 5}$ |  |
| Number without clips | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | $\mathbf{1 0}$ |  |
| Un-clipped ratio | 0.000733 | 0.001511 | 0.002287 | 0.000000 | 0.000731 | 0.000546 | 0.001332 | $\mathbf{0 . 0 0 0 9 9 4}$ |  |
| Mean fork length (mm) | 157.9 | 161.2 | 156.2 | 156.6 | 160.7 | 158.8 | 162.9 | $\mathbf{1 5 9 . 0}$ |  |
| Fork length range (mm) | $101-289$ | $103-281$ | $105-281$ | $81-302$ | $119-297$ | $95-292$ | $111-334$ | $\mathbf{8 1 - 3 3 4}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Release totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clipped releases | 64,454 | 64,196 | 64,178 | 66,077 | 66,418 | 68,355 | 63,800 | $\mathbf{4 5 7 , 4 7 8}$ |  |
| Un-clipped releases | 47 | 97 | 147 | 0 | 49 | 37 | 85 | $\mathbf{4 6 2}$ |  |
| Percentage clipped | $99.9 \%$ | $99.8 \%$ | $99.8 \%$ | $100.0 \%$ | $99.9 \%$ | $99.9 \%$ | $99.9 \%$ | $\mathbf{9 9 . 9 \%}$ |  |
| Total release | $\mathbf{6 4 , 5 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 , 2 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 , 3 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 , 0 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 6 , 4 6 7}$ | $\mathbf{6 8 , 3 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 3 , 8 8 5}$ | $\mathbf{4 5 4 , 9 4 0}$ |  |

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

Total (natural and TRH-produced) coho run-size for the 2008-09 season, above WCW, was estimated at 9,983 fish (Task 1), of which 2,379 were grilse (age 2) and 7,604 were adults (age 3). Age classes were determined using length frequency analysis. The size separating grilse and adults was 52 cm FL (Task 1). Therefore all coho < 52 cm , FL were considered grilse and larger fish as adults.

The percentage of right maxillary-clipped (RM) coho observed at WCW was $96 \%$ (103/107) for grilse salmon and $84 \%(287 / 342)$ for adults. Based on this information the overall marked coho total observed at WCW for the 2007-08 season was $87 \%$ (390/449). Based on RM-clipped coho at WCW and recovery of Project-marked coho at TRH, we estimate that the 2008-09 coho run was composed of 1,312 naturallyproduced fish and 8,671 TRH-produced fish (Table 2.).

Anglers did not return any tags from harvested coho salmon this year, therefore we estimated that no harvest occurred, upstream of WCW. 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. Five tags were returned from coho caught by anglers reported as caught and released.

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 200809 return year.

|  |  |  |  | Spawning escapement |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Strata | BY $^{\text {a/ }}$ | Age $^{\text {b/ }}$ | Run-size | Angler harvest | TRH $^{\text {c/ }}$ | Natural |  |  |  |  |  |
| Naturally | 06 | 2 | 89 | 0 | 6 | 83 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Produced | 05 | 3 | 1,223 | 0 | 362 | 861 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Totals: | 1,312 | 0 | 368 | 944 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRH | 06 | 2 | 2,290 | 0 | 643 | 1,647 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Produced | 05 | 3 | 6,381 | 0 | 4,177 | 2,204 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Totals: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 8,671 | 0 | 4,820 | 3,851 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Grand totals: |  |  |  |  |  |  | 9,983 | 0 | 5,188 | 4,795 |

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

Based on age three coho run-size estimates presented above (Table 2) and age two estimates provided last year, the percent return for BY 2005, TRH-produced coho was
1.34\% (Table 3). Coho from the 2005 BY have reached three years of age and are considered to have completed their life cycle. The estimated return of two-year-old 2006 BY coho was $0.50 \%$. These fish will return during the 2009-10 season as three-year-olds.

Spawning escapement of 2005 BY, TRH-produced coho consisted of 4,447 (64.6\%) fish that entered TRH and 2,437 (35.4\%) fish estimated to have spawned in natural areas (Table 3).

Estimated escapement in 2008-09 of TRH-produced, two-year-old coho from the 2006 BY was 643 (28.1\%) hatchery spawners and 1,647 (71.9\%) 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 Willow Creek weir during the period 2007 through 2008.

| Release Data |  |  |  |  | Estimated Returns |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brood |  |  | Number b/ Site |  | Age c/ | Run-size | \% of release | River harvest | Spawning Escapement |  |  |
| Clip a/ | Year | Date |  |  | TRH d/ |  |  |  | Natural | Total |
| RM | 05 | $\begin{aligned} & 3 / 15- \\ & \hline 0 / 07 \end{aligned}$ | 511961 | TRH |  | 2 | 503 | 0.098 | 0 | 270 | 233 | 503 |
|  |  |  | 511,061 |  | 3 | $6,381$ | $1.25$ | 0 | $4,177$ | 2,204 | 6,381 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Totals: | 6,884 | 1.34 | 0 | 4,447 | 2,437 | 6,884 |
| RM | 06 | $\begin{aligned} & 3 / 16- \\ & 20 / 08 \end{aligned}$ | 455,623 | TRH | 2 | 2,290 | 0.50 | 0 | 643 | 1,647 | 2,290 |

[^5]
## 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 we did trap trapped 449 coho, of which we effectively tagged 430 coho. The total coho run-size estimate of 9,982 fish, produced under Task 1 of this report, had confidence intervals ( $1-p=0.95$ ) within 12 $14 \%$ of the point estimate, which is one of the tightest estimates for our coho run
estimates. Confidence intervals can range up to $35 \%$ in some years. Another source of potential bias, not trapping through the entire run, did not appear to be a major factor this season. Trapping CPUE (Task 1. Table 4, Figure 10) at WCW indicated that the run of coho was declining, but not completely over, prior to its removal in late November. However, we only trapped one coho the last week of operation and the catch curve was normally distributed through our trapping period. 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 2005 BY coho, estimated at $1.34 \%$, is the third lowest in-river return rate over the last twelve coho cohort cycles (Appendix 1). Return rates have ranged from a low of $0.98 \%$ for BY 2004 coho to a high of $6.61 \%$ 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 inriver 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 sport, commercial, in-river sport, and gill-net).

In all but four years, including this year, the estimated number of hatchery-produced coho that have spawned in natural areas has surpassed those that entered TRH (Appendix 1). This indicates that TRH-produced coho stray at substantial rates. Our main stem 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 318 coho in the main stem Trinity River (Task 4). Of these, 165 (51.9\%) 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 twelve 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 $87 \%$ of the run was composed of TRH-produced coho.

## LITERATURE CITED

Sinnen, W. and T. Moore 2000. Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In N. Manji editor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 1999-00 Season. October 2000. Bureau of Reclamation funded contract. Contract No. R0010005.

Sinnen, W. and B. Null, 2002. Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In N. Manji editor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 2000-01 Season. May 2002. Bureau of Reclamation funded contract. Contract No. R0010005.

Sinnen, W., 2004a. Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In N. Manji Supervisor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 2001-02 Season. April, 2004. Bureau of Reclamation funded contract. Contract No. 02FG20027

Sinnen, W., 2004b. Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In N. Manji Supervisor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 2002-03 Season. September, 2004. Bureau of Reclamation funded contract. Contract No. 02FG20027.

Sinnen, W., 2005. Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In N. Manji Supervisor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 2003-04 Season. June, 2005. Bureau of Reclamation funded contract. Contract No. 02FG20027.

Sinnen, W., 2006. Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In N. Manji Supervisor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 2004-05 Season. May, 2006. Trinity River Restoration Program funded contract. Contract No. 02FG20027.

Sinnen, W., 2008. Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In L. Hanson, Editor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 2005-06 Season. April, 2008. Trinity River Restoration Program funded contract. Contract No. 02FG20027.

Sinnen, W. and J. Hileman, 2009 Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In L. Hanson, Editor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 2006-07 Season. July, 2009. Trinity River Restoration Program funded contract. Contract No. 02FG20027.

Sinnen, W. and J. Hileman, 2010 Task 3. Survival and spawner escapement estimates made by coho salmon produced at Trinity River Hatchery. In L. Hanson, Editor. Annual Report Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project. 2007-08 Season. July, 2009. Trinity River Restoration Program funded contract. Contract No. 02FG20027.

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 1994-2005.

| Release data |  |  |  | Return data |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Brood year | Date | Effective Number | Site | Age | Run-size | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { release } \end{gathered}$ | In-river harvest | Spawner Escapement |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | TRH | Natural | Total |
| 1994 | 3/17-21/96 | 72,311 | TRH | 2 | 970 | 1.34\% | 0 | 105 | 865 | 970 |
|  |  |  |  | 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 |
|  |  |  |  | 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 |
|  |  |  |  | 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 |
|  |  |  |  | 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 |
|  |  |  |  | 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 |
|  |  |  |  | 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 |
|  |  |  |  | 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 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 24,162 | 5.81\% | 40 | 8,835 | 15,287 | 24,122 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 27,500 | 6.60\% | 40 | 10,284 | 17,176 | 27,460 |
| 2002 | 3/15-18/04 | 516,906 | TRH | 2 | 5,665 | 1.10\% | 0 | 1,068 | 4,597 | 5,665 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 25,678 | 4.97\% | 0 | 15,704 | 9,974 | 25,678 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 31,343 | 6.06\% | 0 | 16,772 | 14,571 | 31,343 |
| 2003 | 3/14-18/05 | 520,847 | TRH | 2 | 3,012 | 0.58\% | 21 | 1,269 | 1,721 | 2,990 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 17,123 | 3.29\% | 0 | 7,454 | 9,669 | 17,123 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 20,135 | 3.90\% | 21 | 8,723 | 11,390 | 20,113 |
| 2004 | 3/15-20/06 | 545,199 | TRH | 2 | 1,331 | 0.24\% | 0 | 657 | 674 | 1,331 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 4,048 | 0.74\% | 0 | 2,436 | 1,612 | 4,048 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 5,379 | 0.99\% | 0 | 3,093 | 2,286 | 5,379 |
| 2005 | 3/15-20/07 | 511,961 | TRH | 2 | 503 | 0.10\% | 0 | 270 | 233 | 503 |
|  |  |  |  | 3 | 6,381 | 1.25\% | 0 | 4,177 | 2,204 | 6381 |
|  |  |  |  | Totals: | 6,884 | 1.34\% | 0 | 4,447 | 2,437 | 6,884 |



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 1997-2008.

| Run 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 | 4,655 | 865 | 5,520 | 858 | 867 | 1,725 | 39 | 0 | 39 |
| 1998 | Natural | 131 | 1,001 | 1,132 | 123 | 886 | 1,009 | 8 | 115 | 123 | 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 | 1,256 | 1,467 | 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 |
| 2005 | Natural | 81 | 2,648 | 2,729 | 71 | 1,728 | 1,799 | 10 | 920 | 930 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 3,012 | 25,678 | 28,690 | 1,270 | 9,974 | 11,244 | 1,721 | 15,704 | 17,425 | 21 | 0 | 21 |
| 2006 | Natural | 38 | 1,586 | 1,624 | 34 | 1,416 | 1,450 | 4 | 170 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 1,331 | 17,123 | 18,454 | 674 | 7,454 | 8,128 | 657 | 9,669 | 10,326 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2007 | Natural | 42 | 1,157 | 1,199 | 37 | 940 | 977 | 5 | 217 | 222 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 503 | 4,048 | 4,551 | 233 | 1,612 | 1,845 | 270 | 2,436 | 2,706 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2008 | Natural | 89 | 1,223 | 1,312 | 83 | 861 | 944 | 6 | 362 | 368 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | TRH | 2,290 | 6,381 | 8,671 | 1,647 | 2,204 | 3,851 | 643 | 4,177 | 4,820 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
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#### Abstract

A spawning survey monitoring the escapement of Chinook and coho salmon was conducted on the Trinity River from September 16, 2008 to December 19, 2008. This survey was a joint-agency effort including staff from California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) Trinity River Project (TRP), Yurok Tribal Fisheries (YTF), Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries (HVTF), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and U.S. Forest Service (USFS). The survey focused on the main stem Trinity River from the Lewiston Dam to Cedar Flat (101.6 river kilometers) and from Hawkins Bar to Weitchpec (64.1 river kilometers). The section from Cedar Flat to Hawkins Bar is not surveyed due to safety concerns. The survey did not include any tributaries. During the survey, 3,564 Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), 318 coho salmon (Oncorhnchus kisutch), 32 steelhead (Oncorhynchus mykiss), and 90 brown trout (Salmo trutta) were recovered.

This survey is focused on Chinook carcasses recovered throughout the spawning season included both spring-run (spring) and fall-run (fall) Chinook. Coded wire tag (cwt) recoveries from adipose-fin clipped Chinook indicate spring Chinook carcasses outnumbered fall carcasses until after Julian week 44 (ending November 3, 2008). With this Julian week separation, 993 spring Chinook carcasses were recovered and 2,571 fall Chinook carcasses were recovered. CWT recoveries also allow separation of two year old grilse from adults (greater than two years old), so $78.88 \%$ spring Chinook and $83.56 \%$ of the fall Chinook were adults. The recovery of these adipose-fin clipped Chinook carcasses indicated $10.27 \%$ of the spring and $11.12 \%$ of the fall carcasses observed in the main stem surveys were of hatchery origin. A Petersen mark-recapture model estimates the lowest in-river escapement of 11,002 Chinook salmon (3,065 spring and 7,937 fall). The Schaefer model provides the highest estimate of 13,885 Chinook salmon (3,869 spring and 10,016 fall).

The recovery of hatchery clipped coho salmon and adipose-clipped steelhead carcasses indicated $51.89 \%$ of recovered coho salmon carcasses and $31.25 \%$ steelhead carcasses were of hatchery origin. Adult coho salmon represented 96.45\% of all coho salmon recovered.


## TASK OBJECTIVES

1. To determine the size, sex composition, and hatchery component of Chinook and coho salmon spawning populations in the main stem Trinity River.
2. To determine the incidence of pre-spawning mortality among naturally spawning Chinook and coho salmon in the main stem Trinity River.
3. To determine the temporal and spatial distribution of the naturally spawning populations of Chinook and coho salmon within the main stem Trinity River.
4. To estimate in-river escapement of spring and fall utilizing mark-recapture and multiple estimators.

## INTRODUCTION

The California Department of Fish \& Game's (CDFG) Trinity River Project (TRP) in cooperation with the Yurok Tribal Fisheries Program (YTFP), Hoopa Valley Tribal Fisheries (HVTF) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USWFS) conducted a carcass and redd survey in the main stem 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 (Reach 1).

Reporting responsibilities for the project were divided into two parts: 1) CDFG was responsible for reporting on the carcass survey portion of the study, and 2) the USFWS for the redd enumeration part of the study. Redd survey information included in this report was summarized by 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.

Results from spawner surveys can be utilized to improve our understanding of the preand post- treatment effectiveness of flow and habitat manipulations being implemented by the TRRP to improve salmon spawning conditions. Pertinent metrics to be analyzed over time include spawner density, spawner distribution, and prespawn mortality rates in the upper main-stem Trinity River. Additionally, estimates produced from the markrecapture carcass survey can be used to compare estimated in-river spawning from year to year.

## METHODS

The study area included the main stem Trinity River from its upstream limit of anadromy at Lewiston Dam downstream to the Cedar Flat Recreational Area and from Hawkins Bar to Weitchpec. The stretch from Cedar Flat to Hawkins Bar is not surveyed due to hazardous conditions. The study area was divided into 14 reaches (Table 1, Figure 1). Reaches were surveyed between September 16, 2008 and December 19, 2008. Two rafting teams consisting of CDFG and YTFP crews attempted to survey reaches 1-5 weekly by starting at reaches one and working downstream through reach five. USFWS and HVTF crews also attempted to survey reaches six and seven weekly, while reaches $8-10$ and 12-14 were surveyed on a bi-weekly basis. However, logistical constraints caused some reaches to be occasionally excluded (Table 2).

Table 1. Main stem Trinity River spawner survey reach descriptions.

| Reach | Start | End |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Lewiston Dam (RKM 180.1) | Old Lewiston Bridge (RKM 176.9) |
| 2 | Old Lewiston Bridge (RKM 176.9) | Bucktail Launch (RKM 169.0) |
| 3 | Bucktail Launch (RKM 169.0) | Steel Bridge (RKM 158.8) |
| 4 | Steel Bridge (RKM 158.8) | Douglas City Campground (RKM 148.4) |
| 5 | Douglas City Campground (RKM 148.4) | Roundhouse Launch (RKM 132.7) |
| 6 | Roundhouse Launch (RKM 132.7) | Junction City Campground (RKM 125.5) |
| 7 | Junction City Campground (RKM 125.5) | North Fork Trinity confluence (RKM 116.7) |
| 8 | North Fork Trinity confluence (RKM 116.7) | Big Flat Launch (RKM 107.7) |
| 9 | Big Flat Launch (RKM 107.7) | Del Loma Access (RKM 92.2) |
| 10 | Del Loma Access (RKM 92.2) | Cedar Flat Recreation Area (RKM 78.5) |
| 11 | Cedar Flat Recreation Area (RKM 78.5) | Hawkins Bar (RKM 64.1) |
| 12 | Hawkins Bar (RKM 64.1) | Camp Kimtu (RKM 41.7) |
| 13 | Camp Kimtu (RKM 41.7) | Rolands Bar (RKM 20.6) |
| 14 | Rolands Bar (RKM 20.6) | Weitchpec (Trinity mouth RKM 0) |

Surveys were conducted using 12-ft NRS ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Otter and 12-ft Maravia ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ inflatable rafts equipped with rowing frames. Each raft was staffed by two crew members, one rowerrecorder and one technician responsible for recovering carcasses and enumerating redds. Each rafting crew covers one side of the river (right bank to middle and left bank to middle) as the crews proceeded down stream. Additionally, all side channels are walked by the crew covering the bank of origin. 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.


Figure 1. Survey reaches for 2008 Trinity River main stem spawner survey. Map courtesy of USFWS.

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 contain coded wire tags (CWTs), which are implanted in their snouts prior to release from Trinity River Hatchery (TRH). CWTs are race and brood year specific and are currently implanted in approximately $25 \%$ of all TRH Chinook as juveniles. Second, a portion of the carcasses recovered have been marked with spaghetti tags at CDFG fish trapping weirs located near the towns of Junction City and Willow Creek. Race was assigned to each spaghetti tagged fish based on the time they were captured and tagged at the weirs. The week separating spring and fall Chinook runs was established when the percentage of fall Chinook recoveries (based on CWT and tags from weir recaptures) 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: 1) condition 1 was a carcass with one clear eye, 2) condition 2 was a carcass with both eyes cloudy, and 3) condition 3 was skeletal remains. All condition 1 Chinook carcasses were marked with week specific jaw tag and returned to moving water. These carcasses were then available for recapture providing the means to estimate an in-river escapement using several mark-recapture estimators. Estimators used to calculate the estimate include a pooled Petersen (Chapman, 1951), a weekly stratified Petersen, the Schaefer (Ricker, 1975) and a modified Schaefer (Law, 1994).

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

Field crews examined all condition-1 and condition-2 female salmon for spawning condition by direct observation of ovaries. Fish were classified as either spawned or unspawned based upon percent egg retention. Females retaining the majority of their eggs were classified as un-spawned; 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 condition 1 Chinook carcasses were marked with a week specific jaw tag and returned to moving water. All condition 2 and 3 Chinook, marked recaptures, coho salmon, steelhead, and brown trout carcasses encountered during the survey were cut in half with a machete to prevent recounting the same fish on later surveys.

To estimate in-river escapement in the main stem Trinity River, two generally accepted mark-recapture models were employed. The simplest of these models used is the Petersen mark-recapture estimator as described by Ricker (1975). The Petersen estimator calculates seasonal escapement by incorporating data from the entirety of the survey period. We also employed a weekly stratified Petersen to further analyze weekly population substructure. The second model used is the Schaefer estimator as described by Schaefer (1951). We also employed a modified Schaefer estimator as described by Law (1994). This model differs from the original Schaefer in that the number of tags applied after the first week is subtracted from the population estimate to account for sampling with replacement. Schaefer's original model was based on sampling without replacement. However, sampling with replacement occurs during the salmon spawning season.

The Petersen model as described by Ricker (1975):

$$
N_{i j}=\left(\left(M_{i}\right)\left(C_{j}\right) / R_{i j}\right)
$$

Where: $\quad \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ij}}=$ population size in tagging period $i$ recovery period $j$, $M_{i}=$ number of carcasses tagged in the $i$ th tagging period, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{j}}=$ number of carcasses recovered in the $j$ th recovery period, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ij}}=$ number of carcasses tagged in the ith spawning period and recaptured in the jth recovery period,

The Schaefer model as described by Schaefer (1951)

$$
N_{\mathrm{ij}}=\sum\left(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ij}}\left(\left(\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{i}} / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{j}} / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)\right)\right)
$$

Where: $\quad \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ij}}=$ population size in tagging period $i$ and recovery period $j$,
$\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ij}}=$ number of carcasses tagged in the ith spawning period and recaptured in the $j$ th recovery period, $M_{i}=$ number of carcasses tagged in the $i t h$ tagging period, $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{j}}=$ number of carcasses recovered in the jth recovery period, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{i}}=$ total recapture of carcasses tagged in the $i$ th tagging period, and $R_{j}=$ total recapture of carcasses tagged in the jth tagging period.

The Schaefer model as modified by Law (1994):

$$
N_{i j}=\sum\left(R_{i j}\left(M_{i} C_{j} / R_{i} R_{\mathrm{j}}\right)-M_{i}\right)
$$

Where: $\quad \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{ij}}=$ population size in tagging period $i$ recovery period $j$, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{ij}}=$ number of carcasses tagged in the ith spawning period and recaptured in the jth recovery period,
$M_{i}=$ number of carcasses tagged in the ith tagging period,
$C_{j}=$ number of carcasses recovered in the jth recovery period, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{i}}=$ total recapture of carcasses tagged in the ith tagging period, and $R_{j}=$ total recapture of carcasses tagged in the jth tagging period.

## RESULTS

## Spring/ Fall Chinook Separation

From CWT extraction of adipose-fin clipped carcasses, the only overlap of spring and fall Chinook runs occurred during Julian week 45. Spring Chinook carcasses were predominant through Julian week 43 (October 21, 2008 to October 27, 2008), after which, fall Chinook recoveries were most numerous. For the purpose of analysis, all Chinook recoveries prior to and during Julian week 43 are classified as spring Chinook and all subsequent carcass recoveries are classified as fall Chinook (Figure 2).


Figure 2. Weekly recoveries of coded-wire tagged spring and fall Chinook recovered in 2008 Trinity River spawner survey.

## Temporal Carcass Distribution

A total of 3,564 Chinook carcasses were encountered during the survey. Recovery of Chinook carcasses peaked during Julian week 46 (November 11, 2008 to November 17,2008 ) where 511 carcasses were counted. The first coho salmon carcass was recovered during Julian week 39 (September 23, 2008 to September 29, 2008). A total of 318 coho salmon carcasses were recovered during the survey with peak recovery number of 97 during Julian week 49 (December 2, 2008 to December 8, 2008) (Figure 3). It should be noted that temporal coverage of the coho run was incomplete because the survey efforts ended prior to the end of spawning activity. To fully enumerate coho salmon spawning activity in the main stem, survey efforts would need to continue at least through January.


Figure 3. Chinook and coho salmon carcasses collected by Julian week during the 2008 Trinity River main stem spawner survey.

## Carcass Distribution

A total of 3,564 Chinook carcasses were recovered during Julian weeks 38 to 51 (September 16, 2008 to December 19, 2008) in the 14 survey sections (Table 2). Of the 3,564 Chinook carcasses encountered, 1,775 (49.80\%) were recovered in sections 1 and $2,30.58 \%$ of the carcasses were recovered in reach 1 alone. Reach 8 had the fewest carcasses (17) and $25.11 \%$ of encountered carcasses were downstream of reach 5 (Table 2).

Table 2. Recovery of all Chinook salmon by Julian week and section during 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey.

| Section | Number of surveys | Julian week of Chinook recovery |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Section Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 |  |
| 1 | 14 | 5 | 11 | 26 | 82 | 50 | 53 | 51 | 78 | 224 | 180 | 136 | 120 | 53 | 21 | 1090 |
| 2 | 13 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 51 | 59 | 44 | 72 | 76 | 138 | 101 | 60 | 47 | ns | 10 | 685 |
| 3 | 13 | 3 | 7 | 14 | 38 | 25 | 45 | 48 | 35 | ns | 31 | 16 | 24 | 22 | 7 | 315 |
| 4 | 13 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 25 | 49 | 55 | 64 | 55 | 48 | 14 | 0 | 11 | 14 | 0 | 355 |
| 5 | 11 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 19 | 34 | 41 | 51 | 25 | 20 | 11 | 0 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 224 |
| 6 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 56 | 88 | 24 | 33 | 21 | 23 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 261 |
| 7 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 29 | 25 | 9 | 30 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 132 |
| 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 17 |
| 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 16 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 81 |
| 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 30 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 77 |
| 12 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 47 | 0 | 76 | 18 | 0 | 150 |
| 13 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 28 | 141 |
| 14 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 36 |
| Totals | 135 | 18 | 32 | 76 | 216 | 291 | 360 | 381 | 316 | 511 | 462 | 281 | 396 | 146 | 78 | 3,564 |

## Redd Distribution

Similar to carcass recovery, Chinook redds were encountered most frequently in section 1 with a total of 4,116 redds enumerated during the 2008 survey (Table 3 ). A total of 1,412 redds were numerated in section 1, approximately half (34.31\%) of the total $(1,412 / 4,116)$ for all sections combined. The fewest redds (19) were observed in section 8 . Peak redd enumeration occurred during Julian week 47 when 504 redds were counted.

Table 3. Summary of weekly redd enumeration from main stem Trinity River 2008 survey. a/

| Julian Week |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Reach | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | Grand Total |
| 01 | 20 | 58 | 118 | 143 | 75 | 50 | 85 | 111 | 178 | 167 | 160 | 149 | 53 | 28 | 17 | 1,412 |
| 02 |  |  | 14 | 21 | 12 | 70 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 52 | 53 | 39 | 49 |  | 15 | 399 |
| 03 |  | 2 | 10 | 21 | 64 | 38 | 30 | 45 | 20 |  | 37 | 54 | 43 | 30 |  | 394 |
| 04 |  | 3 | 15 | 4 | 82 | 37 | 45 | 41 | 29 | 33 | 7 |  | 22 | 37 |  | 355 |
| 05 |  |  | 3 | 27 | 56 | 42 | 42 | 56 | 10 | 18 | 6 |  | 24 |  |  | 284 |
| 06 |  |  | 2 | 27 |  | 67 | 26 | 4 | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 145 |
| 07 |  |  |  | 14 |  | 32 | 36 | 22 | 2 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 111 |
| 08 |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |  | 15 |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 29 |
| 09 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 59 |  | 56 |  | 14 | 5 |  |  | 7 |  | 142 |
| 10 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 35 |  | 42 |  | 10 |  | 10 |  | 2 |  | 100 |
| 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 | 5 | 14 | 41 | 125 |  | 65 | 42 |  | 304 |
| 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | 6 |  | 59 | 77 | 50 | 53 | 27 | 62 | 337 |
| 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 4 |  |  | 34 | 15 | 31 | 10 | 8 | 104 |
| Grand Total | 20 | 63 | 162 | 259 | 289 | 442 | 306 | 432 | 296 | 401 | 504 | 317 | 340 | 183 | 102 | 4,116 |

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

## Spring Chinook

A total of 993 Chinook carcasses were classified as spring-run during the survey, of which 403 were classified as condition-one (Table 4). Spring Chinook carcass recovery by reach ranged from 227 in reach 1 to zero in reach 12. Spring Chinook carcass density was greatest in reach 1 at 68.79 fish/km and dropped considerably to 25.49 fish/km in reach 2.

Table 4. Number, density, incidence of ad-clips, project tags, and condition of spring Chinook recovered during the 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey. 1/

| Reach | Length <br> (km) | Number observed | Density (fish/km) | $\mathrm{C}-12$ | $\mathrm{C}-2_{3}$ | Adipose Clips |  | Project tags |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total ${ }_{5}$ | $\mathrm{C}-12$ | $\mathrm{Total}_{4}$ | C1 |
| 1 | 3.3 | 227 | 68.79 | 80 | 140 | 19 | 12 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 | 7.1 | 181 | 25.49 | 58 | 117 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| 3 | 10.9 | 132 | 12.11 | 50 | 69 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| 4 | 10.8 | 149 | 13.80 | 56 | 87 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 5 | 14.7 | 99 | 6.73 | 44 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| 6 | 8.6 | 149 | 17.33 | 76 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 7 | 8.9 | 42 | 4.72 | 28 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 10.8 | 2 | 0.19 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 13.8 | 3 | 0.22 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 14.7 | 2 | 0.14 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 22.4 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 21.1 | 5 | 0.24 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 14 | 21.3 | 2 | 0.09 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 103.6 | 993 | 9.58 | 403 | 556 | 26 | 17 | 15 | 8 |

1/All Chinook recovered prior to Julian week 44 (Oct. 28 - Nov.3) were considered spring Chinook.
2/Condition-1 fish are those with at least one clear eye and considered to have died within one week.
3/Condition-2 fish are those with both eyes cloudy and considered to have died more than one week prior to recovery.
4/Adipose clipped Chinook salmon presumed to contain CWT.
5/Spaghetti tags applied at Willow Creek and Juntion City weirs.

## Fall Chinook

A total of 2,571 Chinook carcasses were classified as fall-run during the survey, of which 558 were classified as condition-one (Table 5). Fall Chinook carcass recovery by reach ranged from 863 in reach 1 to 15 in reach 8 . Fall Chinook carcass density was greatest in reach 1 at 261.52 fish/km and dropped considerably to 70.99 fish/km in reach 2 . Below reaches 1 and 2 carcass density was considerably less.

Table 5. Number, density, incidence of ad-clips, project tags, and condition of fall Chinook recovered during the 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey. 1/

| Reach | Length (km) | Number observed | Density (fish/km) | $\mathrm{C}-1{ }_{2}$ | Adipose Clips Project tags |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{C}-2_{3}$ | Total $_{4}$ | $\mathrm{C1}_{2}$ | Total ${ }_{5}$ | $\mathrm{C1}_{2}$ |
| 1 | 3.3 | 863 | 261.52 | 188 | 597 | 71 | 29 | 38 | 13 |
| 2 | 7.1 | 504 | 70.99 | 66 | 374 | 14 | 4 | 16 | 0 |
| 3 | 10.9 | 183 | 16.79 | 34 | 117 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 4 | 10.8 | 206 | 19.07 | 41 | 136 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 |
| 5 | 14.7 | 125 | 8.50 | 32 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 3 |
| 6 | 8.6 | 112 | 13.02 | 36 | 53 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| 7 | 8.9 | 90 | 10.11 | 36 | 46 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 |
| 8 | 10.8 | 15 | 1.39 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| 9 | 13.8 | 78 | 5.65 | 20 | 34 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| 10 | 14.7 | 75 | 5.10 | 26 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| 12 | 22.4 | 150 | 6.70 | 36 | 111 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 13 | 21.1 | 136 | 6.45 | 22 | 112 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 21.3 | 34 | 1.60 | 16 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 168.4 | 2,571 | 15.27 | 558 | 1,728 | 89 | 36 | 93 | 26 |

1/All Chinook recovered after to Julian week 45 (Nov. 4 - Nov.10) were considered fall Chinook.
2/Condition-1 fish are those with at least one clear eye and considered to have died within one week.
3/Condition-2 fish are those with both eyes cloudy and considered to have died more than one week prior to recovery.
4/Adipose clipped Chinook salmon presumed to contain CWT.
5/Spaghetti tags applied at Willow Creek and Juntion City weirs.

## Coho salmon

A total of 318 coho salmon carcasses were recovered during the survey, of which 94 were classified as condition-one (Table 6). The first coho was recovered during Julian week 39 with peak recovery during Julian week 49 (December 2,2008 to December 8, 2008). Coho carcass recovery by reach ranged from 154 (48.43\%) in reach 1 to zero in reaches 10 and 14. Coho salmon carcass density was greatest in reach 1 (46.67 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ ) and dropped considerably to 14.51 fish $/ \mathrm{km}$ in reach 2 . Coho salmon carcass density downstream from reach 3 was less than 3 fish per kilometer.

Table 6. Number, density, incidence of right maxillary (RM) clips, project tags, and condition of coho salmon recovered during the 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey.

| Reach | Length (km) | Number observed | Density (fish/km) | $\mathrm{C}-1_{1}$ | C-2 | Right Max Clip |  | Project tags |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total 3 | C 11 | Total 4 | C1 ${ }_{1}$ |
| 1 | 3.3 | 154 | 46.67 | 44 | 109 | 97 | 19 | 4 | 3 |
| 2 | 7.1 | 103 | 14.51 | 21 | 76 | 48 | 8 | 3 | 1 |
| 3 | 10.9 | 27 | 2.48 | 10 | 14 | 16 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 4 | 10.8 | 8 | 0.74 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 14.7 | 4 | 0.27 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 8.6 | 8 | 0.93 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 8.9 | 4 | 0.45 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 8 | 10.8 | 1 | 0.09 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 13.8 | 5 | 0.36 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 14.7 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 22.4 | 1 | 0.04 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 21.1 | 3 | 0.14 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 14 | 21.3 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 168.4 | 318 | 66.69 | 94 | 214 | 165 | 33 | 9 | 5 |

1/Condition-1 fish are those with at least one clear eye and considered to have died within one week.
2/Condition-2 fish are those with both eyes cloudy and considered to have died more than one week prior to recovery.
3/ Right maxillary (RM) clipped coho salmon
4/Spaghetti tags applied at Willow Creek and Junction City weirs.

## Steelhead and Brown Trout

A total of 32 steelhead carcasses and 90 brown trout carcasses were recovered during the survey (Table 7). Steelhead density with and without the adipose fin clip was highest in reach 1, which is closest to the hatchery. Brown trout density was highest in reaches 2,3 and 4 , and project tags only turned up in reaches 5 and 6 . For the first time a brown trout was observed in reach 1.

Table 7. Number, density, incidence of adipose clips, and project tags recovered during the 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey.

| Reach | Length <br> (km) | Steelhead |  |  |  | Brown Trout |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number Observed | Density (fish/km) | Adipose Clip $_{1}$ | Project <br> Tags 2 | Number Observed | Density (fish/km) | Project <br> Tags 2 |
| 1 | 3.3 | 11 | 3.33 | 7 | 0 | , | 0.3 | 0 |
| 2 | 7.1 | 1 | 0.14 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 2.39 | 0 |
| 3 | 10.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 2.66 | 0 |
| 4 | 10.8 | 1 | 0.09 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 1.02 | 0 |
| 5 | 14.7 | 3 | 0.2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 0.95 | 1 |
| 6 | 8.6 | 8 | 0.93 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0.35 | 1 |
| 7 | 8.9 | 3 | 0.34 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0.9 | 0 |
| 8 | 10.8 | 2 | 0.19 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0.28 | 0 |
| 9 | 13.8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0.14 | 0 |
| 10 | 14.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.07 | 0 |
| 12 | 22.4 | 2 | 0.09 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13 | 21.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.05 | 0 |
| 14 | 21.3 | 1 | 0.05 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 168.4 | 32 | 0.19 | 10 | 0 | 90 | 0.53 | 2 |

1/Adipose clipped steelhead presumably from Trinity River Hatchery with 100\% hatchery clip rate. 2/Spaghetti tags applied at Willow Creek and Junction City weirs.

## Size Composition

Only condition-1 and condition-2 fish that were measured are included in the size composition analysis. Condition-3 fish were assumed to have decomposed to a point where length measurements were no longer accurate. The size separating grilse and adults for spring and fall Chinook and coho salmon 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 spring Chinook ( $\mathrm{n}=961$ averaged 74.7 cm . and ranged between 34-120 cm (Figure 4). Grilse ( $\mathrm{FL}<55 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) accounted for $12.12 \%$ (203/961) of the measured spring Chinook.


Figure 4. Length frequency histogram for all condition 1 and 2 spring Chinook measured during the 2008 main stem Trinity spawner survey.

## Fall Chinook

Fork lengths obtained from fall Chinook ( $\mathrm{n}=2,323$ ) averaged 74.5 cm and ranged between 33-113 cm (Figure 5). Grilse ( $\mathrm{FL}<58 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) accounted for $16.44 \%(382 / 2,323)$ of measured fall Chinook.


Figure 5. Length frequency histogram for all condition 1 and 2 fall Chinook measured during the 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey.

## Coho salmon

Fork lengths of coho salmon ( $\mathrm{n}=310$ ) averaged 67.7 cm and ranged from 33-92 cm. (Figure 6). Grilse (FL < 52 cm ) accounted for $3.55 \%$ (11/318) of measured coho salmon.


Figure 6. Length frequency histogram for all condition 1 and 2 coho salmon measured during the 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey.

## Adult Sex Composition and Female Pre-Spawn Mortality

## Spring Chinook

Of the spring Chinook recovered that were sexed 510 were sexed as males and 464 as females, a male to female ratio of 1.10:1 (Table 8). Gender was indiscernible on 40 fish due to advanced decomposition. Forty (8.62\%) of the 464 female spring Chinook carcasses evaluated were determined to be pre-spawn mortalities. Grilse were included from these totals.

Table 8. Male to Female Ratio and Prespawn Mortality of spring Chinook during 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey by reach.

| Reach | Total Chinook | Males | Females | Unspawned <br> Females | Unknown <br> Gender | Males per <br> Female | Prespawn Mortality <br> (Females) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 227 | 84 | 139 | 17 | 4 | 0.60 | $12.23 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 181 | 92 | 86 | 13 | 3 | 1.07 | $15.12 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 132 | 74 | 57 | 2 | 1 | 1.30 | $3.51 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 149 | 84 | 63 | 3 | 2 | 1.33 | $4.76 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 99 | 56 | 43 | 2 | 0 | 1.30 | $4.65 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 149 | 84 | 57 | 0 | 8 | 1.47 | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 42 | 32 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 3.20 | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | $0.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0.33 | $66.67 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | $50.00 \%$ |
| Total | 993 | 510 | 464 | 40 | 19 | 1.10 | $8.62 \%$ |

## Fall Chinook

Of the 2,571 Chinook that were sexed; 1,141 were sexed as males and 1,256 were sexed as females, for a male: female ratio of 0.91:1 (Table 9). Gender was indiscernible on 174 fish due to advanced decomposition. Seventy ( $5.57 \%$ ) of the 1,256 adult female fall Chinook carcasses examined were determined to be pre-spawn mortalities.

Table 9. Male to Female Ratio and Prespawn Mortality of fall Chinook during 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey by reach.

| Reach | Total Chinook | Males | Females | Unspawned <br> Females | Unknown <br> Gender | Males per <br> Female | Prespawn Mortality <br> (Females) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{1}$ | 863 | 298 | 535 | 16 | 30 | 0.56 | $2.99 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2}$ | 504 | 278 | 195 | 10 | 31 | 1.43 | $5.13 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{3}$ | 183 | 99 | 67 | 4 | 17 | 1.48 | $5.97 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 206 | 103 | 92 | 4 | 11 | 1.12 | $4.35 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{5}$ | 125 | 66 | 55 | 2 | 4 | 1.20 | $3.64 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{6}$ | 112 | 37 | 43 | 5 | 32 | 0.86 | $11.63 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{7}$ | 90 | 35 | 42 | 2 | 13 | 0.83 | $4.76 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{8}$ | 15 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 1.00 | $40.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | 78 | 28 | 30 | 9 | 20 | 0.93 | $30.00 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | 75 | 36 | 33 | 10 | 6 | 1.09 | $30.30 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 2}$ | 150 | 71 | 77 | 4 | 2 | 0.92 | $5.19 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 3}$ | 136 | 64 | 69 | 1 | 3 | 0.93 | $1.45 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 4}$ | 34 | 21 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 1.62 | $7.69 \%$ |
| Total | 2,571 | 1,141 | 1,256 | 70 | 174 | 0.91 | $5.57 \%$ |

## Coho salmon

Of the 318 coho salmon that were sexed; 126 were sexed as males and 176 were sexed as females, for a male: female ratio of 0.72: 1 (Table 10). Gender was indiscernible on 16 fish due to advanced decomposition. Twenty two (12.50\%) of 176 female coho salmon carcasses examined were determined to be pre-spawn mortalities.

Table 10. Male to female ratio and prespawn mortality of coho salmon during 2008 main stem Trinity River spawner survey by reach.
$\left.\begin{array}{|cccccccc|}\hline & & & & & \begin{array}{c}\text { Unspawned }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Unknown } \\ \text { Gender }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Males per } \\ \text { Female }\end{array} \\ \text { Reach } & \text { Total Coho } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Males }\end{array} & \text { Females } & \text { Females } \\ \text { (Females) }\end{array}\right]$

## Incidence of Hatchery Produced Chinook and Coho Salmon

## Spring Chinook

During the spring-run period, $4.22 \%$ (17/403) of condition-one and 2.62\% (26/993) of all spring Chinook bore ad-clips. Observed ad-clip rates in reaches 1 and 2 for spring Chinook were $3.72 \%$ ( $15 / 405$; condition 1) and $2.32 \%$ (23/993; all carcasses).
Downstream of reach 2 ad-clip rates were $0.74 \%$ (3/403; condition 1) and 0.20\% (2/993; all carcasses) (Table 4). Coded wire tags were recovered from 24 of the 26 ad-clipped Chinook encountered during the spring Chinook recovery period, of which all but one were actually spring-run fish. During the period associated with the spring-run, 2 adclipped Chinook were recovered in which no CWTs were found. The majority of CWTs were represented by the 2004 spring-run fingerling release group ( $n=11,47.83 \%$ ). All other CWTs were represented by 2004 brood year spring-run yearling ( $n=7,30.43 \%$ ) 2005 brood year spring-run fingerling ( $n=4,17.39 \%$ ), and 2003 brood year yearling release groups ( $n=1,4.35 \%$ ).

Based on expansion of all CWT codes recovered during the spring period, an estimated 102 (10.27\%) of the total 993 fish recovered were of TRH origin (Table 4). Based on expansions of all spring-run CWT groups, an estimated age structure of TRH spring Chinook recovered in the main stem Trinity River spawner survey was $79.4 \%$ age 4, $16.5 \%$ age 3 , and $4.1 \%$ age 5 (Table 11).

## Fall Chinook

During the fall-run period, $6.45 \%(36 / 558)$ of the condition one and $3.46 \%(89 / 2,571)$ of all fall Chinook bore ad-clips (Table 5). Observed ad-clip rates in reach 1 and 2 for fall Chinook were $12.99 \%$ (33/558; condition 1) and $6.22 \%$ ( $85 / 2,571$; all carcasses).
CWT's were observed in only two other reaches, reaches three and four where ad-clip rates of $0.54 \%$ ( $3 / 558$; condition 1 ) and $0.29 \%$ (4/993; all carcasses) were observed. No CWT's were observed in reaches 5 through 14. Coded wire tags were recovered from 89 of the total Chinook encountered during the fall Chinook recovery period; all of which were fall Chinook. During the period associated with the fall-run, 20 ad-clipped Chinook were recovered in which no CWTs were found. The majority of CWTs during the fall-run recovery period were represented by age four, 2004 brood year fingerling releases ( $\mathrm{n}=50 ; 72.46 \%$ ). All other CWTs were represented by the following brood year groups; 2005 brood year yearlings ( $n=7,10.15 \%$ ), 2005 brood year fingerlings ( $n=6$, $8.70 \%$ ), 2006 brood year fingerling ( $n=3,4.35 \%$ ), and 2003 brood year fingerlings ( $n=1$, 1.44\%).

Based on expansion of all CWT codes recovered during the fall-run period, an estimated 286 (11.12\%) of the total 2,571 fish recovered were of TRH origin (Table 5). Based on expansions of all fall CWT groups, the estimated age structure of TRH fall Chinook recovered in the main stem Trinity River spawner survey was $5.7 \%$ age 2 , $20.4 \%$ age $3,72.5 \%$ age 4 , and $1.4 \%$ age 5 (Table 11).

## Coho salmon

During the course of the survey, $35.11 \%(n=33)$ of condition-1 and $51.89 \%(n=165)$ of all coho salmon recovered bore right maxillary (RM) clips (Table 6). Coho RM clip rates for condition-1 carcasses were highest in reach one. Based on a 100\% clip rate of Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) produced juvenile coho salmon, an estimated 51.890\% of adult coho salmon recovered during the survey were of TRH origin.

Table 11. Release and recovery data for coded-were tagged, Trinity River Hatchery produced Chinook salmon, recovered during 2008 Trinity River spawner survey.

| Release data |  |  |  |  | Recovery data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Release | Production | ecovery | perio |  |  | Expanded |
| CWT Code | Brood year | Age | type $_{1}$ | multiplier $_{2}$ | Spring | Fall | Total | \% of subtotal | total |
| Spring Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65317 | 2003 | 5 | Sy | 4.1616 | 1 |  | 1 | 3.85 | 4.162 |
| 65319 | 2004 | 4 | Sf | 4.20282 | 2 |  | 2 | 7.69 | 8.406 |
| 65320 | 2004 | 4 | Sf | 4.2008 | 2 |  | 2 | 7.69 | 8.402 |
| 65321 | 2004 | 4 | Sf | 4.48686 | 7 |  | 7 | 26.92 | 31.408 |
| 65326 | 2004 | 4 | Sy | 4.14173 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 30.77 | 33.134 |
| 65333 | 2005 | 3 | Sf | 4.04924 | 1 |  | 1 | 3.85 | 4.049 |
| 65334 | 2005 | 3 | Sf | 4.07323 | 1 |  | 1 | 3.85 | 4.073 |
| 65335 | 2005 | 3 | Sf | 4.38751 | 2 |  | 2 | 7.69 | 8.775 |
| No CWT recovered $_{4}$ |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 2 | 7.69 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal: | 25 | 1 | 26 |  | 102.408 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65315 | 2003 | 5 | Ff | 4.00115 |  | 1 | 1 | 1.12 | 4.001 |
| 65322 | 2004 | 4 | Ff | 4.10472 |  | 11 | 11 | 12.36 | 45.152 |
| 65323 | 2004 | 4 | Ff | 4.05842 |  | 6 | 6 | 6.74 | 24.351 |
| 65324 | 2004 | 4 | Ff | 4.05173 |  | 5 | 5 | 5.62 | 20.259 |
| 65325 | 2004 | 4 | Ff | 4.13755 |  | 7 | 7 | 7.87 | 28.963 |
| 65327 | 2004 | 4 | Ff | 4.20284 |  | 21 | 21 | 23.60 | 88.260 |
| 65336 | 2005 | 3 | Ff | 4.70810 |  | 1 | 1 | 1.12 | 4.708 |
| 65337 | 2005 | 3 | Ff | 4.03683 |  | 4 | 4 | 4.49 | 16.147 |
| 65338 | 2005 | 3 | Ff | 4.25156 |  | 1 | 1 | 1.12 | 4.252 |
| 65339 | 2005 | 3 | Ff | 4.02679 |  | 1 | 1 | 1.12 | 4.027 |
| 65341 | 2005 | 3 | Fy | 4.17253 |  | 7 | 7 | 7.87 | 29.208 |
| 65351 | 2006 | 2 | Ff | 4.20807 |  | 1 | 1 | 1.12 | 4.208 |
| 65353 | 2006 | 2 | Ff | 3.98763 |  | 3 | 3 | 3.37 | 11.963 |
| $\mathrm{No} \mathrm{CWT} \mathrm{recovered}_{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  | 20 | 20 | 22.47 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal: | 0 | 89 | 89 |  | 285.497 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Grand Totals: | 25 | 90 | 115 |  | 387.905 |

1/ Release types: Sf-Spring Chinook fingerling, Sy-Spring Chinook yearling; Ff-Fall Chinook fingerling, FyFall Chinook yearling.
2/ Hatchery production multiplier used to account for untagged releases of the same brood year, race and release type.
3/ Spring Chinook recovery period was September 16, 2008 to October 27, 2008. Later recoveries were all considered Fall Chinook.
4/ CWT was not present or was lost during recovery.

## Incidence of Program Marked Salmon

## Spring Chinook

A total of 15 project tags applied at the Junction City and Willow Creek weirs were recovered in survey reaches 1 through 14 (Table 4). This indicates that project tags were recovered on $1.51 \%$ (15/993) of all spring Chinook carcasses. No spring Chinook project tags were found on carcasses in reaches 4,8 through 12, and reach 14. During the course of the survey, seven tags from the Junction City Weir and eight tags from the Willow Creek Weir were recovered prior to Julian week 44. All spaghetti tags were found above reach 5 (Table 4).

## Fall Chinook

A total of 93 project tags applied at Junction City and Willow Creek weirs were recovered during the survey (Table 5). This indicates that project tags were recovered on $3.62 \%$ ( $93 / 2571$ ) of all fall Chinook carcasses. During the course of the survey, 89 tags from the Willow Creek Weir and 4 tags from the Junction City Weir were recovered after Julian week 43. Spaghetti tags were found in all reaches except 13 and 14, and $58 \%$ were found in reaches 1 and 2 (Table 5).

## Coho Salmon

A total of nine project tags applied at the Willow Creek weir were recovered during the survey (Table 6). This indicates that project tags were recovered on $2.83 \%$ of all coho salmon observed. All of these were recovered above reach 4 during Julian weeks 47 through 51 with none found during Julian week 50.

## Steelhead/Rainbow Trout

No project tags were found on steelhead carcasses during this survey.

## Brown Trout

Two project tags were found on brown trout carcasses during this survey, one found in reach 5 during Julian week 41, and one found in reach 6 during Julian week 48.

## In-River Escapement Estimates

This season, a mark-recapture methodology was employed on the upper Trinity River to estimate in-river escapement of Chinook (Tables 12, 13, \&14). Mark-recapture techniques were historically used on the Trinity, and were recently reintroduced during the carcass survey in 2005. During the 2008 survey, crews marked all condition-1 Chinook with week specific jaw tags. Fish are subsequently recaptured to produce
weekly estimates. During the course of the survey, $25.0 \%$ of Chinook were marked, and $32.3 \%$ of those fish were subsequently recaptured (Appendix 5). The upper section (reaches 1-5) had a slightly higher recapture rate ( $39.2 \%$ ) than the survey as a whole (32.3\%) (Appendices $5 \& 6$ ). The lower section (reaches 6-10) had a recapture rate of $18.7 \%$ that included 56 recovered carcasses (Appendix 6). Estimates could not be made for spring-run in the lower reaches due to low numbers of recaptures (nine recaptures). All estimators used in this report require at least 25 recaptures to produce reliable results.

Table 12. In-River escapement estimates for Chinook collected during 2008
Trinity River spawner survey.

| Estimator | Reaches <br> $1-5$ | Reaches <br> $1-14$ | Reaches 1-5 <br> $(95 \% \mathrm{CI})$ | Reaches 1-14 <br> $(95 \% \mathrm{CI})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Peterson | 6,794 | 11,002 | 650 | 1,001 |
| Weekly Stratified Peterson | 7,105 | 11,167 | 601 | 1,038 |
| Schaefer | 9,701 | 13,885 | 710 | 1,383 |
| Schaefer with Law's adjustment | 9,112 | 12,997 | 710 | 1,383 |

The different estimators produced estimates which range from 11,002 to 13,885 Chinook for the entire survey, and from 6,794 to 9,701 for the upper reaches 1-5 (Tables 12\&13). Adding in the 95\% confidence interval, the estimates ranged from 10,001 to 15,268 for the entire survey, and from 6,144 to 10,411 for the upper reaches. These results indicate there is a $5 \%$ chance that the true estimate falls outside of the confidence intervals.

Table 13. In-river escapement estimates for spring and fall Chinook collected during 2008 Trinity River spawner survey above Junction City.

| Above J.C. (reach 1-5) | Spring | Fall | Ratio of Spring to Fall Chinook |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Petersen | 2,006 | 4,788 | $0.419: 1$ |
| Weekly stratified Petersen | 2,098 | 5,007 |  |
| Schaefer | 2,864 | 6,837 |  |
| Schaefer w/ Law's adjustment | 2,690 | 6,421 |  |

Estimates for the different runs in the entire survey ranged from 3,065 to 3,869 for spring Chinook and 7,937 to 10,016 for fall Chinook (Table 14). The estimates for the upper reaches ranged from 2,006 to 2,864 for spring Chinook and 4,288 to 6,837 for fall Chinook (Table 13). The results of the carcass survey indicate spring to fall Chinook ratios of $0.39: 1$ for the entire survey and $0.42: 1$ for the upper reaches (Tables $13 \& 14$ ).

Table 14. In-river escapement estimates for spring and fall Chinook collected during the entire 2008 Trinity River spawner survey.

| Entire survey (reach 1-10) | Spring | Fall | Ratio of Spring to Fall Chinook |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Petersen | 3,065 | 7,937 | $0.386: 1$ |
| Weekly stratified Petersen | 3,111 | 8,056 |  |
| Schaefer | 3,869 | 10,016 |  |
| Schaefer w/ Law's adjustment | 3,621 | 9,375 |  |

## DISCUSSION

When looking at the spring and fall runs as a whole, year to year variation in numbers of salmon carcasses recovered on the upper Trinity River is fairly minimal when examined as an order of magnitude (with the exception of the 2003 Chinook season) and normally tracks well with the number of fish recovered at Trinity River Hatchery (see Task 1). During the 2008 season, crews recovered approximately the same number of total Chinook as fall Chinook alone during the 2007 season (Appendix 1). Coho salmon carcass numbers were also slightly lower than the 2005 season. When comparing yearly data, it is important to acknowledge differences in survey timing and periodicity, as well as climatic events and budgetary constraints that inhibit survey timing and periodicity. In some years, surveys ran into January, therefore covering a greater proportion of the coho salmon run. Additionally, in some years weekly survey periodicity was far from perfect due to extreme weather and high flows.

Prior to 1996, CDFG conducted mark recapture carcass recovery surveys which allowed for estimation of the total numbers of spawners in each survey reach. Due to inclusion of redd data collection and other crew constraints during the 1996-2004 seasons, carcass totals were then solely based on total numbers of carcasses recovered. With the reintroduction of a mark recapture methodology in 2005, we will continue to display the number of carcasses observed per reach, independent of mark recapture, for comparison with past years. Current mark recapture efforts do not produce reach escapement estimates, as weekly efficiencies by reach are sporadic and highly variable.

## Carcass Distribution

As in past years, Chinook and coho salmon carcass densities were highest in the uppermost reaches and declined downstream (Appendices 1, 2, \& 3). Salmon imprint upon the waters in which they rear, and subsequently home on those waters when returning to spawn. If more spawners utilize upper reaches and their progeny rear in those reaches, then it is logical to speculate that the majority of returning salmon would then subsequently spawn in those same upper reaches. Other potential factors
contributing to the observed high densities in the upper reaches include hatchery fish spawning in-river instead of returning to the hatchery, blockage of further upstream migration by Lewiston Dam, and availability of suitable spawning habitat.

## Adult Sex Composition and Female Pre-Spawn Mortality

For all races and species of salmon carcasses recovered on the upper Trinity, female adults out numbered male adults when number of grilse is subtracted from the total number of males recovered. 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 (two year olds), then adult females would then make up a higher percentage of adults. Another factor that could possibly skew male to female ratios is unequal capture probability by sex. Zhou (2002) modeled and analyzed 12 years of Salmon River, Oregon fall Chinook carcass data and found that male Chinook were underestimated by $8 \%$, while female Chinook were overestimated by $12 \%$. Assuming similar bias in Trinity River carcass composition results, male to female ratios are as follows: 1.10:1 for spring Chinook and 0.91:1 for fall Chinook.

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 8.62 \% for spring Chinook and 5.57 \% for fall Chinook. For years in which more than 100 female coho salmon were examined, pre-spawn mortality rates have ranged from 8.5 to $15.9 \%$. The coho salmon pre-spawn mortality rate observed this season was $12.50 \%$. It is unclear how this rate is influenced by a truncated survey season, although if pre-spawn mortalities die sooner than successful spawners, this rate would most likely be overestimated. It has also been noted, most recently by Zuspan (1998), that prespawn mortality may be density dependent and is positively related to run-size in the Trinity River. As in the past, pre-spawn mortality numbers fluctuate similarly to fluctuating escapement numbers.

## Mark Recapture Estimators

Carcass mark recapture or capture recapture estimators are commonly used by the Department to estimate in-river escapement of salmon; these estimators have been used in Central Valley tributaries including the American and Sacramento since the early 1970's (Snider, Reavis and Hill, 1999). In the Klamath basin, the Department currently utilizes both the Petersen and Schaefer estimators to produce in-river escapements from carcass survey data (S. Borok, pers comm, 2005). It is important to acknowledge the limitations and potential biases associated with these estimators. If basic assumptions are violated, or bias is excessively high, options should be pursued to refine these estimators or another estimator should be selected.

The Petersen estimator is the most popularly used mark recapture model in fisheries management. However, it is often portrayed as a crude application because it is a closed population model, and its assumptions concerning zero births or death (immigration and survival) are rarely met. With respect to salmon carcass surveys, the Petersen model has been found to consistently overestimate population estimates, sometimes exceeding $250 \%$ of the true population (Law, 1994). Stratifying Petersen estimates by week can minimize some of the bias created by births and deaths; however, its use in this study showed it to be even more positively biased than the pooled Petersen as seen in tables 12 and 13.

The Schaefer estimator is commonly used as an alternative to the simple pooled Petersen when the assumptions of equal mixing, homogenous capture, or homogenous recapture probabilities will not hold (Schwarz et al, 2002). When these assumptions are violated, stratifying capture and recaptures by time or location and using either a stratified Petersen or Schaefer estimator may be appropriate. Law (1994) found the Schaefer estimator to be less positively biased than the Petersen estimator, but cautioned that it also overestimates populations, especially at low survival and low catch rates. Law (1994) suggests the use of the Jolly-Seber open population mark recapture model for use in salmon carcass population estimates, but recognized that on larger rivers, the Jolly-Seber may produce estimates that are consistently low. It is also possible that the basic assumption of equal mixing of tagged carcasses with all carcasses may be violated, in which case, recaptured carcasses may constitute a different sub-population.

## Other Possible Sources of Bias

Problems or biases associated with salmon carcass surveys should be identified and subsequently minimized in order to produce more accurate and precise estimates. Some problems are inherent to survey design or human nature, while others are specific to situations or crews working on the Trinity River.

Inter-observer variation is a source of bias affecting all types of fish surveying methods. During this survey, we attempted to minimize this variation by maintaining the same rower/observer teams and rotating sides of the river by week. By rotating banks weekly, bias concerning memory of where marked carcasses were released was minimized. Maintaining the same crew throughout the season is also important to minimize variation in data collection methods and ensure data consistency between weeks and sections.

Carcass condition is a potential source of bias in the mark-recapture estimators due to the fact that fall Chinook carcass eyes appear to rot more quickly than spring Chinook carcasses. The decrease in marking rates is apparent as the season progresses. Only condition one carcasses are marked, and that criterion is met when at least one of the carcass eyes is clear. Since fall Chinook carcasses rot quicker and both eyes are often cloudy even at the time of spawning, a lower percentage of fall Chinook carcasses
(21.70\%) were classified as condition one than spring Chinook carcasses (40.58\%) (Tables 4 \& 5). This accounts for the different marking rates between spring and fall Chinook. Therefore, due to the higher marking rates for spring Chinook, the estimates may be more efficient for spring Chinook than fall Chinook due to the higher marking rate.

Weather is an uncontrollable factor, which most likely has a great affect on consistency of survey methods. High flow events reduce carcass capture efficiency due to higher instream velocities and increased turbidity. Extreme high flow events may also cause exclusion of weekly surveying efforts on dropped reaches. Capture efficiency can also possibly be reduced by excessive cloud cover or glare associated with the azimuth of the sun.

Sufficient survey periodicity is necessary to ensure proper temporal coverage in recovery of salmon carcasses. Weekly survey periodicity is most convenient when surveying long sections, necessitating the use of four crews. In reaches 8 to 10 and 12 to 14 , bi-weekly surveys were conducted due to logistical constraints. Fresh carcasses were available for recapture for four to five weeks following initial capture, thus only fresh carcasses were tagged and used to calculate capture efficiency. An additional problem which may necessitate more frequent surveying is predation and removal of carcasses. No direct evidence of carcass removal by predation was observed during the 2008 season, but we assume that predation does exist. High carcass predation rates reduce the efficiency of carcass recovery. If predation rates are found to be inversely proportional to run size (ie predators remove a higher ratio of carcasses when less carcasses exist) then survey periodicity should be increased in lower run-size seasons. Conversely, there could be a density dependent relationship between run-size and attraction of predators, which would also necessitate increased survey periodicity.

Hatchery contribution estimates may be underestimated due to problems associated with identification of hatchery fish. Poor detection of fin clips or errors in recording those fin clips can negatively skew hatchery contribution rates. The right maxillary clip exhibited by TRH released coho salmon is very easy to miss if special attention is not paid to detecting that clip. Advanced decomposition of salmon carcasses may also inhibit the ability to detect hatchery clips. Poor detection or loss of adipose clipped salmon heads or CWT's extracted from those heads also could negatively skew hatchery contribution rates.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1.) Annual spawner surveys incorporating a mark-recapture methodology should be continued for future seasons, facilitating future comparisons of mark recapture escapement estimates.
2.) Mark recapture estimators should be statistically evaluated for bias, and the JollySeber model should be considered if bias is found to be excessive, thus minimizing the potential of producing unacceptable estimates.
3.) In future years, the entire survey area should be surveyed on a consistent temporal basis (e.g. once each week) if possible.
4.) Redd survey protocols and datasheets should be simplified, in order to concentrate crew efforts on carcass and redd detection.
5.) If recovery of coho salmon becomes a high priority, the temporal coverage of the surveys will need to be extended into January. If surveys are extended into January, a mark-recapture methodology should be initiated for coho salmon.
6.) More research into carcass deterioration rate differences between spring-run and fall-run Chinook.
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## APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Total spring Chinook carcasses recovered by reach during the main stem Trinity River spawner survey 2000-2008.

| Spring Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reach |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| 2000 | 695 | 368 | 101 | 52 | 11 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | ns | ns | ns | 1,241 |
| 2001 | 383 | 331 | 137 | 113 | 8 | 12 | 19 | 3 | 2 | 2 | ns | ns | ns | 1,010 |
| 2002 | 951 | 641 | 311 | 214 | 169 | 245 | 124 | 20 | 46 | 8 | ns | ns | ns | 2,729 |
| 2003 | 2643 | 1139 | 551 | 285 | 267 | 239 | 93 | 9 | 21 | 4 | ns | ns | ns | 5,251 |
| 2004 | 431 | 345 | 172 | 96 | 83 | 37 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 2 | ns | ns | ns | 1,187 |
| 2005 | 566 | 267 | 119 | 93 | 75 | 36 | 31 | 8 | 22 | 7 | ns | ns | ns | 1,224 |
| 2006 | 306 | 303 | 191 | 186 | 108 | 44 | 38 | 1 | 9 | 8 | ns | ns | ns | 1,194 |
| 2007 | 418 | 384 | 163 | 215 | 106 | 73 | 26 | 1 | 14 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1,411 |
| 2008 | 227 | 181 | 132 | 149 | 99 | 149 | 42 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 993 |

Appendix 2. Total fall Chinook carcasses recovered by reach during the main stem Trinity River spawner survey 2000-2008.

| Fall Chinook |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reach |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| 2000 | 3,644 | 979 | 174 | 50 | 25 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 13 | 6 | ns | ns | ns | 4,909 |
| 2001 | 3,217 | 872 | 136 | 118 | 23 | 14 | 75 | 12 | 32 | 6 | ns | ns | ns | 4,505 |
| 2002 | 569 | 462 | 89 | 100 | 46 | 66 | 84 | 25 | 32 | 13 | ns | ns | ns | 1,486 |
| 2003 | 6,050 | 2656 | 886 | 385 | 84 | 91 | 50 | 23 | 72 | 24 | ns | ns | ns | 10,321 |
| 2004 | 2,319 | 714 | 188 | 178 | 58 | 40 | 64 | 17 | 44 | 16 | ns | ns | ns | 3,638 |
| 2005 | 1,370 | 440 | 104 | 67 | 44 | 20 | 17 | 1 | 18 | 15 | ns | ns | ns | 2,096 |
| 2006 | 1,780 | 649 | 222 | 142 | 69 | 80 | 57 | 4 | 38 | 32 | ns | ns | ns | 3,073 |
| 2007 | 2,243 | 847 | 167 | 116 | 96 | 94 | 20 | 2 | 15 | 21 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3,322 |
| 2008 | 863 | 504 | 183 | 206 | 125 | 112 | 90 | 15 | 78 | 75 | 150 | 136 | 35 | 2,571 |

Appendix 3. Total coho salmon carcasses recovered by reach during the main stem Trinity River spawner survey 2000-2008.

| Coho salmon |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Reach |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Year | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 14 | Total |
| 2000 | 291 | 112 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 417 |
| 2001 | 465 | 211 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 692 |
| 2002 | 125 | 29 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 177 |
| 2003 | 304 | 106 | 37 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 468 |
| 2004 | 1,162 | 55 | 147 | 58 | 52 | 14 | 19 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,029 |
| 2005 | 572 | 237 | 72 | 28 | 20 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 961 |
| 2006 | 378 | 127 | 15 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 537 |
| 2007 | 127 | 57 | 16 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 214 |
| 2008 | 154 | 103 | 27 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 318 |

Appendix 4. Salmon female prespawn mortality rates observed in the Trinity River spawner survey 1955 through 2008.

| Study | Literature | Spring-run Chinook |  |  | Fall-run Chinook |  |  | Total Chinook |  |  | Coho salmon |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Source | Spaw ned | Not Spaw ne | \% Not spaw ne | Spaw ned | Not Spaw ne | \% Not Spaw ne | Spaw ned | Not Spaw ne | \% Not Spaw ned | Spaw ned | Not Spaw n | \% Not <br> Spaw ned |
| 1955 | Gibbs (1956) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2,076 | 32 | 1.5 |  |  |  |
| 1956 | Weber (1965) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3,438 | 219 | 6.0 |  |  |  |
| 1963 | LaFaunce (1965) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4,953 | 328 | 6.2 |  |  |  |
| 1968 | Rogers (1970) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,494 | 124 | 7.7 |  |  |  |
| 1969 | Smith (1975) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,889 | 23 | 1.2 |  |  |  |
| 1970 | Rogers (1973) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 632 | 34 | 5.1 |  |  |  |
| 1972 | Miller (1972) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 791 | 110 | 12.2 |  |  |  |
| 1987 | 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 | 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 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Aguilar/Davis } \\ \text { (1995) } \end{gathered}$ | 202 | 2 | 1 | 380 | 12 | 3.1 | 582 | 14 | 2.3 |  |  |  |
| 1995 | Zuspan (1997) | 2,711 | 517 | 16 | 8,502 | 3,188 | 27.3 | 11,213 | 3,705 | 24.8 |  |  |  |
| 1996 | Zuspan (1997) | 1,243 | 42 | 3.3 | 11,058 | 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 | 1,940 | 146 | 7 | 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/Knechtle (2006) | 3,173 | 220 | 6.5 | 5,526 | 730 | 11.7 | 8,699 | 950 | 9.8 | 210 | 39 | 15.7 |
| 2004 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Sinnen/Currier } \\ (2005) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 646 | 60 | 8.5 | 1,864 | 100 | 5.1 | 2,510 | 160 | 6.0 | 1,042 | 187 | 15.2 |
| 2005 | Garrison (2006) | 603 | 48 | 7.4 | 1,003 | 70 | 6.5 | 1,606 | 118 | 6.8 | 414 | 78 | 15.9 |
| 2006 | Hill(2007) | 481 | 37 | 7.1 | 1138 | 11 | 1.0 | 1,619 | 48 | 3.0 | 288 | 31 | 9.7 |
| 2007 | Hill (2008) | 915 | 74 | 7.5 | 2,158 | 185 | 7.9 | 3,073 | 259 | 7.8 | 97 | 11 | 10.2 |
| 2008 | Current study | 424 | 40 | 8.6 | 1180 | 70 | 5.6 | 1,604 | 110 | 6.4 | 154 | 22 | 12.5 |

Appendix 5. Carcass mark recapture statistics and estimates observed on main stem Trinity River spawner surveys 2005 to 2008.

| 2005 | Captured | Marked | Recaptured | Marking <br> Rate | Recapture Rate | Petersen | Stratified <br> Petersen | Schaefer | Schaefer w/ Law's |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spring | 1,385 | 533 | 143 | 38.40\% | 26.80\% | 3,158 | 3,539 | 3,256 | 2,855 |
| Fall | 2,436 | 553 | 341 | 22.70\% | 61.70\% | 5,407 | 6,060 | 5,574 | 4,890 |
| Both | 3,821 | 1,086 | 484 | 28.40\% | 44.60\% | 8,565 | 9,600 | 8,831 | 7,745 |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring | 1,311 | 520 | 116 | 39.70\% | 22.30\% | 3,567 | 3,958 | 4,039 | 3,661 |
| Fall | 3,462 | 832 | 390 | 24.00\% | 46.90\% | 9,172 | 10,176 | 10,386 | 9,412 |
| Both | 4,772 | 1,352 | 506 | 28.30\% | 37.40\% | 12,739 | 14,134 | 14,425 | 13,073 |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring | 1,505 | 491 | 95 | 32.60\% | 19.30\% | 4,162 | 3,845 | 3,984 | 3,756 |
| Fall | 3,528 | 322 | 180 | 9.10\% | 55.90\% | 10,684 | 9,871 | 10,226 | 9,642 |
| Both | 5,033 | 813 | 275 | 16.20\% | 33.80\% | 14,846 | 13,716 | 14,210 | 13,398 |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring | 993 | 384 | 69 | 38.67\% | 17.97\% | 3,065 | 3,111 | 3,869 | 3,621 |
| Fall | 2,571 | 507 | 219 | 19.72\% | 43.20\% | 7,937 | 8,056 | 10,016 | 9,375 |
| Both | 3,564 | 891 | 288 | 25.00\% | 32.32\% | 11,002 | 11,167 | 13,885 | 12,997 |

Appendix 6. Trinity River upper (reaches 1-5) and lower (reaches 6-14) reaches expansion matrix for Chinook mark-recapture estimators during 2008 survey.

| Upper <br> Reaches <br> (1-5) | Captured | Marked | Recaptured | Marking <br> Rate | Recapture <br> Rate | Petersen | Stratified <br> Petersen | Schaefer | Schaefer <br> w/ Law's |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Spring | 788 | 269 | 60 | $34.14 \%$ | $22.30 \%$ | 2,006 | 2,098 | 2,864 | 2,690 |  |
| Fall | 1881 | 323 | 172 | $17.17 \%$ | $53.25 \%$ | 4,788 | 5,007 | 6,837 | 6,421 |  |
| Both | 2669 | 592 | 232 | $22.18 \%$ | $39.19 \%$ | 6,794 | 7,105 | 9,701 | 9,112 |  |
| Lower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reaches <br> $(6-10)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spring | 205 | 115 | 9 | $56.10 \%$ | $7.83 \%$ | $/ b$ | $/ b$ | $/ b$ | $/ \mathrm{b}$ |  |
| Fall | 690 | 184 | 47 | $26.67 \%$ | $25.54 \%$ | 3,635 | 1,810 | 2,616 | 2,500 |  |
| Both | 895 | 299 | 56 | $33.41 \%$ | $18.73 \%$ | 4,715 | 2,349 | 3,393 | 3,243 |  |

a/ These estimates were made in violation of the rule requiring at lest 25 recaptures for each on of these estimators.
b/ Estimates could not be made because of the inadequate number of recaptures.
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#### Abstract

During August 6, 2008 through November 4, 2008 a creel census was conducted in the lower (Pacific Ocean to Hwy 96 Bridge in Weitchpec) Klamath River to determine numbers of upstream migrating Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) and steelhead trout (Oncorhynchus mykiss) harvested by sport anglers. A total of 4,916 (1,037 adults and 3,879 grilse) Chinook salmon and 58 (56 adults and 2 half-pounders) steelhead were harvested. Chinook salmon caught before August 15, 2008 were considered spring-run (spring) Chinook salmon. Eightyseven spring Chinook (18 adults and 69 grilse) salmon were harvested in 2008. The 2008 in-river sport quota was 22,500 adult fall-run (fall) Chinook salmon. 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 basin is the second largest river system in California (the Sacramento system is the largest). It drains over 40,000 sq km in northern California and southern Oregon. The Trinity River is its largest tributary and empties into the Klamath River at Weitchpec (river kilometer (rkm) 68.8). Other major tributaries of the Klamath River are the Salmon River (rkm 105.6), the Scott River (rkm 228.8) and the Shasta River (rkm 283.2).

The upper limit of anadromy in the main Klamath River is Iron Gate Dam (rkm 304.2). Iron Gate Hatchery, at the base of the dam, mitigates for loss of historic anadromous fish habitat above the dam. The upper limit of anadromy in the Trinity River is at Lewiston Dam (rkm 177.8). Trinity River Hatchery is located at the base of Lewiston Dam and mitigates for loss of historic anadromous fish habitat above the dam. Both hatcheries are operated by California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG).

The Klamath River system is one of the state's primary producers of Chinook salmon and steelhead trout. These two species support popular sport fisheries throughout the

Klamath River system with most of the concentrated effort and catch occurring in the lower 50 kilometers of the main stem 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 of 1921. Coots (1952) reports on angler harvest of anadromous salmonids during a year long creel census from the mouth of Salmon River (rkm 105.6) to Copco Dam (rkm 314) 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 fishery in the lower Klamath River above the Highway 101 bridge conducted during the fall 1951 adult steelhead and Chinook salmon immigration period.

Other earlier creel census reports on the main stem Klamath River conducted upstream of the Salmon River (rkm 105.6) deal with angler catches during the summer trout season. Some adult steelhead and juvenile coho salmon are reported in the catch reports (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 between Dutch Creek (rkm 147) and Iron Gate (rkm 304) and by Miller (1971) working in an area of the middle Klamath River from Johnson's (rkm 40) to Salmon River (105.6 rkm). Steelhead comprised the majority of the sampled catches.

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

The Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 established a 200-mile fishery conservation zone and created eight regional Fisheries Management Councils, one of which is the Pacific Fisheries Management Council (PFMC), the purpose of which was to develop and implement a Fishery Management Plan (FMP) for commercial and recreational salmon fisheries off the coasts of Washington, Oregon and California. All inland waters and those ocean waters out to the 3 mile mark are managed by the individual adjoining states, those waters off California are managed by CDFG.

The Klamath River is regarded as one of the more important producers of fall Chinook salmon in California's commercial and sport fisheries. PFMC management objectives include measures to rebuild and protect depressed Klamath River fall Chinook stocks (PFMC 1983). PFMC management practices have focused on harvest restrictions for commercial and recreational fisheries that were impacting Klamath River Chinook stocks. The California Fish and Game Commission (Commission), with management
jurisdiction of fisheries in coastal waters from shore out 5 kilometers (3 miles) and inriver sport fisheries, has implemented Chinook salmon management practices and regulations supporting PFMC objectives. Thus, Klamath River adult fall Chinook runsize data has been a critical management component of the fall Chinook resource and its fisheries in northern California and southern Oregon.

The number of fall Chinook salmon entering the Klamath Basin (run-size) is determined by summarizing the number harvested in-river (both sport and tribal), the number returning to the two basin hatcheries and natural spawning escapement (fish spawning in natural areas). Angler harvest of Klamath River fall Chinook salmon has been monitored by CDFG to provide data for fall Chinook salmon run-size estimates since 1978. Annual reports summarizing these activities have been written through the 2007 season (Boydstun 1979, 1980; Lee 1984a, 1984b, 1985, Lau 1992-1998; Borok 19992010).

This report covers the period from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009. It provides data and a description of the CDFG fall Chinook salmon angler harvest monitoring program in the main stem Klamath River from the mouth of the Klamath River to the Highway 96 Bridge at Weitchpec (rkm 68.8) excluding the Trinity River.

For the purposes of this study the Klamath River and Trinity River are divided into sample reach areas. The Klamath River is divided onto 3 areas: From the mouth of the river to the Highway (Hwy) 101 Bridge; from the Hwy 101 bridge to the Hwy 96 Bridge at Weitchpec; and from Hwy 96 Bridge at Weitchpec up to Iron Gate Dam. The Trinity River is divided into 2 areas: From the confluence with the Klamath River up to Cedar Flat; and from that point up to the Old Lewiston Bridge in Lewiston (245.7 rkm). We determine angling effort and harvest by area. The CDFG uses this information to determine in real time when sport anglers have reached the in-river sport harvest subquota for each section of fall-run adult Chinook salmon. This report covers the lower 2 sample reach sections, the Klamath River from the ocean to the Hwy 96 Bridge at Weitchpec.

The Klamath River Chinook quota works in the following manner: Fifty percent of the total in-river quota is dedicated to the lower river (rkm 0 to 68.8). The other half is split between the mid Klamath River (17\%) (rkm 68.8 to 306) and the Trinity River (33\%). CDFG monitors or models each of the areas for the fall-run Chinook harvest and determine when the quota of each portion has been met. Once a sub-quota in any of the sections is met, an adult Chinook salmon harvest closure goes into effect in that section of 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. After all sub-quotas are met, fishing for grilse Chinook and other legal species is still permitted but the entire river is closed to the harvest of any adult Chinook. However, once the hatcheries (Iron Gate Hatchery and Trinity River Hatchery) have reached mitigation egg take goals, special exempted fisheries for adult Chinook are permitted from Iron Gate Dam to where Interstate 5 crosses the Klamath

River and downstream of Old Lewiston Bridge to the mouth of Indian Creek Bridge on the Trinity.

Starting in 1999 CDFG implemented an "impact quota" 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 divided among each of the areas in the same manner as the division of the basin quota.

During the 2008 season, fishing regulations allowed anglers to harvest three Chinook salmon per day (up to two adult Chinook) and one hatchery trout or one hatchery steelhead per day. These regulations started on August 15, 2008 in the Lower Klamath River and September 1, 2008 in the Trinity River and the Klamath River above the Hwy 96 Bridge in Weitchepec. The limit of hatchery steelhead, in the Trinity River only, was increased to two per day and four in possession. No harvest of coho salmon was permitted. Regulations stated: One "hatchery" trout or one "hatchery" steelhead could be harvested, which eliminated the cutthroat trout fishery in the lower river.

## METHODS

## Description of the Fishery and Creel Sample Area

To estimate angler catch and effort, CDFG divides the main stem Klamath River from the mouth to Iron Gate Dam into three areas. The mouth of the river to the Hwy 96 Bridge in Weitchpec (Areas 1 and 2) are included in this report. From upstream of the Hwy 96 bridge in Weitchpec to Iron Gate Dam (Area 3) was not surveyed by CDFG 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 Hwy 101 Bridge and is referred to as the estuary. All shore angling effort in this area took place at the mouth of the river in 2008. River mouth configuration, which changes annually, determines which side (north or south) affords better angling. A creel sample of shore anglers was conducted at the mouth location. During the 2008 season fishing the mouth was not closed at any time. The $15 \%$ of the basin quota caught below the Hwy 101 Bridge (3,375 adult fall-run Chinook salmon) which could have closed the spit to fishing was not met.

All boat angling effort in the estuary originated from ten resort boat docks in the estuary area. Three resort docks (Golden Bear RV Park, Riverside RV Park, and Panther Creek RV Park) and south side river mouth access were sampled this season for angler effort and catch.

Area 2: This area extended from the Hwy 96 Bridge (rkm 68) in Weitchpec downstream to the Hwy 101 Bridge at Klamath (rkm 5) The division was formerly the falls at Coon Creek ( 54.4 rkm ) near the community of Johnson's riffle (Pecwan Creek), but to make the distinction clearer for anglers it was changed. Shore angling effort is generally confined to two popular easily accessed riffles (Lower Klamath Glen and Blake's) located in the lower 5 km of this area and were easily accessible to the shore angler. One former resort boat dock (Klamath Glen) and a public boat launch (Roy Rook), also located in this section 5 km , are the principal boat facilities in the area. Creel sampling occurred at these locations.

Angler access routes at Lower Klamath Glen and Blake's 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.

Shore angling access above Blake's riffle was limited to three access points: the mouth of Blue Creek (rkm 26.3); Ah Pah Creek (rkm 27.5); and Bear Riffle (rkm 29.8). These points are all accessible by vehicle but accounted for an estimated less than one percent of all angling effort from data in past surveys.

## Creel Census Methods

Study methods and procedures used in Areas 1 and 2 during the 2008 season were 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).

Each of the sites identified in the area description on the lower Klamath River were sampled three days 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 for the day 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) Fish harvested are identified to species, fork length is measured and they are inspected for marks, external tags and unusual conditions. Also a scale sample was collected.
5) For Chinook salmon missing an adipose fin, (possessed a CWT) the head was removed and retained by staff.
6) The number and species of fish caught and released (actually released not lost) by the angler was recorded as juveniles, grilse or adults.
7) In Area 1 only, the angler was questioned weather they fished the mouth or from a boat and if fish were harvested above or below the Hwy 101 Bridge.
8) Was this a professionally guided trip?

## Harvest and Effort Estimating Procedures

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

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

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
I = boat sampling ratio

Area 2: Harvest estimates for the area above Highway 101 to the Hwy 96 Bridge at Weitchpec was calculated by multiplying the observed harvest and effort by a sampling ratio. This ratio is the weekly expansion value. This value is a simple ratio based on the number of days sampled to 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 not sampled. The boat expansion formula is:
(Boats at the non-sampled docks + Boats at sampled docks) Boats at Sampled docks

The product of this formula yields a ratio used to expand catch and effort data for nonsampled boats anglers. This ratio is obtained by counting the number of boats at all the docks (both sampled and non-sampled) below Hwy 101. This count occurs usually between 1100 to 1500 hrs. Although not all the boats will be at their docks at this time the assumption that the percentage of boats that do not return to their docks is the
same between both the unsampled and sampled docks. It is also assumed that the effort and catch are equal between the non-sampled boats and sampled boats.

A boat count is made every day Area 1 is sampled. This count excludes all boats used in the Indian gill-net fishery. 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 KRP 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, CDFG estimated one, two, and three day harvest projections to allow lead time of any adult Chinook salmon fishery closures.

## RESULTS

Rounding numbers to whole numbers may cause some slight addition discrepancies in these results. Spring run Chinook numbers are included in totals. All graphic fork lengths representations are smoothed by a moving average of five.

The creel census for the lower Klamath River began on August 6 and ran through November 4 (JW 32 through 44) of 2008. Chinook salmon harvested in the creel fishery ranged in size from 33 to 100 cm in fork length (Figure 1). The adult portion of Chinook harvested ranged in size from 51 to 100 cm FL and averaged 67.3 cm FL. The grilse component of the angler harvest ranged in size from 33 to 50 cm FL and averaged 43.8 cm FL.

Steelhead harvested ranged in size from 37 to 75 cm FL and averaged 63 cm FL (Figure 2). Any steelhead less than 42 cm FL is considered to be a half-pounder, and those larger are considered adults. Steelhead less than 23 cm FL are considered resident trout and not anadromous. Half-pounder steelhead ranged in size from 37 to 41 cm FL and the adult steelhead ranged in size from 42 to 75 cm FL.


Figure 1. Fork length frequency of Chinook salmon harvested in the lower Klamath River creel during the 2008 season.


Figure 2. Fork length frequency of steelhead harvested in the lower Klamath River creel during the 2008 season.

## Estimated Angler Effort and Harvest

During the 2008 season, anglers made an estimated total of 10,827 trips in Areas 1 and 2 combined. Of the 10,827 trips; 4,128 were in Area 1, and 6,699 were in Area 2 (Table 1). These trips resulted in a total effort of 56,005 fishing hours. As in previous seasons, boat anglers out-numbered shore anglers in both Areas (Table 1).

A total of 3,947 (1,056 adults and 3,426 grilse) Chinook salmon and 58 (56 adults and 2 half-pounders) steelhead were harvested (Table 1). During Julian weeks 32 and 33,

237 ( 50 adult and 187 grisle) spring Chinook salmon were harvested. The total of fall Chinook harvested was 3,710 (1,006 adults and 3,239 grilse) fish. Nine adult coho salmon were harvested this season.

Table 1. Summary of estimated angler effort and harvest during the 2008 lower Klamath River creel census.

| Site | Angler |  | Steelhead |  | Chinook salmon |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Trips | Hours | $1 / 2$ lbers | Adults | Grilse | Adults |
| Area 1 -Mouth to Hwy 101 Bridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shore | 1,445 | 5,177 | 0 | 2 | 161 | 44 |
| Boats | 2,683 | 10,462 | 0 | 10 | 359 | 97 |
| Total | 4,128 | 15,639 | 0 | 12 | 521 | 141 |
| Area 2 - Hwy 101 Bridge to Hwy 96 Bridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shore | 1,049 | 3,816 | 0 | 2 | 159 | 42 |
| Boats | 5,651 | 36,550 | 2 | 41 | 3,267 | 872 |
| Total | 6,699 | 40,366 | 2 | 43 | 3426 | 915 |
| Grand Total | 10,827 | 56,005 | 2 | 56 | 3,947 | 1,056 |
| 2007 | 13,913 | 64,101 | 7 | 767 | 255 | 3,388 |
| 2006 | 8,920 | 41,792 | 23 | 231 | 4,626 | 53 |

## 2008 Harvest and Effort Patterns

The average length during the 2008 season was 5.2 hours (Table 2) and was longest trip length of this data set. Average trip length over the 17 years was 4.0 hours per trip.

## Catch and Release

Catch and release data were recorded as part of the creel interview. Anglers were specifically asked if fish were released rather than lost. This data should only be used as an estimation of trends as they can be highly subjective. CDFG estimated anglers released 624 half-pounders, 296 adult steelhead, 1,379 grilse, and 243 adult Chinook salmon (Tables 3 and 4). In addition an estimated 13 grilse and 58 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. As in all years, if the quota is met early the number of adult Chinook released increases.

Table 2. Number of angler trips, hours, and average length of trip in the lower Klamath River sport fishery for the last seventeen seasons, 1992-2008.

|  | Total Angler |  | Average <br> Hours/Trip |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1992 | Trips | Hours | 3.0 |
| 1993 | 11,190 | 33,080 | 3.2 |
| 1994 | 15,100 | 51,889 | 3.6 |
| 1995 | 19,881 | 54,748 | 3.6 |
| 1996 | 27,929 | 91,019 | 3.3 |
| 1997 | 18,402 | 67,154 | 3.6 |
| 1998 | 17,606 | 52,145 | 3.0 |
| 1999 | 11,852 | 45,109 | 3.8 |
| 2000 | 14,150 | 57,184 | 4.0 |
| 2001 | 20,116 | 88,053 | 4.4 |
| 2002 | 18,376 | 85,925 | 4.7 |
| 2003 | 16,514 | 79,228 | 4.8 |
| 2004 | 15,180 | 71,397 | 4.7 |
| 2005 | 12,629 | 61,000 | 4.8 |
| 2006 | 8,902 | 41,792 | 4.7 |
| 2007 | 13,913 | 64,101 | 4.6 |
| 2008 | 10,827 | 56,005 | 5.2 |



Figure 3. Harvest per hour of Chinook salmon from the sport harvest on the lower Klamath River creel census 1980 to 2008.

Table 3 Number of estimated Chinook and coho salmon and steelhead caught and released from the lower Klamath River creel surveys 1994-2008.

|  | Chinook |  | Steelhead |  | Coho |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Grilse | Adults | $<42 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{FL}$ | $>41 \mathrm{~cm}$ FL | Grilse | Adults |
| 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 |
| 2005 | 657 | 1,394 | 3,678 | 1,159 | 11 | 157 |
| 2006 | 3,758 | 2,922 | 1,030 | 1,129 | 12 | 91 |
| 2007 | 162 | 1,407 | 1,416 | 1,050 | 11 | 21 |
| 2008 | 1,379 | 243 | 624 | 296 | 13 | 58 |

Table 4. Summary of estimated catch and releases during the 2008 lower Klamath River creel census by species and area.

| Site | Angler |  | Steelhead |  | Chinook salmon |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Location | Trips | Hours | $1 / 2$ Ibers | Adults | Grilse | Adults |  |
| Area 1 -Mouth to Hwy 101 Bridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shore | 1,445 | 5,177 | 26 | 14 | 16 | 2 |  |
| Boats | 2,683 | 10,462 | 10 | 15 | 44 | 0 |  |
| Total | 4,128 | 15,639 | 35 | 29 | 60 | 2 |  |
| Area 2-Hwy 101 Bridge to HYW 96 Bridge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shore | 1,049 | 3,816 | 868 | 54 | 59 | 2 |  |
| Boats | 5,651 | 36,550 | 476 | 161 | 505 | 291 |  |
| Total | 6,699 | 40,366 | 1,344 | 214 | 564 | 294 |  |
| Grand Total | 10,827 | 56,005 | 1,379 | 243 | 624 | 296 |  |
| 2007 | 13,913 | 64,101 | 1,416 | 1,050 | 162 | 1,407 |  |
| 2006 | 8,920 | 41,792 | 1,030 | 1,129 | 3,758 | 2,922 |  |

## Harvest Timing

Julian week 37 was the week with the most Chinook harvested, both grilse and adults (Figure 4). In Julian week 35 a large peak of Chinook released was recorded due to a fishing derby by the American Fishing Foundation (Figure 5).

Fewer steelhead (58) were harvested than in the last three seasons (774 in 2007, 278 in 2006 and 152, in 2005). Julian week 36 was the peak harvest of adult steelhead (Figure 6), while Julian week 32 had the highest released half pounders (Figure 7). Very few half-pounders (2) were harvested this season.


Figure 4. Estimated harvest of Chinook by Julian week in the 2008 lower Klamath River creel season.

Table 5. Harvest, release and angler effort by Julian week (JW) during the 2008 lower Klamath River creel census.



Figure 5. Estimated Chinook released by Julian week during the 2008 lower Klamath River creel season.


Figure 6. Estimated steelhead harvested during the 2008 lower Klamath River creel season, by Julian week.


Figure 7. Estimated steelhead released during the 2008 lower Klamath River creel season, by Julian week.

## Coded-Wire Tag Recovery

KRP personnel recovered the heads of 42 adipose fin-clipped and coded-wire-tagged (Ad+CWT) Chinook salmon during Julian weeks 33 through 39 of the 2008 season. There was one non-random recovery (NRR), wherein anglers and or resort owners saved their fish head for our personnel. These NRRs are not used to estimate the harvest of marked hatchery origin (Ad+CWT) Chinook salmon (Table 6), however, they are used to calculate harvest timing (Figure 8). CWTs were not recovered from seven
heads and four hatchery fish were recorded but the heads were not received for processing. This left 30 tags to decode. Of these 30 heads, 17 were adult salmon while 13 were grilse salmon.

No Trinity River Hatchery spring Chinook heads were recovered during the creel census. Fin-clipped fall-run adult Chinook recovered ranged in size from 60 to 90 cm and grilse ranged in size from 38 cm to 66 cm . Heads from all fin-clipped fish collected in the angler survey were assigned an individual head tag number which allowed tracking of each head through the extraction and decoding process.

## Hatchery Contribution

Randomly recovered, marked Chinook salmon composed 2.03 \% $(41 / 2,012)$ of the actual Chinook salmon harvested. With expansions made from creel sampling and hatchery production multipliers for each tag group, CDFG estimated 794 hatchery fish were harvested (Table 7). Hatchery fish represented an estimated 15.8\% (794/5,003) of the entire sport harvest in the lower Klamath River. All 30 random recovered heads that had tags which could be read were from Klamath and Trinity basin origin Chinook salmon.

## Iron Gate Hatchery Origin Chinook Salmon

CDFG decoded 19 randomly recovered tags from Klamath River origin Chinook. These Chinook salmon represent 11 different tag codes; two from the 2004 brood year, two from the 2005 brood year and seven from the 2006 brood year at Iron Gate Hatchery (Table 6). When expanded for creel sampling and hatchery production multipliers for each tag group, Iron Gate Hatchery origin fish account for $13.6 \%(679 / 5,003)$ of the total sport harvest (Table 7). The Klamath River origin Chinook were harvested between Julian weeks 35 to 39 (Figure 8).

## Trinity River Hatchery Origin Chinook Salmon

CDFG decoded a total of 11 randomly recovered tags from Trinity River Hatchery fallrun origin Chinook. These Chinook represent five different tag codes; one from the 2004 brood year, one from the 2005 brood year and three from the 2006 brood year at Trinity River Hatchery (Table 6). Trinity River origin fish represented 2.3\% $(115 / 5,003)$ of the total sport harvest (Table 7). Trinity River origin Chinook were harvested between Julian weeks 34 to 38 (Figure 8).

During the 2008 season, sport in-river harvest by stock can be described as follows: the tail-end of the Trinity River Hatchery springChinook salmon made up the majority of harvest up to Julian week 33 (based on past data), next Iron Gate Hatchery fall-run Chinook salmon were present and peaked at Julian week 36. The bulk of the Trinity

River fall-run tags were collected during Julian weeks 37 and 38, no more coded-wire tagged Chinook salmon were recovered after Julian week 39 (Figure 8).

Table 6. Actual coded-wire-tag recoveries by Julian week of Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) and Trinity River Hatchery (TRH) Chinook salmon obtained from the lower Klamath River creel, 2008 season.


Table 7. Fall Chinook salmon harvest in the 2008 lower Klamath River sport harvest proportioned by hatchery origin and expanded for creel sampling and hatchery production multiplier.

|  | IGH | TRH <br> Expanded | Estimated <br> Total <br> Hatchery | Hatchery |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Fall Chinook Salmon | Exanded | Hatse | 3947 | 354 | 38 |
| 392 | $9.93 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
| Adults | 1056 | 325 | 77 | 402 | $38.07 \%$ |
| Total | 5003 | 679 | 115 | 794 | $48.00 \%$ |



Figure 8. Coded wire tagged Chinook recovered during the 2008 lower Klamath River creel census, expanded for sampling and by individual tag code

## DISCU SSION

More grisle salmon were harvested and released this season. This bodes well for future salmon fishing seasons in the basin if ocean conditions are favorable. Regulations were similar to past seasons and could not account for the higher returns from the 2006 brood year.

## CONCLUSION

The size of the quota affects the economy of this area and should be taken into consideration in the allocation process each year.
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Appendix 1. List of Julian weeks and their calendar equivalents.

| Julian week | Inclusive dates |  |  | Julian week | Inclusive dates |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 01-Jan | - | 07-Jan | 27 | 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-Feb | - | 11-Feb | 32 | 06-Aug | - | 12-Aug |
| 7 | 12-Feb | - | 18-Feb | 33 | 13-Aug | - | 19-Aug |
| 8 | 19-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-Apr | 41 | 08-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 | - | 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-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 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 and CWT), hatchery-produced Chinook and right-maxillary-clipped coho salmon.
    ${ }^{2}$ Spaghetti tags applied by CDFG personnel to returning spawning-run fish.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ The use of brand or trade names is for identification purposes only, and does not imply the endorsement of any product by the CDFG.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Chapman, D. G. 1951. Some properties of the hypergeometric distribution with applications to zoological census. Univ. CA Publ. Stat. 1:131-160, As cited in Ricker (1975).

[^3]:    * Eight dayJulian week only during leap years
    **Eight day Julian week every year

[^4]:    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/ $B Y=$ 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.

[^5]:    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, actual count.

