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#### Abstract

A total of 6,287 Chinook salmon (Chinook, Oncorhynchus tshawytscha) were estimated to have entered the Shasta River during the 2009 spawning season. An underwater video camera was operated in the flume of the Shasta River Fish Counting Facility (SRFCF) twenty four hours a day, seven days a week, from September 1, 2009 until December 31, 2009. The first Chinook was observed on September 5, 2009 and the last Chinook on December 19, 2009. Klamath River Project (KRP) staff installed a trap immediately upstream of, and connected to the video flume, and a total of 388 Chinook were trapped and sampled for fork length (FL), sex and presence/absence of marks or tags between September 15, 2009 and December 24, 2009. KRP staff also processed a total of 189 Chinook carcasses during spawning ground surveys, and a total of 330 Chinook carcasses were collected as wash backs against the SRFCF weir during the season.

Chinook ranged in FL from 38 cm to 100 cm and grilse were determined to be $<60 \mathrm{~cm}$ in FL. The run was comprised of 292 grilse (4.6\%), and 5,995 adults (95.4\%). A net total of 9 adipose-clipped (AD) Chinook were observed passing through the SRFCF during the season, and these fish were assumed to be of hatchery origin. The heads from two AD Chinook were recovered from carcasses examined in the wash back sample, but only one contained a coded wire tag (CWT). Analysis of the tag recovered from this head indicated that this was a brood year 2004 fish released from Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) as a yearling in 2005. Expansion of this CWT by the production multiplier yielded an estimate of 8 hatchery origin Chinook. The remaining 7 AD Chinook were observed in the video flume but not recovered. An estimate of hatchery contribution was derived based on applying the proportion of CWT recoveries observed at Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) to these 7 ad-clipped fish. Using this method, a total of 123 additional hatchery origin Chinook were estimated to have entered the Shasta River during the 2009 run. This yields a total estimate of 131 hatchery Chinook, or $2.1 \%$ of the total run observed in 2009.

A net total of 9 coho salmon (coho, Oncorhynchus kisutch) were estimated to have entered the Shasta River during the 2009-10 season. The first coho of the season was observed passing through the SRFCF on November 2, 2009 and the last coho was observed swimming downstream through the SRFCF on December 21, 2009. All coho observed in the video review and in the trap appeared to be males. A total of 22 coho were observed passing upstream through the SRFCF and 14 coho were observed passing downstream from November 2, 2009 to December 21, 2009. Since it cannot be assumed that the 13 coho observed moving downstream through the SRFCF remained in the Shasta River, the net number of coho that are known to have remained in the Shasta River is 9 .


## Introduction

The Klamath River Project (KRP) of the California Department of Fish and Game (Department) is responsible for estimating the number of fall-run Chinook salmon that return to the Klamath River Basin, excluding the Trinity River Basin, each year. To achieve this task the KRP employs several techniques which include a creel survey of sport fishing effort and harvest, recovery of fish returning to Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH), completion of cooperative spawning ground surveys in major tributary streams and rivers, and operation of video fish counting weirs on the Shasta River, Scott River and Bogus Creek.

Video equipment was first installed at the Shasta River Fish Counting Facility (SRFCF) in 1998 and has been used to describe migration of fall-run Chinook into the Shasta River ever since. Although the primary responsibility of the KRP is to enumerate and describe fall-run Chinook salmon populations, data is recorded for other salmonid species observed at the SRFCF during its period of operation as well.

Since 2004, the KRP has elected to continue operating the SRFCF beyond the end of the Chinook run in an effort to document migration of coho salmon into the Shasta River. On August 5, 2004, the California Fish and Game Commission proposed to add coho populations between San Francisco and Punta Gorda (Central California Coast ESU) to the state's list of Endangered Species and those between Punta Gorda and the northern border of California, including the Klamath River, (Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast ESU) to the list of Threatened Species (Walsh and Hampton, 2007).

This report describes the characteristics of the Chinook and coho salmon runs that entered the Shasta River during the fall of 2009.

## Methods

Monitoring of the salmon run within the Shasta River is accomplished through four primary efforts: operation of a video weir, operation of a trap connected to the upstream end of the video flume, collection of data from salmon carcasses that become impinged on the weir panels as they float downstream (wash backs), and completion of spawning ground surveys to obtain biological data from salmon carcasses.

## Video Weir

The SRFCF consists of a video camera, counting flume and an Alaska style weir strategically placed in a diagonal cross section across the river channel (Figure 1). Fish immigrating upstream are directed through a narrow flume, which passes in front of an underwater video camera. The camera is connected to a time lapse video recorder and monitor. A JVC digital color video camera (Model No TK-C92OU) equipped with a 5 50mm 1:1.3 Computar lens was used at the SRFCF. An Everfocus EDSR 100H digital video recorder (DVR) with a Seagate 250 hard drive in a swappable Everfocus DTLA 250F tray were used as for recording.
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Figure 1. Alaska-style panels of the Shasta River Fish Counting Facility.
The weir and video camera were installed during the last week of August and began recording on September 1, 2009. During the 2009 season, staff of the KRP performed routine daily maintenance of the SRFCF. Staff inspected the video system to insure that everything was operating correctly, inspected and cleaned the weir panels and made any necessary repairs, and processed any wash-back carcasses present. Twice per week, on Mondays and Thursdays, the hard drive was removed from the DVR and replaced with a blank drive. All recording equipment was secured in locked enclosures and access to the site was controlled through a locked gate located on private property.

Hard drives with stored video data were immediately returned to the office where each was subsequently downloaded onto a one terra-bite (TB) external hard drive for storage and review by staff in the video lab. During each review, staff recorded the date, time (hour:min:sec), and species of each fish observed. In addition, staff noted the presence of adipose-clipped (AD) fish, and recorded the presence of lampreys or any other distinguishable marks that were visible on the footage. Fish recorded as "unknown" as to species were reviewed by project biologists. All data were then entered into files on a
personal computer and each data file was edited by a second individual prior to commencement of data analysis.

## TRAP

A temporary trap was installed immediately upstream of, and connected to the SRFCF on September 15, 2009 for the purpose of collecting biological data on upstream migrating Chinook and coho salmon, and also in collaboration with the Department's Shasta/Scott Resource Assessment Program whose objective was to radio-tag Chinook and coho for migration investigations. The trap was serviced by the KRP weir crews on Monday, Wednesday and Friday mornings by 0800 hours and checked and processed between 1100 and 1200 hours. All Chinook and coho salmon were sampled for FL, sex, and presence/absence of marks or clips. Scale and tissue samples were collected from every 5th Chinook. Each sampled Chinook was marked with a left operculum punch to prevent duplicate sampling should the fish be recovered as a carcass on spawning ground surveys or as a wash back on the weir. The trap was removed on December 24, 2009.

## WASHBACK CARCASSES

All salmon carcasses that drifted downstream and became impinged on the weir panels were recovered and processed. Data collected on these wash back carcasses included species, gender, and FL. Scales were removed from the left side of each carcass at a location posterior to the dorsal fin just above the lateral line whenever possible.

Every carcass was also examined for the presence of fin clips, marks or tags. Carcasses encountered in the wash back or spawning ground survey sample which had an operculum punch were cut in half and not sampled, as the punch indicated the fish had been sampled earlier in the trap located at the SRFCF. Heads were collected from each AD fish for later CWT recovery and analysis. Each female carcass was also examined to determine whether successful spawning had occurred. Female salmon with more than $50 \%$ of their egg mass still present in their body cavity were identified as pre-spawn mortalities. Carcasses were then cut in half to prevent sample duplication and returned to the river downstream of the weir.

## SPAWNING GROUND SURVEYS

Spawning ground surveys were conducted on the lower seven miles of the Shasta River, on publicly owned lands and on private lands where permission to access was obtained, and on the upper Shasta River and Big Springs Creek in the Big Springs area. The purpose of the spawning ground surveys was to gather biological data necessary to describe physical characteristics of the run, and to document spawning distribution in
areas previously inaccessible to Department personnel. Surveys were conducted once per week and were limited to areas historically used, or believed to be used, by spawning salmon.

During each survey, crews walked along the river bank searching for salmon carcasses. As carcasses were located crews processed each as previously described for weir wash backs. In addition to scale and tissue samples, one otolith sample was collected per reach on each survey day. Otoliths collected were supplied to Rebecca Quinones at the USDA Forest Service/University of California at Davis for microchemistry analysis, and were collected following protocols provided by Rebecca Quinones.

In 2009, weekly spawning ground surveys were conducted on the Shasta Big Springs Ranch, a 4000+ acre ranch property purchased in 2008 by the Nature Conservancy (TNC). This property includes Big Springs Creek and 2.9 miles of the mainstem Shasta River (RM 31.98 to 34.88 ). Because this property has not historically been accessible to the Department, one of the objectives of the 2009 spawning ground surveys was to map the location of salmon redds. The first spawning ground survey occurred on October 14, 2009 and the last survey occurred on December 2, 2009.

## Results

Operation of the SRFCF began the morning of September 1, 2009 at approximately 10:48 hours, Pacific Standard Time (P.S.T.). The first Chinook of the season was observed on September 5, 2009 at 04:11 hours and the last Chinook was observed on December 19, 2009 at 14:06 hours, P.S.T. (Figure 2). The weir and recording equipment were removed on December 31, 2009 due to anticipated high in-stream flows.

Recording was disrupted on two occasions: the first on October 13, 2009 when a power outage prevented recording for four hours and 20 minutes, and on December 9, 2009 when a buildup of ice on the weir resulted in the partial collapse of one of the tripods supporting the weir panels. Following this event, the SRFCF facility was not fish tight for four days and one hour. Weir crews attempted to break up the ice twice per day during this period. The weir was repaired and recording resumed on December 13, 2009 after air and water temperatures increased and the ice buildup ceased.

## Chinook Salmon

A net total of 6,275 Chinook were counted passing upstream through the SRFCF during the 2009 season. This number was derived by subtracting the number of downstream observations $(1,380)$ from the number of upstream observations $(7,655)$. The number of Chinook which may have passed through the SRFCF during periods of video malfunctions was estimated by averaging Chinook movements during the same time
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period two days prior to and two days after each video malfunction. An additional 12 Chinook were estimated to have entered the Shasta River during periods of equipment malfunctions, yielding a total estimate of $\mathbf{6 , 2 8 7}$ Chinook.

Consistent with previous years monitoring efforts, the majority of Chinook (95\%) passed through the SRFCF during day light hours between 06:00 and 17:00 hours (Figure 3).


Figure 2. Run timing of fall Chinook salmon observed at the Shasta River Fish Counting Facility in 2009.
The video camera is positioned on the right side of the flume, facing downstream, and therefore, the left side of each fish is visible to the camera as salmon migrate upstream. As staff reviewed each video tape, information was recorded on the presence of lamprey, fin clips, scars or other abnormalities that may be present on each fish. A total of 1,080 Chinook, $14 \%$ of the Chinook observed swimming upstream at the SRFCF, had live lamprey attached to their bodies. Since the right side of each fish cannot be seen during review of video tapes, any of these abnormalities that may be present on the right side cannot be observed. In many cases, lamprey attached to the right side of fish can be seen dangling below, above, or behind, these fish as they pass through the flume. As a result, the estimated number of fish observed with lamprey attached likely underestimates the actual occurrence of lamprey attachments by a small portion.


Figure 3. Diel run timing of Chinook salmon movement through the Shasta River Fish Counting Facility during the 2009 season.

A net total of 9 AD Chinook were observed passing through the SRFCF during the season, and these fish were assumed to be of hatchery origin (Table 1). The heads from two AD Chinook were recovered from carcasses examined in the wash back sample, but only one contained a coded wire tag (CWT). Analysis of the tag recovered from this head indicated that this was a brood year 2004 fish released from Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) as a yearling in 2005. Expansion of this CWT by the production multiplier yielded an estimate of 8 hatchery origin Chinook. The remaining 7 AD Chinook were observed in the video flume but not recovered. An estimate of hatchery contribution was derived based on applying the proportion of CWT recoveries observed at Iron Gate Hatchery (IGH) to these 7 AD fish. Using this method a total of 123 additional hatchery origin Chinook were estimated to have entered the Shasta River during the 2009 run. This yields a total estimate of 131 hatchery Chinook, or $2.1 \%$ of the total run observed in 2009.
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Table 1. Estimated contribution of 9 AD-clipped Chinook salmon observed at the SRFCF in 2009 based on the number of CWT fish actually observed at IGH and expanded based on the production multiplier for each CWT release code.

| Coded Wire Tag | Brood <br> Year | Age | Release Type | Number of CWT's observed at IGH | IGH CWT <br> Proportion | Estimated Number of CWT's | Production Multiplier | Estimated <br> Hatchery <br> Contribution |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 601020504 | 2004 | 5 | F | 2 | 0.0025 | 0.0174 | 17.12 | 0 |
| 601020505 | 2004 | 5 | F | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 16.61 | - |
| 601020506 | 2004 | 5 | F | 2 | 0.0025 | 0.0174 | 34.04 | 1 |
| 601020507 | 2004 | 5 | F | 1 | 0.0012 | 0.0087 | 37.42 | 0 |
| 601020508 | 2004 | 5 | Y | 1 | 0.0012 | 0.0087 | 9.09 | 0 |
| 601020509 | 2004 | 5 | Y | 0 | 0.0000 | 0.0000 | 8.01 | - |
| 601020602 | 2005 | 4 | F | 24 | 0.0298 | 0.2084 | 18.01 | 4 |
| 601020603 | 2005 | 4 | F | 17 | 0.0211 | 0.1476 | 18.67 | 3 |
| 601020604 | 2005 | 4 | F | 13 | 0.0161 | 0.1129 | 37.01 | 4 |
| 601020605 | 2005 | 4 | F | 4 | 0.0050 | 0.0347 | 46.33 | 2 |
| 601020606 | 2005 | 4 | Y | 55 | 0.0050 | 0.0347 | 9.24 | 0 |
| 601020607 | 2005 | 4 | Y | 118 | 0.0682 | 0.4777 | 9.22 | 4 |
| 601020608 | 2006 | 3 | F | 64 | 0.1464 | 1.0248 | 20.82 | 21 |
| 601020609 | 2006 | 3 | F | 98 | 0.0794 | 0.5558 | 15.93 | 9 |
| 601020700 | 2006 | 3 | F | 57 | 0.1216 | 0.8511 | 16.61 | 14 |
| 601020701 | 2006 | 3 | F | 45 | 0.0707 | 0.4950 | 16.54 | 8 |
| 601020702 | 2006 | 3 | F | 42 | 0.0558 | 0.3908 | 16.65 | 7 |
| 601020703 | 2006 | 3 | F | 44 | 0.0521 | 0.3648 | 18.11 | 7 |
| 601020704 | 2006 | 3 | Y | 174 | 0.0546 | 0.3821 | 9.57 | 4 |
| 608020000 | 2007 | 2 | Ff | 8 | 0.2159 | 1.5112 | 19.84 | 30 |
| 608020001 | 2007 | 2 | Ff | 10 | 0.0099 | 0.0695 | 18.10 | 1 |
| 608020002 | 2007 | 2 | Ff | 2 | 0.0124 | 0.0868 | 15.93 | 1 |
| 608020003 | 2007 | 2 | Ff | 6 | 0.0025 | 0.0174 | 16.26 | 0 |
| 608020004 | 2007 | 2 | Ff | 6 | 0.0074 | 0.0521 | 16.66 | 1 |
| 608020005 | 2007 | 2 | Ff | 8 | 0.0074 | 0.0521 | 17.59 | 1 |
| 608020006 | 2007 | 2 | Fy | 5 | 0.0099 | 0.0695 | 10.64 | 1 |
|  |  |  | Subtotal | 806 |  | 7 |  | 123 |
| Hatchery contribution of 7 unknown ad-clipped Chinook Salmon= Expansions of one known CWT= |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 123 |

Total estimated contribution of hatchery origin Chinook =

## Spawning Ground Surveys

A total of 670 redds were observed in two reaches of the Shasta Big Springs Ranch in 2009 (Figure 4,Table 2).

A total of 186 Chinook carcasses were sampled during spawning ground surveys. Of the 181 carcasses for which sex determinations were made 129 ( $71 \%$ ) were female and 52 (29\%) were male. FL measurements were collected from 179 of the 186 carcasses recovered (Figure 5) during the spawning ground survey.
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Figure 4. Redds located in Big Springs Creek and the main stem Shasta River above Big Springs Creek, 2009.

Table 2. Number of live Chinook salmon and new redds observed by date on two reaches on the Shasta Big Springs Ranch during 2009.

| Reach | Date | \# Lives | \# New Redds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Mainstem (Parks Creek to Big Springs Creek) | $10 / 7 / 2009$ | 21 | 15 |
|  | $10 / 14 / 2009$ | 65 | 89 |
|  | $10 / 21 / 2009$ | 144 | 134 |
|  | $10 / 28 / 2009$ | 0 | 7 |
|  | $11 / 4 / 2009$ | 5 | 107 |
|  | $11 / 18 / 2009$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{2 3 5}$ | $\mathbf{3 5 2}$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Big Springs Creek | $10 / 8 / 2009$ | 31 | 24 |
|  | $10 / 14 / 2009$ | 80 | 64 |
|  | $10 / 21 / 2009$ | 0 | 101 |
|  | $10 / 22 / 2009$ | 6 | 3 |
|  | $10 / 28 / 2009$ | 37 | 116 |
|  | $11 / 4 / 2009$ | 23 | 0 |
|  | $11 / 18 / 2009$ | 0 | 10 |
|  | $12 / 2 / 2009$ | 0 | 0 |
|  | Total | $\mathbf{1 7 7}$ | $\mathbf{3 1 8}$ |



Figure 5. Length frequency distributions of 2009 Shasta River Chinook salmon sampled in spawning ground surveys conducted during the 2009 season.

## Wash backs

A total of 331 Chinook carcasses were recovered and sampled as wash backs on the weir. Of the 327 for which sex was determined, 94 (29\%) were female and 233 (71\%) were male. Since 2004, the wash back samples at the SRFCF have shown a heavy bias toward males (Table 3).

Table 3. Sex composition of wash back carcasses sampled at Shasta River Fish Counting Facility, 20052009.

| Year | Sample Number | \% Males | \% Females |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2005 | 395 | 76 | 24 |
| 2006 | 457 | 94 | 6 |
| 2007 | 228 | 71 | 29 |
| 2008 | 767 | 96 | 4 |
| 2009 | 327 | 71 | 29 |

Trap
Between September 15, 2009 and December 24, 2009 a total of 388 Chinook were trapped and sampled for FL, sex, presence/absence of marks or tags, scale and tissue samples. Figure 6 represents the FL distribution of the Chinook sampled in the trap.

KRP staff elected to determine the grilse fork length cut-off for the 2009 Shasta River Chinook run based on fork length data obtained at the trap, as it eliminated the apparent bias toward males in the wash back sample and the apparent bias toward adult fish seen in the spawning ground survey sample. Using the FL distribution of 388 Chinook sampled in the trap, KRP staff determined that grilse salmon were $<60 \mathrm{~cm}$ in FL. Based on this determination, the Department estimates that the Chinook run in the Shasta River during 2009 was comprised of 292 (4.6\%) grilse and 5,995 (95.4\%) adults.


Figure 6. Length frequency distribution of Chinook salmon sampled at SRFCF trap during the 2009 season.

## Coho Salmon

A total of 22 coho salmon were observed passing upstream and 13 coho were observed passing downstream through the SRFCF from November 2, 2009 to December 21, 2009 (Figure 7). After subtracting the 14 coho observed moving downstream through the SRFCF, the total number of coho that are known to have remained in the Shasta River is 9 fish.

Beginning in 1996, all coho released from IGH (75,000 yearlings) receive a left maxillary clip and all coho released from Trinity River Hatchery (500,000 yearlings) receive a right maxillary clip. Unfortunately, the picture quality of the video footage does not allow for accurate determination of the presence of a maxillary clip. Therefore, the potential contribution of hatchery origin coho cannot be accurately determined from video review.


Figure 7. Run timing of coho salmon observed at the Shasta River Fish Counting Facility in 2009.

Nine observations were made of upstream migrating coho with lamprey attachments as they passed through the SRFCF, and 3 of these were observed with at least two lamprey attachments.

During the 2009 season, the Department's Shasta/Scott Resource Assessment program conducted a radio telemetry investigation in which 3 male unmarked coho were trapped and tagged at the SRFCF between November 5, 2009 and December 18, 2009.

Of three tagged coho, the furthest upstream detection occurred at RM 9, upstream of the I-5 bridge just above the canyon. The second was detected at the Highway 263 bridge ten days after tagging and the third never left the weir area (Olswang, 2009).

## Steelhead Trout

A total of 814 observations of steelhead trout were recorded by SRFCF technicians during the 2009 season, 316 less than the 2008 observations of 1,130. After subtracting the downstream observations from the upstream, a net total of 668 steelhead trout were estimated to have migrated into the Shasta River during the recording period.

## Flow

In-stream flow data for the Shasta River was downloaded from the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) gauge no. 11517500 located near the mouth of the Shasta River north of Yreka. Complete flow records are available for this gauge for water years 1934 through 1941 and 1946 to the present. Flow data for the 2009-2010 water year are provisional at this time and may be subject to revision once these records have been finalized by the USGS. Annual discharge volumes in the Shasta River have ranged from a low of 56,299 acre feet (AF) in 1934 to a high of 263,128 AF in 1974.

Flow data for the SRFCF 2009 season are shown in Figure 8. During the 2009 recording period, USGS gage \# 11517500 recorded a minimum flow of 9.5 cfs on September 4, 2009 and a maximum flow of 152 cfs on December 16, 2009. The agricultural irrigation season on the Shasta River officially ends on October 1 of each year, after which time flows in the Shasta River typically increase. Immediately following the end of irrigation season and following storm events, KRP staff increased efforts to clear debris off the weir panels. Recording was not disrupted due to high flows in 2009; however, a period of cold weather from December 9 to December13 caused ice to form on the weir, resulting in a broken tripod. Weir integrity was compromised for four days until temperatures increased, ice melted and water levels allowed filming to resume.
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Figure 8. Average daily flows (cfs) in the Shasta River at USGS Gauge No. 11517500 from September 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009.

## Discussion

## Chinook Salmon

Since 1978 the run size of fall Chinook in the Shasta River has averaged 5,194 fish, and has ranged from a low of 533 fish in 1990 to a high of 18,731 fish in 1978. The 2009 fall Chinook run totaled 6,287 fish, and ranks as the $11^{\text {th }}$ highest run recorded since 1978 (Figure 9).


Figure 9. Chinook salmon run size estimates for the Shasta River from 1978 through 2009.

During the late summer and early fall of 2009, flows in the Shasta River were among the lowest on record: 4.74 cfs measured at the SRFCF site on July 29, 2009, with water temperature 25.5 degrees C (Hampton, 2009). On September 23, 2009, the USGS gauge recorded a reading of 23 cfs , a record low for that date, the historical impaired mean being 95 cfs. Over 1,400 Chinook had passed through the SRFCF by September 24, 2009. Field observations during the last week of September indicated that most of these Chinook were holding in pools in the canyon reach of the lower river. Elevated air and water temperatures and low flows created conditions in which Chinook might be at risk for pre-spawning mortality due to stress or disease outbreaks, or reduced egg viability due to high temperatures and a delay in reaching spawning areas. Marine (2010) found in controlled trials of Trinity River spring Chinook that at temperatures of 14.5 degrees C and above, mortality increased rapidly for incubating embryos and preemergent larvae. While adult Chinook salmon were present (Figure 10) in the Shasta River, daily mean stream temperatures recorded at the counting facility were in excess of $14.5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ from when the first Chinook was observed on September 4, 2009 to September 29, 2009 when stream temperatures rapidly started to decline (Figure 11).

Department staff monitored water temperatures and dissolved oxygen (DO) levels in several large pools where Chinook were holding from September 24 to September 30, 2009. Evening water temperatures were as high as 20 degrees C; however, DO levels remained within specie tolerance levels and no signs of distress or unusual mortality were observed in the fish. Conditions improved by September 27, 2009 when air temperatures cooled and six Shasta River irrigators, aware of the potential for a fish kill, voluntarily shut off their diversions early in an effort to increase in-river flows.

Between 2001 and 2009, an average of 31\% of the Shasta River fall Chinook runs passed through the SRFCF on or before September 30, prior to the end of irrigation season (Table 4).


Figure 10. 2009 Shasta River Chinook migrating through the SRFCF per day and average daily flows (cfs) at USGS Gauge No. 11517500 from September 1, 2009 to December 31, 2009.
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Figure 11. Average daily temperatures recorded at the Shasta River Fish Counting facility from February 12, 2009 to December 31, 2009.

Table 4. Percentage of the total annual Shasta River fall Chinook run counted through the SRFCF on or before September 30, and October1 through 8, from 2001 to 2009.

| Percent of Chinook observed on or before September 30 |  | Percent of Chinook observed October 1 through October 8 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Percent of run | Year | Percent of run |
| 2001 | 25\% | 2001 | 32\% |
| 2002 | 51\% | 2002 | 16\% |
| 2003 | 26\% | 2003 | 28\% |
| 2004 | 18\% | 2004 | 32\% |
| 2005 | 33\% | 2005 | 16\% |
| 2006 | 36\% | 2006 | 28\% |
| 2007 | 15\% | 2007 | 24\% |
| 2008 | 39\% | 2008 | 27\% |
| 2009 | 32\% | 2009 | 42\% |
| Average | 31\% | Average | 27\% |

Hatchery Straying
Since 2002, the KRP has estimated the number of hatchery origin fall Chinook that may have strayed into the Shasta River. These estimates have been based on sample expansions from tag recoveries obtained from the Shasta River, or have been based on the proportional distribution of CWT recoveries observed at IGH and applied to the number of ad-clipped Chinook that were observed passing through the SRFCF during the season, or both. Since 2001 the percent estimated contribution of hatchery strays to the Shasta River has ranged from a low of $1.2 \%$ in 2002 to a high of $38.7 \%$ in 2004 (Table 5). The percentage of hatchery strays into the Shasta River was $2.1 \%$ in 2009.

Table 5. Estimates of hatchery strays as percentage of Chinook entering the Shasta River, 2002-2009.

| Year | Total Number <br> of Chinook | Hatchery Stray <br> Estimate | Percent <br> Hatchery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2002 | 6,820 | 79 | $1.2 \%$ |
| 2003 | 4,289 | 436 | $10.2 \%$ |
| 2004 | 962 | 372 | $38.7 \%$ |
| 2005 | 2,129 | 469 | $22.0 \%$ |
| 2006 | 2,184 | 106 | $4.9 \%$ |
| 2007 | 2,035 | 69 | $3.4 \%$ |
| 2008 | 6,362 | 66 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 2009 | 6,287 | 131 | $2.1 \%$ |

Each year the Klamath River Technical Advisory Team determines the age composition for fall Chinook salmon populations that return to the Klamath River and its tributary streams. These analyses are based on both length frequency distributions and results of scale age analysis conducted for each sub-basin within the Klamath River watershed. The data are used in an Klamath River Ocean Harvest Model to estimate age specific ocean abundance and develop harvest management recommendations for the following season. A summary of the age composition determinations for Shasta River fall Chinook salmon are provided in Table 6.

Table 6. Age composition of Shasta River fall Chinook salmon from 2002 through 2009 as determined by the Klamath River Technical Advisory Team.

| Year | Age 2 | Age 3 | Age 4 | Age 5 | Total <br> Adults | Total Run |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2002 | 386 | 4,286 | 2,088 | 58 | 6,432 | 6,818 |
| 2003 | 155 | 2,798 | 1,325 | 11 | 4,134 | 4,289 |
| 2004 | 129 | 184 | 484 | 166 | 833 | 962 |
| 2005 | 38 | 1,409 | 600 | 82 | 2,091 | 2,129 |
| 2006 | 863 | 253 | 1,042 | 27 | 1,321 | 2,184 |
| 2007 | 27 | 1,855 | 146 | 8 | 2,008 | 2,035 |
| 2008 | 3,621 | 1,222 | 1,456 | 63 | 2,741 | 6,362 |
| 2009 | 126 | 5,595 | 314 | 252 | 6,161 | 6,287 |

In 2008, the grilse (2006 Brood Year (BY) component of the Shasta River Chinook run was the third highest in KRP history at 56.9 percent. A strong 3-year old component of the 2009 run was expected, and in 2009, the basin-wide component of 3 -year olds was estimated to be $89 \%$ of the total run (Table 6).

Closures of ocean commercial and extreme reductions of sport Chinook fisheries off California and most of Oregon in 2008 and 2009, enacted to protect weak Sacramento River fall Chinook stocks, may have had a positive effect on Klamath Basin stocks. The conservation objective of 40,700 natural area adult spawners was met in 2009, when 44,589 natural area adult spawners were estimated to have returned to the Klamath Basin.

The Shasta River is an important component of the Klamath Basin Chinook runs. Table 7 shows that the Shasta River has contributed an average of 9 percent of the basin-wide natural spawning escapement during the period from 1978 to 2009. As habitat conditions improve in the Shasta River watershed the ability of the watershed to produce fish will hopefully improve. The river's current habitat conditions continue to produce more 0+ Chinook as more adults return, indicating that the watershed has not reached a "saturated level" or "carrying capacity" for Chinook salmon (Figure 12). The Shasta River has been known for its extremely productive conditions and at the current levels of fish abundance the Shasta River is considered spawner limited.

Figure12. Number of 0+ Chinook produced per adult spawner in the Shasta River, Brood Years 2000-2008.


Table 7. Klamath Basin and Shasta River Chinook natural spawner escapements (age 2-5), 1978-2009.

| Year | Chinook Natural Spawner Escapement | $\%$ Shasta |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Klamath Basin |  |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 7 8}$ | 74,906 | 18,731 | $25 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 7 9}$ | 37,398 | 8,151 | $22 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 0}$ | 48,465 | 8,096 | $17 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 1}$ | 50,364 | 12,220 | $24 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 2}$ | 50,597 | 8,455 | $17 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 3}$ | 33,310 | 3,872 | $12 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 4}$ | 21,349 | 2,842 | $13 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 5}$ | 61,628 | 5,124 | $8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 6}$ | 142,302 | 3,957 | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 7}$ | 110,489 | 4,697 | $4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 8}$ | 91,930 | 2,842 | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 8 9}$ | 49,377 | 1,577 | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | 16,946 | 533 | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 1}$ | 12,367 | 726 | $6 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 2}$ | 17,171 | 586 | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 3}$ | 25,683 | 1,426 | $6 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | 38,578 | 5,203 | $13 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | 179,118 | 13,511 | $8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | 87,500 | 1,450 | $2 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | 50,369 | 2,001 | $4 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | 45,343 | 2,542 | $6 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | 28,904 | 3,197 | $11 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | 89,122 | 12,296 | $14 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | 85,581 | 11,093 | $13 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | 69,502 | 6,818 | $10 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | 89,744 | 4,289 | $5 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | 28,516 | 962 | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | 27,931 | 2,129 | $8 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 6}$ | 45,002 | 2,184 | $5 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 7}$ | 61,741 | 2,036 | $3 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 8}$ | 48,073 | 6,362 | $13 \%$ |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 2 , 7 0 2}$ | 6,287 | $12 \%$ |
| Average | $\mathbf{5 8 , 5 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 , 1 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{9} \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |

## Coho Salmon

Since 2001, the KRP has operated the SRFCF beyond the Chinook salmon migration period in an effort to better document coho returns in the Shasta River.
Figure 13 shows returns of coho to the Shasta River from 1978 to 2009. Sampling from 1983 to 2000 cannot be directly compared to other years, as the weir was removed on or before November 11 during those years and sampling does not represent the entire run of coho.

Returns of wild coho to the Shasta River and throughout the Klamath Basin were extremely poor in 2009. All nine of the coho known to have entered the Shasta River
appeared to be males. Five of the 9 were captured in the SRFCF trap and sex was determined by direct observation, and the other four were observed during video review. One of the 5 coho (20\%) trapped was marked with a left maxillary clip indicating that this fish was of hatchery origin, most likely IGH. Based on a sub-sample of coho handled at the trap the proportion of hatchery origin fish has be estimated from 20072009 (Table 8).


Figure 13. Returns of coho salmon to the Shasta River, 1978-2009.
Table 8. Estimates of hatchery strays as percentage of coho entering the Shasta River, 2007-2009.

| Year | Total Number <br> of Coho | Hatchery Stray <br> Estimate | Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 249 | 5 | Hatchery |

During the ice buildup from December 9 to December 13, 2009, the weir was compromised. It is possible that additional coho may have entered the river over the weir (Figure 14), but given that no coho were observed during the four days prior to or the four days following that event, and given that the ice buildup was not associated
with an increase in flow, it seems unlikely that a significant portion of the coho run entered the river during that period.


Figure 14. Ice buildup caused the collapse of a tripod supporting the Alaskan weir at the SRFCF, December, 4, 2009.

Radio tagging studies conducted in 2004 through 2009 identified two main spawning areas in the Shasta River: the lower six miles of canyon and the upstream area known as the Big Spring Complex. (Littleton and Pisano, 2006; Olswang, 2007, 2008 and 2009). Rotary screw trapping studies at the mouth of the Shasta River from 2003 to 2009 have documented the emigration of coho fry or parr in response to low flows and high water temperatures which typically occur after the start of the agricultural irrigation season on April 1st (Chesney et al, 2010). These studies concluded that high summer temperatures, low flows and barriers to juvenile migration out of the canyon make it unlikely that the progeny of canyon-spawning coho are able to find over- summer rearing habitat in the Shasta River.

In the Big Springs complex, during the summers of 2008 and 2009 direct observations as well as pit tagging studies identified several cold water spring areas where coho were rearing over the summer. Pit tagged coho were observed to move upstream into these thermal refugia when water temperatures rose elsewhere in the river. Chesney et al concluded that conservation of these areas were essential to the survival of juvenile coho.


Figure 15. Returns of Shasta coho cohort 1.
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Figure 16. Returns of Shasta coho cohort 2.


Figure 17. Returns of Shasta coho cohort 3.
Figures 15, 16 and 17 show declines of 3 Shasta River coho cohorts.
Given the extremely poor returns of cohorts 2 and 3, it appears that the best chance for restoration of Shasta River coho remains with cohort 1, which is due to return in 2010. At this time management options under consideration include a conservation hatchery using captured and captively reared Shasta coho, flow enhancing agreements with irrigators to ensure adequate flows and water temperatures for juvenile rearing of juveniles and enhanced flows to facilitate the immigration of adults.

Utilizing the number of yearling coho produced in the Shasta River (Chesney et al 2010) and the results of the adult abundance estimates allows for analysis of freshwater production and out of basin survival by brood year. The number of yearling coho that are required to produce a single adult coho has averaged 33.83 and ranged from a low of 23.11 to a high of 43.7 for brood years 2001-2006. The corresponding out of basin survival has averaged 3.14 percent and ranged from a low of 2.35 percent to a high of 4.33 percent (Table 9). Although the proportion of yearlings that survive outside the Shasta River watershed is largely driven by factors uncontrollable it is important to track this survival metric to accurately evaluate ongoing restoration efforts taking place within the watershed.

Table 9. Yearling coho outmigrant abundance point estimates, adult coho abundance estimates, ratio of outmigrant yearlings to adult returns and proportion of outmigrant yearlings that returned as adults by brood year for the Shasta River, Brood Years 2001-2006.

| Brood Year | Yearling Year | Yearling point <br> Estimate | Adult Year | Adult <br> Estimate | Yearlings <br> to adult | Percent <br> Yearling survival |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | 2003 | 11052 | 2004 | 373 | 29.63 |  |
| 2002 | 2004 | 1799 | 2005 | 69 | 26.37 |  |
| 2003 | 2005 | 2054 | 2006 | 47 | 43.70 | 2.84 |
| 2004 | 2006 | 10833 | 2007 | 255 | 42.48 | 2.39 |
| 2005 | 2007 | 1178 | 2008 | 31 | 38.00 | 2.63 |
| 2006 | 2008 | 208 | 2009 | 9 | 23.11 | 4.33 |
| Average |  |  |  |  | 33.83 | 3.14 |

Analyzing the comparisons of estimated adult coho returns to yearling coho production estimates (Chesney et al 2010) also produces freshwater survival estimates in the form of yearling coho produced per adult return. The number of yearling coho produced per returning adult has averaged 20.0 and ranged from a low of 4.4 to a high of 38.0 for brood years 2001-2006 (Table 10). As the number of yearlings produced per returning adult increases it can be inferred that in river conditions for coho salmon are improving. Conversely as the number of yearlings produced per returning adult decreases it can be inferred that in river conditions for coho salmon are getting worse.

Table 10. Adult coho estimates, yearling coho production point estimates and ratio of yearling coho produced per adult return for the Shasta River, Brood Years 2001-2006.

| Adult Year <br> Brood Year | Adult <br> Estimate | Yearling Year | Yearling point <br> Estimate | Yearlings produced <br> per adult |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 | 291 | 2003 | 11052 | 38.0 |
| 2002 | 86 | 2004 | 1799 | 20.9 |
| 2003 | 187 | 2005 | 2054 | 11.0 |
| 2004 | 373 | 2006 | 10833 | 29.0 |
| 2005 | 69 | 2007 | 1178 | 17.1 |
| 2006 | 47 | 2008 | 208 | 4.4 |
| Average |  |  | 20.0 |  |

It is hoped that as conditions in Big Springs Creek and other properties being managed and restored for the benefit of Salmonids improve, the production, survival and successful out-migration of future coho runs will improve in the Shasta River.
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