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#### Abstract

A total of 40,015 fall-run Chinook salmon (Oncorhynchus tshawytscha), entered Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) during the fall 2012 spawning season from September 26, 2012 through November 26, 2012. Klamath River Project (KRP) staff systematically sampled 1 in every 10 Chinook, as well as all adiposeclipped (AD) Chinook during recovery efforts, for a systematic random sample size of 3,885 and nonrandom sample size of 7,665 . Scale samples, sex and fork length data were collected for all sampled Chinook. Analysis of the length-frequency distribution for systematically sampled Chinook males indicates that the preliminary cutoff point between grilse and adults occurred at $\leq 59$ centimeters ( cm ) fork length (FL). Systematically sampled male Chinook ranged in size from 40 to 98 cm FL , and systematically sampled female Chinook ranged from 56 to 93 cm FL. Based on scale age analysis, the Klamath River Technical Team (KRTT) estimated that $3.8 \%(1,537)$ of the run were grilse. Females accounted for $52.5 \%(21,014)$ of the run while males accounted for $47.5 \%(19,001)$. The 2012 return to IGH contributed roughly $12 \%$ to the total (Klamath basin) in-river run and $20 \%$ to the total spawner escapement. Based on coded wire tag expansion, KRP staff estimated that $84 \%$ of the Chinook entering IGH during the 2012 season were of hatchery origin.

A total of 644 coho salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch) entered IGH during the 2012 spawning season. The recorded dates for the coho run were from October 11, 2012 to December 6, 2012. KRP staff collected biological data (sex, fork length, presence of marks or clips, scale samples, and tissue samples) on every coho that entered the hatchery as well as otoliths from coho used for spawning. Males ranged in size from 35 to 77 cm FL and represented $68 \%$ of the run, while females ranged in size from 40 to 74 cm . fork length and represented $32 \%$ of the run. Based on the length frequency distribution of 441 male coho, grilse were estimated to be $\leq 55 \mathrm{~cm}$. fork length, for an age composition of $54 \%$ grilse and $46 \%$ adult coho in 2012. The proportion of grilse among males was $77.7 \%$. Of the 644 coho sampled by KRP staff, 609 ( $94.6 \%$ ) had left maxillary clips, 29 ( $4.5 \%$ ) had no clips, 4 ( $0.6 \%$ ) had a right maxillary clip, one ( $0.15 \%$ ) had both a left and a right maxillary clip, and one ( 0.15 ) had an AD clip but no CWT. For the third season, coho were spawned at IGH in 2012 using a spawning matrix provided weekly by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Salmon Genetics Repository in Santa Cruz, CA., using tissue samples obtained from coho as they entered IGH. Potential brood stock were held in individual tubes pending genetic analysis, and all coho not used as brood stock (342) were tagged with a Passive Integrated Transponder (PIT) and released back to the Klamath River at IGH.


## INTRODUCTION

## Iron Gate Hatchery

The Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) is located adjacent to the Klamath River (river kilometer 306), in Siskiyou County, CA, approximately 120 miles north of Redding, near the Oregon border (Figure 1). This hatchery was established in 1963 to mitigate for loss of habitat between Iron Gate Dam and Copco Dam. The production goals for the hatchery are listed in Table 1 (CDFG and PP\&L 1996).

Table 1. Production goals for anadromous salmonid releases from Iron Gate Hatchery, Klamath River.

| Species | Number released | Released | Run timing |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Chinook Salmon | $5,100,000$ smolts | May-June | mid September to early November |
|  | 900,000 yearlings | November |  |
| Coho | 75,000 yearlings | March | late October to early January |
| Steelhead | 200,000 yearlings | March-May | November to March |



Figure 1. Location of Iron Gate Hatchery, Siskiyou County, California.

## Klamath River Project

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife's (CDFW) Klamath River Project (KRP) conducts systematic sampling of fall-run Chinook (Chinook) salmon annually during the spawning season. The purpose of the sampling is to characterize the Chinook run entering IGH in terms of age and sex composition, and to recover data from all coded wire tags (CWT) recovered from the heads of adipose fin clipped (AD) Chinook. All Chinook tagged at IGH are marked with an adipose fin clip to identify the presence of a CWT when they return to the hatchery or other locations during subsequent spawning seasons. Data from CWT fish provide a reference of known-age fish which is used, along with scale samples and analysis of length frequency distribution, to determine the age composition of the run. KRP staff also sample coho salmon (coho) that enter IGH, typically from mid-October through December.

## Coded Wire Tagging

The KRP was historically responsible for the adipose-clipping and coded- wire tagging of Chinook smolts and yearlings at IGH, however, in 2011 and 2012 tagging operations were transferred to Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission personnel, utilizing fulltime trailer operators and a regional tagging coordinator.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Chinook Salmon

Starting in 1997 all Chinook entering the fish ladders have been allowed to enter IGH. Upon entering the hatchery, Chinook selected by IGH staff as brood stock are spawned or held in round tanks until they are ready to spawn. Readiness to spawn is determined by hatchery staff and based on timing, firmness of the ovaries, and ease of stripping eggs when handled. Once daily or weekly egg goals are met, extra Chinook are sacrificed and put on ice, and loaded into trucks by American-Canadian fisheries on site, for processing and later distribution to interested individuals and organizations.

In 2012, KRP staff conducted a systematic sample of every $10^{\text {th }}$ Chinook along the process line, as well as all AD Chinook. These systematic and non-systematic fish were set aside for sampling. Sampling included collection of data on fork length, sex, scale samples, presence or absence of clips and/or marks, and spawning disposition. Heads were taken from all AD Chinook (systematic and non-systematic fish). Heads collected from AD-clipped fish were run through a tag detector prior to freezing, and whether a tag was detected was noted on the data sheets. All heads were sent to the KRP's Arcata or Yreka laboratories for tag extraction and reading.

Preliminary grilse and adult cutoff fork lengths were determined using length frequency analysis of systematically sampled male Chinook, and final grilse/adult and age composition determinations were made by the KRTT using scale age proportions.

## Coho Salmon

As coho entered IGH in 2012, hatchery personnel anaesthetized each fish, determined whether it would be retained for potential spawning or released, then sent the fish to a processing tank, where KRP staff collected biological data including tissue samples, fork length, sex, scale samples, and clip/tag information. Those coho retained as potential brood stock were assigned a brood stock number, placed in individual PVC tubes, and placed in a round tank (Figure 2). These fish were tracked on data sheets and a master board, and as genetic information was received from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), were either used as brood stock or tagged with a PIT tag and released into the Klamath River at the spawning building. Tissue samples were sent to NOAA's salmon genetics repository in Santa Cruz, CA. via overnight Federal Express.


Photo by Rosa Albanese
Figure 2. Coho brood stock held in individually numbered tubes awaiting spawning matrix.

NOAA laboratory staff developed a spawning matrix designed to minimize the spawning of closely related individuals. The weekly matrix, sent via e-mail to the KRP, displayed a series of columns with brood stock number of each female coho at the top of a column, and beneath it, brood stock numbers of males in descending order of spawning suitability for that female. Males which were determined to be too closely related to any given female were denoted with an asterisk as "do not spawn" and were listed at the bottom of each column. A sample matrix is shown in Appendix 1.

On subsequent spawning days, coho were checked in their tubes for spawning readiness, and were either left in the tubes if not ready to spawn, or brought into the spawning building from the round tanks, sacrificed and spawned with fish chosen from
the spawning matrix. In 2012, coho crosses were 2:1 (two males to one female, with half of the female's eggs being fertilized by each male, and the egg lots kept separate), except for seven 1:1 pairings where only one suitable male was available. IGH and KRP personnel tracked the use of marked vs. unmarked individuals and the use of grilse for spawning. Otoliths were collected from all spawned coho.

After IGH reached its egg-taking goal, all coho not used in spawning were released into the Klamath River at the IGH spawning building. KRP personnel tagged these fish with PIT tags. PIT tag numbers of released coho that re-entered the hatchery were recorded as well. All coho tissue samples were sent at the end of the season to the NOAA facility in Santa Cruz.

## RESULTS

## Chinook Salmon

Chinook began entering IGH on September 26, 2012. A total of 40,015 Chinook returned to IGH during the fall 2012 spawning season. Of these, KRP staff collected scale samples, determined sex, and measured fork lengths for 11,550 Chinook (3,885 systematic random samples and 7,665 non-random samples). Systematically sampled male Chinook ranged in size from 40 to 98 cm . fork length (Figure 3), and systematically sampled female Chinook ranged from 56 to 93 cm . fork length (Figure 4). A preliminary grilse cutoff was made using the length frequency distribution from 1,808 systematically sampled Chinook males. The preliminary cutoff point of grilse occurred at $\leq 58 \mathrm{~cm}$. in fork length, yielding approximately $3.9 \%$ grilse $(1,537)$ and $96.1 \%$ adults $(38,478)$ for a total run size of 40,015 . Females accounted for $53.5 \%(21,393)$ of the run and males accounted for $46.5 \%$ ( 18,622 ). The last Chinook of the season entered IGH on November 26, 2012.


Figure 3. Length frequency distribution for systematic sample of male Chinook salmon recovered at IGH during the 2012 spawning season.


Figure 4. Length frequency distribution for systematic sample of female Chinook salmon recovered at IGH during the 2012 spawning season.

The KRTT met in February of 2013 to review the 2012 Chinook run monitoring efforts and estimate the age composition of the 2012 run (KRTT 2013). The KRTT used scale age proportions for developing adult and grilse age structure for the 2012 IGH Chinook returns (Table 2).

Heads from 8,400 AD Chinook (from systematic and non-systematic fish) were collected for CWT recovery, from which positive reads were obtained for 8,083. The remainder were either lost during extraction (124), were unreadable (56), or had shed their tags (137). The contribution of lost or unreadable CWTs was estimated by applying the proportions of known CWTs $(8,083)$ to the 180 lost or unreadable CWTs (Table 3).

The estimated contribution of unknown CWTs was then added to the contribution of known CWTs to determine the total contribution of hatchery Chinook entering IGH. All but 4 of the 8,083 CWTs recovered (and successfully read) originated from IGH, and the remaining 4 originated from Trinity River Hatchery (TRH). Based on the expansion of CWTs, KRP staff estimated that $84.4 \%$ of the Chinook entering IGH during the 2012 season were of hatchery origin (Table 4). Proportions of hatchery-origin Chinook returning to IGH from 2002-2012 are shown in Figure 5. Of the expanded CWT returns in 2012, $833(2.5 \%)$ were from yearling release groups and $32,225(97.5 \%)$ were from smolt release groups.

Table 2. Age composition of the 2012 Chinook salmon run that entered Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH), as developed by the Klamath River Technical Team (KRTT).

| Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Total Adults | Total Run |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1,537 | 36,485 | 1,992 | 0 | 38,478 | 40,015 |
| $3.8 \%$ | $91.2 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $0 \%$ |  |  |

Table 3. Estimated contribution of 180 Ad-cliped Chinook salmon with unknown coded-wire-tag (CWT) codes (lost or unreadable) that were recovered at IGH based on the proportional distribution of known CWTs recovered at IGH during the 2012 season.

| CWT | BY | \# CWTs <br> Recovered | Proportion of <br> CWTs recovered | Estimated <br> Number | Production <br> Multiplier | Expanded <br> Estimate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 68642 | 2008 | 12 | 0.001484597 | 0.26723 | 4.02 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 68643 | 2008 | 9 | 0.001113448 | 0.20042 | 4.02 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 68644 | 2008 | 34 | 0.004206359 | 0.75714 | 4.03 | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| 68645 | 2008 | 58 | 0.007175554 | 1.29160 | 4.02 | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| 68646 | 2008 | 67 | 0.008289002 | 1.49202 | 4.03 | $\mathbf{6}$ |
| 68647 | 2008 | 88 | 0.010887047 | 1.95967 | 4.06 | $\mathbf{8}$ |
| 68648 | 2008 | 143 | 0.017691451 | 3.18446 | 4.02 | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |
| 68661 | 2008 | 25 | 0.003092911 | 0.55672 | 4.02 | $\mathbf{2}$ |
| 68662 | 2008 | 29 | 0.003587777 | 0.64580 | 4.03 | $\mathbf{3}$ |
| 68818 | 2008 | 1 | 0.000123716 | 0.02227 | 4.05 | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| 68710 | 2009 | 1639 | 0.202771248 | 36.49882 | 4.02 | $\mathbf{1 4 7}$ |
| 68711 | 2009 | 1680 | 0.207843622 | 37.41185 | 4.01 | $\mathbf{1 5 0}$ |
| 68712 | 2009 | 1230 | 0.152171224 | 27.39082 | 4.04 | $\mathbf{1 1 1}$ |
| 68713 | 2009 | 1081 | 0.133737474 | 24.07275 | 4.17 | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |
| 68714 | 2009 | 901 | 0.111468514 | 20.06433 | 4.01 | $\mathbf{8 0}$ |
| 68715 | 2009 | 612 | 0.075714462 | 13.62860 | 4.04 | $\mathbf{5 5}$ |
| 68716 | 2009 | 260 | 0.032166275 | 5.78993 | 4.01 | $\mathbf{2 3}$ |
| 68720 | 2009 | 6 | 0.000742299 | 0.13361 | 4.29 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| 68837 | 2009 | 3 | 0.000371149 | 0.06681 | 4.03 | $\mathbf{0}$ |
| 68792 | 2010 | 54 | 0.006680688 | 1.20252 | 4.03 | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| 68793 | 2010 | 51 | 0.006309539 | 1.13572 | 4.17 | $\mathbf{5}$ |
| 68794 | 2010 | 45 | 0.005567240 | 1.00210 | 4.02 | $\mathbf{4}$ |
| 68795 | 2010 | 48 | 0.005938389 | 1.06891 | 12.17 | $\mathbf{1 3}$ |
| 68799 | 2010 | 7 | 0.000866015 | 0.15588 | 4.03 | $\mathbf{1}$ |
| Totals |  | $\mathbf{8 , 0 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 . 0 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ |  | $\mathbf{7 3 6}$ |



Figure 5. Number of Chinook returns to Iron Gate Hatchery that were determined to be of hatchery origin, 2002-2012.

Table 4. Estimated contribution of hatchery origin Chinook salmon recovered at IGH during the 2012 spawning season.

| CWT | Release <br> Location | Brood Year | Age | Release Type | Number <br> Recovered | Production <br> Multiplier | Expanded Estimate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Estimated contribution of known CWTs: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 68642 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Ff | 12 | 4.02 | 48 |
| 68643 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Ff | 9 | 4.02 | 36 |
| 68644 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Ff | 34 | 4.03 | 137 |
| 68645 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Ff | 58 | 4.02 | 233 |
| 68646 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Ff | 67 | 4.03 | 270 |
| 68647 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Ff | 88 | 4.06 | 357 |
| 68648 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Fy | 143 | 4.02 | 575 |
| 68661 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Fy | 25 | 4.02 | 101 |
| 68662 | IGH | 2008 | 4 | Fy | 29 | 4.03 | 117 |
| 68818 | TRH | 2008 | 4 | Ff | 1 | 4.05 | 4 |
| 68710 | IGH | 2009 | 3 | Ff | 1,639 | 4.02 | 6,589 |
| 68711 | IGH | 2009 | 3 | Ff | 1,680 | 4.01 | 6,737 |
| 68712 | IGH | 2009 | 3 | Ff | 1,230 | 4.04 | 4,969 |
| 68713 | IGH | 2009 | 3 | Ff | 1,081 | 4.17 | 4,508 |
| 68714 | IGH | 2009 | 3 | Ff | 901 | 4.01 | 3,613 |
| 68715 | IGH | 2009 | 3 | Ff | 612 | 4.04 | 2,472 |
| 68716 | IGH | 2009 | 3 | Ff | 260 | 4.01 | 1,043 |
| 68720 | IGH | 2009 | 3 | Ff | 6 | 4.29 | 26 |
| 68837 | TRH | 2009 | 3 | Fy | 3 | 4.03 | 12 |
| 68792 | IGH | 2010 | 2 | Ff | 54 | 4.03 | 218 |
| 68793 | IGH | 2010 | 2 | Ff | 51 | 4.17 | 213 |
| 68794 | IGH | 2010 | 2 | Ff | 45 | 4.02 | 181 |
| 68795 | IGH | 2010 | 2 | Ff | 48 | 12.17 | 584 |
| 68799 | IGH | 2010 | 2 | Fy | 7 | 4.03 | 28 |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal | 8,083 |  | 33,070 |
| Estimated contribution of unknown CWTs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 200000 |  |  |  |  | 124 |  |  |
| 400000 |  |  |  |  | 56 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Subtotal | 180 |  | 736 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Total Estimated Hatchery Contribution = |  |  |  |  |  | 33,806 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unreadable CWTs: $200000=$ CWT lost, $400000=$ CWT unreadable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Coded-Wire Tagging

In the spring of 2012 a 25 percent constant fractional mark (cfm) was applied to brood year (BY) 2011 Chinook salmon at IGH, the fourth consecutive year that this was accomplished. . A total of $1,468,533$ juvenile Chinook were AD clipped and CWT'd in 2012. The release of clipped and tagged fingerlings was $1,171,585$ and the release of clipped and tagged yearlings was 296,948. The total release of fingerlings (tagged and untagged) was 4,695,117 and the total release of yearlings was 1,188,881. Both groups had a tagging rate of $25 \%$. The first smolt release occurred on June 6, 2012 with Klamath River temperature at 63 degrees $F$ and flow of 1,560 cfs, and the remainder of the smolt releases occurred during the week of June 18, 2012 with Klamath River temperature 64.5 degrees F and flow of 1,540 cfs below Iron Gate Dam. The first yearling groups were released on November 7 and 8, 2012, with Klamath River temperature 56 degrees $F$ and flow of $1,000 \mathrm{cfs}$, and the last group of approximately 200,000 was released on November 15, 2012 with river temperature at 52 degrees F and flow at 1,000 cfs.

## Coho Salmon

Six hundred forty-four (644) coho entered IGH during the fall 2012 season between October 11, 2012 and December 6, 2012. Of these, 609 ( $94.6 \%$ ) had left maxillary (LM) clips, indicating they were of IGH origin, $29(4.5 \%)$ were unmarked, 4 ( $0.6 \%$ ) had a right maxillary clip, indicating Trinity River Hatchery origin, one ( $0.1 \%$ ) had both a left and right maxillary clip, and one had an AD clip but no CWT. Male coho ranged in size from 35 to 77 cm . in fork length (Figure 6). Female coho ranged in size from 45 to 74 cm . in fork length (Figure 7). Based on the length frequency distribution of 441 male coho, grilse were estimated to be $\leq 55 \mathrm{~cm}$ fork length. Analysis of 641 coho salmon (male and female) fork lengths determined that $53.5 \%$ (343) were grilse. Among males, the grilse component was 77.7\%


Figure 6. Length frequency distribution for male coho salmon recovered at Iron Gate Hatchery during the 2012 spawning season.


Figure 7. Length frequency distribution for female coho salmon recovered at Iron Gate Hatchery during the 2012 spawning season.

A total of 342 coho salmon which entered IGH and were in excess of brood stock needs were PIT tagged and released back to the Klamath River between October 17, 2012 and December 6, 2012. Of these, 59 were detected by antenna arrays in nearby Bogus

Creek (Klamath River RKM 304) and 50 in the Shasta River (Klamath River RKM 283). Eighty-two (24\%) PIT tagged coho re-entered IGH after their initial release. Of these, 67 re-entered the hatchery once after initial release, 14 re-entered twice and 1 re-entered three times. Bogus Creek and Shasta River were the only locations where antenna arrays were installed and maintained by CDFW, so it is unknown where else IGHreleased coho may have strayed.

The number of days that elapsed between the release of PIT tagged coho from IGH and the date of first detection in the Shasta River ranged from 2 to 27 days, and the average was 10 days. The river miles travelled per day ranged from 0.4 to 6 miles. Of the 50 coho, all were detected at the arrays located furthest downstream near the Shasta River Fish Counting Facility (SRFCF) at RKM 0, two were also detected at RKM12, although that array was not installed until November 18, 2012 and is likely to have missed some coho, and one was detected at RKM 56 .

Fifty-nine coho salmon PIT tagged and released from IGH were detected at the nearby Bogus Creek Fish Counting Facility (BCFCF), located approximately .3 miles from the mouth of Bogus Creek just below IGH. The number of days elapsed from release from IGH and detection at the BCFCF ranged from 1 to 40 days, and the average was 17 days. One 44 cm . coho grilse, released from IGH on 11/15/12, was detected at the BCFCF on 11/16/12 and again at the SRFCF five days later on 11/21/2012.

## DISCUSSION

## Chinook Salmon

The 2012 run $(40,015)$ of Chinook salmon at IGH was the second highest since KRP monitoring began in 1978, and exceeded the 35 -year average of 16,556 by 23,459 fish (Figure 8). In 2012 IGH Chinook comprised roughly 12\% of the total (Klamath basin) inriver run $(323,582)$ and $20 \%$ of the total spawner escapement $(195,291)$ (Table 5 ).

Since 1978, KRP has been monitoring the escapement of fall-run Chinook in the Klamath River basin, excluding the Trinity River. The Trinity River Project (TRP) has been monitoring salmon returns in the Trinity River basin during the same period, and the combined run size information generated from these two efforts is summarized in the CDFG "Mega Table" each year. Chinook run size data are compiled and reviewed by the KRTT during their annual age composition meeting in late January or early February. During the age composition meeting, results of the scale analysis are integrated into run- size data to estimate the age structure for each of the various stocks within the basin. Age-specific estimates of natural and hatchery in-river escapement coupled with ocean harvest data allow for cohort reconstruction of Klamath River fall-run Chinook, and are the foundation of model-based forecasting of next year's abundance in the ocean (KRTT 2013).

Klamath Basin fall Chinook ocean abundance forecasts are input by the KRTT into the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model, which models ocean mortality and fishery impacts to
allow for ocean fishery options and meet mandated in-river tribal and sport harvest sharing and in-river adult natural area spawner escapement targets. Thus, the run -size estimates that are compiled each year provide a critical source of data necessary for the effective management of fall Chinook each year.

After a record return of grilse to the Klamath Basin in 2011, the forecast was for a large return of three year old Chinook, and this was observed in 2012 (Table 6). Grilse and adult returns to IGH and Bogus Creek from 1978 to 2012 are shown in Table 7. A low observed incidence of Ceratomyxa shasta in 2010 (True et al., 2011), along with favorable flow and temperature conditions in the main stem Klamath River during the spring and early summer outmigration period, and favorable ocean conditions were likely contributors to the above normal survival of age three fall Chinook (brood year 2009).


Figure 8. Chinook salmon escapement to Iron Gate Hatchery, 1978 to 2012.
The Chinook salmon releases from IGH include both smolt and yearling releases. The current production goals include releases of 5,100,000 Chinook smolts in May and June and 900,000 yearlings in November. With the advent of the automated tagging trailer, more accurate raceway counts are possible, compared to the estimates of prior years (Chesney and Knechtle, 2011). Raceway counts in 2012 once again showed smolt release numbers below the hatchery goal, however, aggressive bird deterrent methods being employed at IGH appear to be reducing losses due to bird predation in the raceways during the period between tagging and release. The yearling release exceeded the goal by 288,881 .

One of the recommendations of the Joint Hatchery Review Committee (2001) was for IGH to produce more yearlings and fewer smolts, to reduce hatchery-origin/natural-
origin interactions during the typically low flow and poor water quality months of June and July. Flows during the mid-October to mid-November yearling release period are typically higher, and water quality better, resulting in less competition for food and space during out-migration (CDFG and NMFS 2001). Table 8 shows a comparison of return rates between CWT Chinook released as smolts and as yearlings. At this time there are physical and funding constraints that limit the Department's ability to implement an increased rearing program for yearling Chinook salmon.

Table 5. Historic Chinook salmon totals (includes adults and grilse) for the Klamath Basin, Iron Gate Hatchery and Bogus Creek, 1978-2012.

| Year | In-River Run (IRR) <br> Totals | Spawner Escapement (SE) |  | Iron Gate Hatchery |  |  | Bogus Creek |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Totals | \% IRR | Totals | \% IRR | \%SE | Totals | \% IRR | \%SE |
| 1978 | 115,728 | 90,135 | 77.9\% | 7,870 | 7\% | 9\% | 5,579 | 5\% | 6\% |
| 1979 | 62,970 | 42,255 | 67.1\% | 2,558 | 4\% | 6\% | 5,938 | 9\% | 14\% |
| 1980 | 82,413 | 57,683 | 70.0\% | 2,863 | 3\% | 5\% | 5,070 | 6\% | 9\% |
| 1981 | 108,422 | 56,333 | 52.0\% | 2,595 | 2\% | 5\% | 3,642 | 3\% | 6\% |
| 1982 | 106,020 | 67,076 | 63.3\% | 10,186 | 10\% | 15\% | 7,143 | 7\% | 11\% |
| 1983 | 61,392 | 47,960 | 78.1\% | 8,885 | 14\% | 19\% | 3,048 | 5\% | 6\% |
| 1984 | 55,542 | 30,375 | 54.7\% | 6,094 | 11\% | 20\% | 3,504 | 6\% | 12\% |
| 1985 | 133,827 | 104,487 | 78.1\% | 22,110 | 17\% | 21\% | 4,647 | 3\% | 4\% |
| 1986 | 239,559 | 180,263 | 75.2\% | 18,557 | 8\% | 10\% | 7,308 | 3\% | 4\% |
| 1987 | 228,182 | 143,890 | 63.1\% | 17,014 | 7\% | 12\% | 10,956 | 5\% | 8\% |
| 1988 | 215,696 | 130,749 | 60.6\% | 16,715 | 8\% | 13\% | 16,440 | 8\% | 13\% |
| 1989 | 133,440 | 72,438 | 54.3\% | 11,690 | 9\% | 16\% | 2,662 | 2\% | 4\% |
| 1990 | 40,274 | 25,705 | 63.8\% | 7,040 | 17\% | 27\% | 785 | 2\% | 3\% |
| 1991 | 34,425 | 19,121 | 55.5\% | 4,067 | 12\% | 21\% | 1,281 | 4\% | 7\% |
| 1992 | 40,391 | 28,479 | 70.5\% | 7,318 | 18\% | 26\% | 1,154 | 3\% | 4\% |
| 1993 | 64,810 | 48,945 | 75.5\% | 21,711 | 33\% | 44\% | 3,716 | 6\% | 8\% |
| 1994 | 78,354 | 60,850 | 77.7\% | 14,566 | 19\% | 24\% | 8,260 | 11\% | 14\% |
| 1995 | 245,542 | 217,312 | 88.5\% | 22,940 | 9\% | 11\% | 46,432 | 19\% | 21\% |
| 1996 | 185,305 | 108,325 | 58.5\% | 14,165 | 8\% | 13\% | 10,797 | 6\% | 10\% |
| 1997 | 91,729 | 70,303 | 76.6\% | 13,727 | 15\% | 20\% | 10,030 | 11\% | 14\% |
| 1998 | 95,286 | 75,157 | 78.9\% | 15,326 | 16\% | 20\% | 6,835 | 7\% | 9\% |
| 1999 | 70,296 | 50,088 | 71.3\% | 14,120 | 20\% | 28\% | 6,165 | 9\% | 12\% |
| 2000 | 228,323 | 188,642 | 82.6\% | 72,474 | 32\% | 38\% | 35,051 | 15\% | 19\% |
| 2001 | 198,676 | 142,324 | 71.6\% | 38,568 | 19\% | 27\% | 12,575 | 6\% | 9\% |
| 2002 | 170,014 | 99,016 | 58.2\% | 24,961 | 15\% | 25\% | 17,834 | 10\% | 18\% |
| 2003 | 195,791 | 152,390 | 77.8\% | 32,260 | 16\% | 21\% | 15,610 | 8\% | 10\% |
| 2004 | 88,589 | 53,478 | 60.4\% | 11,519 | 13\% | 22\% | 3,788 | 4\% | 7\% |
| 2005 | 67,579 | 56,188 | 83.1\% | 13,997 | 21\% | 25\% | 5,397 | 8\% | 10\% |
| 2006 | 88,258 | 70,986 | 80.4\% | 13,990 | 16\% | 20\% | 4,132 | 5\% | 6\% |
| 2007 | 132,167 | 95,998 | 72.6\% | 17,149 | 13\% | 18\% | 4,741 | 4\% | 5\% |
| 2008 | 95,619 | 64,487 | 67.4\% | 11,231 | 12\% | 17\% | 4,566 | 5\% | 7\% |
| 2009 | 112,685 | 73,688 | 65.4\% | 13,492 | 12\% | 18\% | 5,926 | 5\% | 8\% |
| 2010 | 107,500 | 69,584 | 64.7\% | 11,347 | 11\% | 16\% | 4,566 | 4\% | 7\% |
| 2011 | 188,845 | 144,314 | 76.4\% | 18,039 | 10\% | 12\% | 5,517 | 3\% | 4\% |
| 2012 | 323,582 | 195,291 | 60.4\% | 40,015 | 12\% | 20\% | 12,631 | 4\% | 6\% |
| Average | 128,207 | 89,552 | 69.5\% | 16,605 | 13\% | 19\% | 8,678 | 7\% | 9\% |
| MAX | 245,542 | 217,312 | 89\% | 72,474 | 34\% | 44\% | 46,432 | 19\% | 21\% |
| MIN | 34,425 | 19,121 | 52\% | 2,558 | 2\% | 5\% | 785 | 2\% | 3\% |
| ST DEV | 71,234 | 51,392 | 0.1 | 13,207 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 9,166 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

Table 6. Estimate of age composition of Klamath River fall Chinook salmon returning to the Klamath River Basin in 2012.

| Run Size |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Age |  | Number |  | Proportion |
| 2 |  | 21,473 |  | 0.07 |
| 3 |  | 248,532 |  | 0.77 |
| 4 |  | 51,352 |  | 0.16 |
| 5 |  | 2,225 |  | 0.01 |
| Total |  | 323,582 |  |  |

Table 7. Adult and grilse components of Chinook salmon returns to the Klamath Basin and Iron Gate Hatchery, 1978-2012.

| Total Klamath Basin Fall Chinook Escapement |  |  |  |  | Iron Gate Hatchery Returns |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Grilse | Adults | Total | \%Grilse | Year | Grilse | Adults | Total | \% Grilse |
| 1978 | 22,745 | 92,983 | 115,728 | 20\% | 1978 | 925 | 6,945 | 7,870 | 12\% |
| 1979 | 11,675 | 51,295 | 62,970 | 19\% | 1979 | 257 | 2,301 | 2,558 | 10\% |
| 1980 | 36,773 | 45,640 | 82,413 | 45\% | 1980 | 451 | 2,412 | 2,863 | 16\% |
| 1981 | 28,130 | 80,292 | 108,422 | 26\% | 1981 | 540 | 2,055 | 2,595 | 21\% |
| 1982 | 39,408 | 66,612 | 106,020 | 37\% | 1982 | 1,833 | 8,353 | 10,186 | 18\% |
| 1983 | 3,846 | 57,546 | 61,392 | 6\% | 1983 | 514 | 8,371 | 8,885 | 6\% |
| 1984 | 8,281 | 47,261 | 55,542 | 15\% | 1984 | 764 | 5,330 | 6,094 | 13\% |
| 1985 | 69,389 | 64,438 | 133,827 | 52\% | 1985 | 2,159 | 19,951 | 22,110 | 10\% |
| 1986 | 44,540 | 195,019 | 239,559 | 19\% | 1986 | 1,461 | 17,096 | 18,557 | 8\% |
| 1987 | 19,048 | 209,134 | 228,182 | 8\% | 1987 | 1,825 | 15,189 | 17,014 | 11\% |
| 1988 | 24,054 | 191,642 | 215,696 | 11\% | 1988 | 609 | 16,106 | 16,715 | 4\% |
| 1989 | 9,100 | 124,340 | 133,440 | 7\% | 1989 | 831 | 10,859 | 11,690 | 7\% |
| 1990 | 4,392 | 35,882 | 40,274 | 11\% | 1990 | 321 | 6,719 | 7,040 | 5\% |
| 1991 | 1,755 | 32,670 | 34,425 | 5\% | 1991 | 65 | 4,002 | 4,067 | 2\% |
| 1992 | 13,693 | 26,698 | 40,391 | 34\% | 1992 | 3,737 | 3,581 | 7,318 | 51\% |
| 1993 | 7,598 | 57,212 | 64,810 | 12\% | 1993 | 883 | 20,828 | 21,711 | 4\% |
| 1994 | 14,371 | 63,983 | 78,354 | 18\% | 1994 | 758 | 13,808 | 14,566 | 5\% |
| 1995 | 22,774 | 222,768 | 245,542 | 9\% | 1995 | 259 | 22,681 | 22,940 | 1\% |
| 1996 | 9,532 | 175,773 | 185,305 | 5\% | 1996 | 543 | 13,622 | 14,165 | 4\% |
| 1997 | 7,993 | 83,736 | 91,729 | 9\% | 1997 | 452 | 13,275 | 13,727 | 3\% |
| 1998 | 4,639 | 90,647 | 95,286 | 5\% | 1998 | 403 | 14,923 | 15,326 | 3\% |
| 1999 | 19,248 | 51,048 | 70,296 | 27\% | 1999 | 4,830 | 9,290 | 14,120 | 34\% |
| 2000 | 10,246 | 218,077 | 228,323 | 4\% | 2000 | 839 | 71,635 | 72,474 | 1\% |
| 2001 | 11,343 | 187,333 | 198,676 | 6\% | 2001 | 1,364 | 37,204 | 38,568 | 4\% |
| 2002 | 9,226 | 160,788 | 170,014 | 5\% | 2002 | 1,296 | 23,667 | 24,963 | 5\% |
| 2003 | 3,845 | 191,948 | 195,793 | 2\% | 2003 | 290 | 31,970 | 32,260 | 1\% |
| 2004 | 9,646 | 78,943 | 88,589 | 11\% | 2004 | 937 | 10,582 | 11,519 | 8\% |
| 2005 | 2,398 | 65,125 | 67,523 | 4\% | 2005 | 42 | 13,955 | 13,997 | 0\% |
| 2006 | 27,073 | 61,629 | 88,702 | 31\% | 2006 | 2,386 | 11,604 | 13,990 | 17\% |
| 2007 | 22,745 | 92,983 | 115,728 | 20\% | 2007 | 196 | 15,249 | 15,445 | 1\% |
| 2008 | 25,261 | 70,358 | 95,619 | 26\% | 2008 | 2,130 | 9,101 | 11,231 | 19\% |
| 2009 | 11,938 | 100,747 | 112,685 | 11\% | 2009 | 1,132 | 12,360 | 13,492 | 8\% |
| 2010 | 14,307 | 55,277 | 69,584 | 21\% | 2010 | 1,113 | 10,234 | 11,347 | 10\% |
| 2011 | 74,223 | 70,091 | 144,314 | 51\% | 2011 | 9,549 | 8,490 | 18,039 | 53\% |
| 2012 | 17,344 | 177,957 | 195,301 | 9\% | 2012 | 1,537 | 38,478 | 40,015 | 4\% |
| Average | 18,931 | 102,796 | 121,727 | 16\% | Average | 1,349 | 15,206 | 16,556 | 8\% |

Table 8. Return rates of IGH smolt and yearling CWT releases for brood years 1990-1996, 1999, 2000 and 2002-2008.

| $\begin{array}{c}\text { Brood } \\ \text { Year }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { IGH Smolt Releases } \\ \text { \# CWTs } \\ \text { Released }\end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { \# CWTs } \\ \text { Returned }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { \% } \\ \text { Return }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { IGH CWTs } \\ \text { Released }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { \# CWTs } \\ \text { Returned }\end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 188,595 | 713 | $0.378 \%$ | 95,880 | 740 | 0.7 |  |
| Return |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \(\left.\begin{array}{c}(eatio of <br>

return rates\end{array}\right]\)

## Coho Salmon

In recent years, returns of coho salmon to IGH (Figure 9) have been more stable than returns of naturally produced coho salmon throughout the basin (Chesney, D. et al 2011; Knechtle, M. et al 2011). There is increasing concern among fishery managers that the conservation of remaining upper Klamath River coho genetic resources is essential if the short-term risk of extinction is to be prevented. Because of the relatively stable returns of coho to IGH, there are proposals in place to use IGH coho in excess of brood stock needs to supplement escapement to areas of severely depressed runs, such as the Shasta River.

The 2009 Draft Hatchery Genetic Management Plan (HGMP) was developed for IGH as part of the CDFG's application for an ESA Section 10(a)(1)(A) permit for hatchery operation. The HGMP is intended to guide hatchery practices toward the conservation and recovery of listed species, specifically, the upper Klamath River coho population unit. Changes to the management of IGH coho, including the use of NOAA's spawning matrix and the addition of bird exclusion netting in the outdoor rearing raceways, were recommendations of the draft HGMP and were implemented in 2010 (CDFG, 2011). The draft HGMP also recommends increasing the proportion of natural origin broodstock (pNOB) and the proportion of jacks included in the broodstock (pJacks) (Table 9).

Table 9. Male, female and jack returns, number of females spawned, proportion of natural origin broodstock and jacks used in spawning, egg take, fecundity and yearlings released by brood year at IGH from 1993-2012.

| Year | Males | Females | Jacks | Females | Natural Origin |  |  |  |  | Yearlings released |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Spawned | Broodstock | pNOB | pJacks | \# Eggs | Fecundity |  |
| 1993 | 361 | 314 | 29 | 219 | ? | $\sim 15$ | $\sim 1$ | 503,326 | 2,298 | 79,506 |
| 1994 | 100 | 72 | 97 | 57 | ? | $\sim 15$ | $\sim 1$ | 141,397 | 2,481 | 74,250 |
| 1995 | 708 | 793 | 29 | 294 | ? | $\sim 15$ | $\sim 1$ | 782,170 | 2,660 | 81,489 |
| 1996 | 1,715 | 1,831 | 551 | 200 | ? | $\sim 15$ | $\sim 1$ | 547,255 | 2,736 | 79,607 |
| 1997 | 825 | 1,047 | 302 | 126 | 16 | 6.3 | $\sim 1$ | 304,728 | 2,418 | 75,156 |
| 1998 | 243 | 268 | 158 | 122 | 75 | 30.7 | $\sim 1$ | 298,357 | 2,446 | 77,147 |
| 1999 | 90 | 61 | 18 | 35 | 5 | 7.1 | $\sim 1$ | 86,519 | 2,472 | 46,250 |
| 2000 | 295 | 428 | 631 | 95 | 52 | 27.4 | $\sim 1$ | 270,151 | 2,844 | 67,933 |
| 2001 | 972 | 1,494 | 107 | 126 | 22 | 8.7 | $\sim 1$ | 404,370 | 3,209 | 74,271 |
| 2002 | 566 | 627 | 108 | 187 | 68 | 18.2 | $\sim 1$ | 609,193 | 3,258 | 109,374 |
| 2003 | 609 | 708 | 241 | 197 | 172 | 43.7 | $\sim 1$ | 502,048 | 2,548 | 74,716 |
| 2004 | 630 | 865 | 239 | 276 | 10 | 4.0 | $\sim 1$ | 799,623 | 2,897 | 89,482 |
| 2005 | 596 | 799 | 30 | 103 | 10 | 4.9 | $\sim 1$ | 295,101 | 2,865 | 118,487 |
| 2006 | 112 | 151 | 69 | 85 | 10 | 5.9 | $\sim 1$ | 236,406 | 2,781 | 53,950 |
| 2007 | 300 | 325 | 154 | 124 | 10 | 4.0 | $\sim 1$ | 316,155 | 2,550 | 117,832 |
| 2008 | 508 | 770 | 24 | 148 | 9 | 3.0 | $\sim 1$ | 455,480 | 3,078 | 121,000 |
| 2009 | 21 | 25 | 18 | 20 | 6 | 15.0 | $\sim 1$ | 53,435 | 2,672 | 22,236 |
| 2010 | 193 | 235 | 57 | 91 | 22 | 12 | 6 | 259,490 | 2,852 | 155,840 |
| 2011 | 248 | 204 | 134 | 57 | 21 | 25 | 12 | 151,241 | 2,653 | 39,250 |
| 2012 | 98 | 203 | 345 | 66 | 12 | 10 | 58 | 158,651 | 2,404 | N/A |
| Average | 460 | 561 | 167 | 131 | 33 | 14 | 25 | 358,755 | 2,722 | 81,988 |

The relatedness coefficient (Rxy) of pairs of coho salmon spawned at IGH during the 2012 season are shown in Figure 10. This was the third season for which the NOAA spawning matrix was used. Yellow bars represent actual spawned pairs. The maroon bars represent the optimal pairings of males and females that could be achieved if the most unrelated male was spawned with its most unrelated female for each mating. In the absence of the spawning matrix and if pairs were selected purely at random the resulting Rxy values are represented by blue bars (Garza et al., 2013) Highly inbred pairings result in Rxy values $>0.10$, and as a result of utilizing the spawning matrix, 76 inbred matings were prevented in 2012. Twelve pairings which were made in the absence of a matrix (female coho entering the hatchery ready to spawn, and in condition unlikely to survive until the next matrix was available) were analyzed after spawning. The NOAA lab recommended culling 11 of the 12 egg lots, as the parents were too closely related. Ten of the 11 "blind" pairings were between an adult female and a grilse male, and the $11^{\text {th }}$ was between an unmarked female and an unmarked male.

The findings of these analyses appear to contradict the long-held assumption that using jacks and unmarked fish for spawning reduces, with some certainty, the risk of pairing closely related individuals. As can be seen in Appendix 1, jacks and unmarked males can be closely related to an adult female, and are therefore not always safe choices for pairing. With the combined efforts of NOAA, CDFW and PacifiCorps, future coho spawning operations will likely continue to improve the genetic fitness of IGH coho.

Beginning in 1997 all coho that entered IGH, whose origin was either IGH or TRH, would have been maxillary clipped prior to release. Returns of clipped and unclipped coho from 1997 to 2012 are shown in Table 10.


Figure 9. Coho salmon returns at Iron Gate Hatchery from 1962 to 2012.


Figure 10. Observed relatedness coefficients of actual spawned pairs, optimally spawned pairs and randomly chosen pairs for IGH coho during the 2012 season (Figure provided by NOAA Southwest Fisheries Science Center Salmonid Genetic Laboratory).

Table 10. Summary of marked and unmarked coho salmon that entered IGH 1997-2012


Appendix 1. . Spawning matrix created by NOAA Salmon Genetics Repository. Females are shown at the top of each column with suffix F. Males are shown below in order of suitability for spawning with that female. The suffix MJ refers to a grilse male, and MU an unmarked male. Males shown in black text are acceptable for spawning, and males in red text are too closely related to that female and are not to be used for spawning.

| F_100F | F_101F | F_102F | F_103F | F_104F | F_105F | F_106F | F_107F |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M 127M | M_143MJ | M_7M | M_120MJ | M_113MJ | M 127MJ | M 116MJ | M_104M |
| M_104M | M 51M | M_113MJ | M_116MJ | M_141MJ | M 114MJ | M 119MJ | M_127MJ |
| M 113M | M 104M | M 111 MJ | M_140MJ | M 143MJ | M 94M | M 132MJ | M 51M |
| M 124MJ | M _127MJ | M_120MJ | M 143MJ | M 120MJ | M 136M | M_104M | M |
| M_1 | M_114MJ | M_108M | M 154N | M 1 | M |  | M |
| M $\quad 51 \mathrm{M}$ | M_140MJ | M_139M | M 117 N | M 1 | M_153M |  | M_93M |
| M_135M | M-1 | M | M_1 | M | M_104M | M_103M | M |
| M ${ }^{\text {a }}$ M | M_117MJ | M 122 M | M 93 M | M_114M | M_109MJ | M 114MJ | M 143MJ |
| M 120M | M 93M | M_142MJ | M 111 MJ | M_135MJ | M_130MJ | M_21MJ | M 124MJ |
| M 150MJ | M_120MJ | M 150MJ | M 110MJ | M 21 MJ | M_98MJ | M 143MJ | M_140MJ |
| M 111MJ | M_147MJ | M 135MJ | M_112MJ | M_147MJ | M_21MJ | M_112MJ | M 154MJ |
| M_21MJ | M 1 | M_21MJ | M_129MJ | M_111MJ | M_141MJ | M 129MJ | M 153MJ |
| M 143 MJ | M 116 M | M_117M | M 124 MJ | M_115M | M ${ }^{\text {-134MJ }}$ | M_136M | M 116 MJ |
| M 133MJ | M_1 | - | - | - | M_146M | - | M_112MJ |
| M_106M | M 129MJ | M_104M | M_119M |  | M_80MJ | - | M 129MJ |
| M_103M | M_110MJ | M_80M | M ${ }^{-132 M J}$ | M_98MJ | M ${ }^{\text {- }}$ 51M | M_140MJ | M_94M |
| M 142 MJ | M 137 MJU | M ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ 99M | M 147MJ | M_126M | M_101M | M 96 M | M_103M |
| M_105M | M_124MJ | M_134M | M_130MJ | M_140MJ | M 144MJ | M_117M | M_21MJ |
| M 140MJ | M 148M** | M_97M | M 145MJ | M_144M | M 106 MJ | M 154 MJ | M 96 M |
| M 108MJ | M_111MJ** | M 123MJ | M 155MJ | M 96 M | M_103M | M 153MJ | -_150M |
| M 153MJ | M_151MJ** | M_75MJ | M_151MJ | M | M_126MJ | M 120MJ | M_148M |
| M 130M | M_135MJ** |  | M 51M | M | M_142MJ | N | M_80MJ |
| M_115M | M_133MJ** | M_106MJ | M ${ }^{-135 N}$ | M ${ }^{-142 M J}$ | M_150MJ | M ${ }^{-141 M}$ | M_119MJ** |
| M 1 | M_123MJ** | M_149 |  | M | M_140MJ | M | M_132MJ** |
| M 15 | M | M_103M | M_49M | M_132MJ | M_108MJ | M_130M | M_105M** |
|  | M_1 |  |  |  |  | M_135M |  |
| M -122 MJ |  | M-140MJ | $\mathrm{M}^{-}$ |  | M-121MJ | M -51 M | M-147MJ** |
| M_-123MJ | $\mathrm{M}^{-1} 150 \mathrm{MJ}{ }^{* *}$ | M_-121MJ | M_114 | M_-130MJ | M-138MU | $\mathrm{M}^{-124 M J * *}$ | M_155MJ** |
| M ${ }^{\text {-144MJ }}$ | M 7 $^{* *}$ | M_105M | M_106M | M_145MJ | M_148M | M_127M ${ }^{* *}$ | M_135MJ** |
| M ${ }^{\text {96M }}$ | M_96M** | M_119MJ | M 152M | M_104M | M 147MJ | M_113MJ** | M_133MJ** |
| M 126 MJ | M_115MJ** | M 132 MJ | M | M_122MJ** | M 119MJ | M_126MJ** |  |
| M ${ }^{-117 M W}$ | M $145 \mathrm{MJ}{ }^{* *}$ | M | M | M_134MJ** | M_132MJ |  |  |
| M_154M | M_105M | M_115MJ | M | M | M_115MJ |  | ${ }^{* *}$ |
| M_148 | M_155MJ** | M 130 MJ | M_126M | _ | M 116 MJ | M_145MJ** | $\mathrm{MN}^{* *}$ |
| M_7M | M_125M** | M_151M | M_113MJ** | M_128MJ** | M_112MJ | M_108MJ** | M_110MJ** |
| M_119MJ | M_49M** | M $\quad$ - 51 M | M_103M** | M_109MJ** | M_129MJ | M_155M ** | M_113MJ** |
| M_132MJ | M_100M** | M_100M | M 87M ${ }^{* *}$ | M_136M** | M_49M | M_111MJ** | M_142MJ** |
| M 141 MJ | M_153MJ** | M $\quad 78 \mathrm{MJ}$ | M_96M** | M_117MJ** | M ${ }^{-133 M J}$ | M_98M ** | M_108MJ** |
| M_116MJ | M 21MJ** | M_79MJ | M $7 \mathrm{M}^{* *}$ | M_103M** | M 137M | M_134MJ** | M_151MJ** |
| M ${ }^{\text {-99M }}$ | M $106 \mathrm{MJ}{ }^{* *}$ | M 133MJ | M 115M | M $138 \mathrm{MU**}$ | M 118MJ | M_106MW** | M 99M** |
| M 137 MW | M_109M | M 127 M | M 105N | M 80M ** | M | M_152M ** | 25M** |
| M_100M | M_126MJ** | M_152MJ** | M_108MJ** | M_121MJ** | M 124 MJ | M 128MJ** | M 111M ${ }^{* *}$ |
| M_98M ${ }^{\star *}$ | M 80MJ** $^{\text {* }}$ | M_128MJ** | M_99M** | M_148M** | M_128MJ | M_138MU** | M_97M** |
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